2015

Where Are All the Women? The Decline of Female Coaches Post Title IX

Madeline Amon
Bowling Green State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/hmsls_mastersprojects

Repository Citation
Amon, Madeline, "Where Are All the Women? The Decline of Female Coaches Post Title IX" (2015). Masters of Education in Human Movement Sport and Leisure Studies Graduate Projects. 8.
https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/hmsls_mastersprojects/8

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Human Movement, Sport and Leisure Studies at ScholarWorks@BGSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters of Education in Human Movement Sport and Leisure Studies Graduate Projects by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@BGSU.
WHERE ARE ALL THE WOMEN?

THE DECLINE OF FEMALE COACHES POST TITLE IX:

Madeline Amon

Master’s Project
Submitted to the School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies
Bowling Green State University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

In

Sport Administration

April 20, 2015
Abstract

This paper helps illustrate the decline of female coaches in the NCAA post Title IX. Before Title IX was passed female coaches coached over 90% of female athletes and currently, while female sport participation is at an all-time high, female’s coaching female athletes is not. This drop in females coaching is a serious issue that demands change. This paper calls for change within the current NCAA administrative structure. This paper looks at recent literature surrounding the issue and replicates a study conducted by Dr. Nicole LaVoi from the University of Minnesota that illustrates the issue at the Division I level. The Division II level is not widely researched and this paper can add to the literature surrounding the decline of female coaches. Giving an institution a grade helps compare them to others with likeness. Ultimately this project answers the following question: What percentage of women occupies head coach positions for women’s sport teams at the top ranked 25 football schools at the Division II level for the 2014-2015 academic year?
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Reflection

During my two year program in the School of Human Movement, Sport, and Leisure Studies at Bowling Green State University I underwent a series of change. I came into the program not knowing what to expect and was blindsided by the amount of research that required with little background in sport. This may not have been an issue for many in the program but coming from a background in criminal Justice and Sociology I was unfamiliar with many issues relating to sport.

I quickly learned to adjust and was thrilled when my classes required reading and studying of current events in sport. I was constantly learning new things and was able to discuss relevant issues in class. I learned how to form an educated opinion and debate it within class discussions. The challenging, rigorous workload kept me busy but I was still given the opportunity to work with the Bowling Green State University volleyball team. This was probably the most important part of my two years in Bowling Green. I learned what I ultimately didn’t want to do. I also learned coping techniques when the stress of school and work was extreme. I had been coaching for a couple years prior to enrolling and believed that coaching at the Division I level was what I ultimately wanted to do. While I gained valuable I learned that this would not be a profession that made me happy.

Being accepted into the HMSLS program gave me the opportunity to explore different career pathways. Through on the job experience through graduate assistantships I learned how to manage my time and create a strong work ethic. Sport is not a 9-5 profession and having the skills and experience I gained during my two years will set me up for success.

My topic for my project underwent many changes as I was personally experiencing them. I finally realized that I wanted to illustrate major issues for female coaches. I was shown
firsthand how difficult it is as a female in the workplace at a Division I institution. I used this project as a way to prove the struggles are extremely real and that change must happen to promote diversity in the NCAA. I want this project to serve as a stepping stone to help future, prospective coaches. Recruitment and support is needed within athletic departments and without the NCAA may lose out on talented female coaches because of the hardships relating to obtaining a job.

I will take these different skills that I learned in my time at Bowling Green and will be successful. I am extremely grateful I was given the opportunity to attend BGSU and will be better off professionally because of it.
Introduction

Female coaches face many challenges in the workplace. Job availability, home-work life balance and support are issues females face (Kamphoff, Amerntroux, & Driska, 2010). Being taken seriously in college athletics is becoming a difficult task for females. Kamphoff, Amerntroux, & Driska (2010) explained it best when describing how female coaches were seen. They stated, “many times the women described that they were mistaken for athletic trainers, relatives, reporters, statisticians, managers or even potential dating companions instead of head coaches” (p.300). Past research shows the difficulties female coaches face and many illustrate the steep decline of female’s coaching (Kamphoff, 2010; LaVoi, 2010; Norman, 2010; Stengl & Kane, 1991; Satore & Cunningham, 2007).

There has been a steady decline of females coaching females since Title IX was passed. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, “Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 protects people from discrimination based on sex in education programs and activities that receive federal financial assistance” (nces.ed.gov). It took a few years for Title IX to be reflected in athletics. In athletics, “to be considered in compliance with Title IX, athletics departments must show that they are achieving parity in the following three areas: participation, treatment in program areas and athletic financial assistance” (nacwaa.org). It wasn’t until five years after Title IX was enacted for a female to be named a head coach in the NCAA (Richman, 2010).

These rules were put in place to offer opportunities for women to participate in sport that were not previously offered. Women rarely played sports, they were seen as male dominant, and oftentimes were blamed for health issues in women (Gems, Borish & Pfister, 2008). A woman’s
job was seen as a simple task, Remain a healthy, robust reproductive being. They held top role in the domestic domain. Only certain forms of physical activity was seen as appropriate for women for fear of problems with reproductive health (Gems, Borish & Pfister, 2008). Sport has been and still is male dominated however, Title IX created opportunity. Opportunity for female athletes?
Yes.
Female coaches?
Not so much.

The real question is, “Why does transparent discrimination continue for female coaches?” (Richman, 2010, p 379). Richman (2010) tries to answer this difficult question by explaining, “Because Title IX, the legislation most often relied on for equal opportunity litigation, has proven to have inadequate remedies and penalties against such discrimination” (p.379). Reform is needed and looking at how Title IX has failed female coaches is one way it could be made possible. Structural inequalities of Title IX have created barriers for women (Richman, 2010). These issues include: male athletic directors, men coaching female teams, inequality in salaries, a competitive advantage for men, and a lack of female role models. This paper will review the literature surrounding these issues.

Previous research shows the decrease in the percentage of females coaching female athletes to be vast. Acosta & Carpenter (2012) found that only 20% of all collegiate teams (men’s and women’s) are coached by women and in 1972, 9 out of 10 coaches for women’s teams were females compared to 4 out 10 coaches for women’s teams are females in 2014.

Research surrounding this decrease is important. It can help figure out how to recruit and retain female coaches, offer changes to help support female coaches, and determine why
female coaches are leaving the profession (LaVoi, 2012). Currently, the vast majority of research surrounding female coaches is at the Division I level. It is important to look at other divisions to determine if this phenomenon is strictly related to highly sought after, power positions in athletics. My research question is: What percentage of women occupies head coach positions for women’s sport teams at the top ranked 25 football schools at the Division II level for the 2014-2015 academic year?

**Review of Literature**

Acosta and Carpenter have done years of research documenting the decline of women in coaching positions within the NCAA. For the past 37 years they have surveyed thousands of participants in collegiate athletic departments to determine what opportunities are available for women in athletics. Currently female sport participation is at an all-time high and the number of female coaches coaching female athletes is at an all-time low (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). This is the basis of a huge problem and other researchers have looked into this issue to help determine why females are not coaching and why are they leaving the positions they use to hold. Pre-Title IX 90+% of females were coached by females (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). This was because most of these coaches were Physical Education teachers and volunteered their time to the few females that were able to participate in sport. Women who were in these original coaching positions were leaving and women were not being chosen to replace them (Stengl & Kane, 1991).

Before the NCAA was created women governed their own sports through the AIAW, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. They were in charge of championships and female sport as a whole (Lovett & Lowery, 1995). Once the NCAA was created, the AIAW was no longer a governing body and many proponents of the AIAW believe that now because women
are not in charge it will be a challenge to overcome the status quo (Lovett & Lowery, 1995). The NCAA had been historically led by males in dominant positions which “deeply ingrained a male culture of athletic departments” (Welch & Sigelman, 2007, p.1421). Often times those in charge like to hire employees similar to them. This creates a challenge for women who want to break into the “ol’ boys club” (Stengl & Kane, 1991).

Jane Marie Stengl and Mary Jo Kane (1991) had similar findings to Welch & Sigelman’s findings. They stated, “homologous reproduction is a process whereby dominants reproduce themselves based on social and/or physical characteristics. Therefore the employment relationship between sex of athletic director and sex of head coach was considered” (p.47). Therefore it is important to look at how women can be places in higher administrative positions.

Research shows people are more likely to hire those who are similar to them (Stengl & Kane, 1991). Once men’s and women’s athletic departments were merged many woman lost out in administrative roles. This causes many women to rethink a position in coaching (Richman, 2010). This could explain why women are not being hired (Stengl & Kane, 1991). Men in charge and the NCAA counter this argument with a “blame the victim” stance.

Past research shows that male athletic directors believe that there is a lack of qualified female coaches; women do not apply for job openings in coaching, that there is a lack of qualified female administrators, and females do not coach due to time constraints most likely due to family obligations (Acosta & Carpenter, 1989; Stengl & Kane, 1991). If this were true then they are saying women are to blame and that there is no issue with the current system.

Kamphoff, Amertrout, & Driska (2010) state that “the critical point underlying these logical connections is the belief that women are not being hired because of their inadequacies--- qualifications as a head coach---rather than any inadequacy in the system” (p.24).
Blaming the victim is an easy thing for athletic departments to do. It offers a scapegoat for lack of recruiting and retaining female coaches and administrators. Studies show that females are hired at a greater rate by female administrators compared to male administrators (Stengl & Kane, 1991). This reiterates the fact that underrepresentation of females in sport is an issue that starts with the leaders of sport organizations. It can become difficult for females to work their way up in athletics because of barriers surround gender and stereotyped biases. Working to change this issue is the main way to combat a “blaming the victim” stance. Education and support will help women rise out of the victim role.

When women are seen as a victim they are seen as weak. Sport in the United States is highly congruent to ideas of masculinity and aggression (Kamphoff, Amerntout, & Driska, 2010). Therefore positions in sport themselves are seen as masculine and not feminine. In other words, “the dominant forms of sport in the U.S. demand strength, aggression, and courage—all of which are congruent with the notion of masculinity, not femininity” (Kamphoff, Amerntout, & Driska, 2010, p.305).

Females in sport are trying to break through gender barriers and stereotypes surrounding a woman in sport. Satore & Cunningham (2007) found that: sport organizations provide one of the most notable examples of the persistent nature of discrimination (e.g., Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Knoppers, Bedker Meyer, Ewing & Forrest, 1989; Stangl & Kane, 1991). Norman (2014) found, for example, “In the case of women breaking into powerful, culturally visible roles and opposing the dominant masculine hegemony of coaching, it appears that women are some distance from attempting to climb the career ladder” (p. 540). This is an issue in a nation where civil rights movements have occurred many years prior and yet we still see inequality within sport.
Because of constant gender barriers and discrimination found in sport women may experience lower self-efficacy and motivation to pursue a job in sport (Norman, 2010). Social ideologies and social context may prevent women from coaching. Because of these social issues women are not seen in the same light as men and often do not see coaching as a readily available position for them (Satore & Cunningham, 2010). Norman (2010) makes a strong case that “coaching sociology should focus on how structural inequalities are manifested into the practices of ‘everyday’ to understand women’s unequal representation within the profession” (p.101).

Support would lead to higher self-efficacy and women would see coaching as a viable option improving the underrepresentation in the profession. The underrepresentation of women in coaching roles leads to lack of female role models for young female athletes.

When young athletes fail to see female coaches often times females are devalued as role models (Knoppers, 1989). Because of the lack of women coaching these young athletes do not have female role models to look up too. Having female coaches at a young age is important because this is when young athletes are most impressionable (LaVoi, 2013). For example, “exposure to female role models and leaders in a context that matters to young people (e.g., sport) may help to change values and beliefs about women in positions of power and leadership. Second, if girls and young women see females in coaching roles they will more likely think about coaching as a legitimate and viable career, and so may aspire to become a coach” (p.2).

Oftentimes women in coaching attribute their success to a male coach because lack of female remodels (Kamphoff, Amerntroat, & Driska, 2010). Leading these young female athletes to a successful playing career and ultimately could leave positive impressions about female coaches is the main goal. Having a mentor can help a female athlete in the future. Athletics is about networking and creating a strong network of female coaches is difficult to do if there is a
lack of female coaches (Richman, 2010).

Men are often looking for coaching jobs posted for a women’s team. Since Title IX jobs that were not there are now being made available. Budget increases were used to support women’s team and the coach that would be coaching. These increases were put in place for females to be hired however that was not what happened (Richman, 2010). Additionally, “with this increase in attention for male coaches, men see coaching female teams as a ‘stepping stone’ into coaching competitive male intercollegiate athletic teams in the future. Coaching intercollegiate women at a high level, with success, can be one avenue that a male coach can take before moving on to a more ‘glorious’ role of coaching male teams” (p.382). This was a huge shift in athletics, one that hurts prospective female coaches.

Women are currently trying to break through the glass ceiling in just about every occupation including coaching. Salary discrepancies are seen in athletics often. Because of different reasons besides gender the courts have ruled it to be legal for females to get paid less than their male counterpart (Richman, 2010). This has made it difficult for women to gain a leg up in the coaching profession. Issues surrounding salary has been seen in the media recently especially because of the controversy surrounding University of Minnesota Duluth’s decision to fire Women Hockey’s head coach, Shannon Miller. Shannon Miller is a successful female coach whose $215,000 contract wasn’t renewed because of what the university is calling a decrease in budget. However, her male counterpart, the head men’s hockey team, who makes $22,000 more than Miller, is still employed by the university. “Coach Miller was a highly successful coach who has graduated her players, earned the respect of her community and peers, and hasn’t gotten in any trouble or in a scandal,” Dr. Nicole LaVoi, said. “I have never in my career in studying women coaches ever heard of a coach like that not being retained because they were being paid
too much. It’s kind of a game-changer.” This “game changer” has sparked controversy across college athletics and shows how deep the inequalities against female coaches are rooted.

Another issue women are facing is the competitive advantage men have. Men have had the opportunity to coach for a longer amount of time for women making it difficult for women to break into the coaching profession (Richman, 2010). Males with more experience are often times going to be offered the job over a less experienced woman trying to break into the profession. Risk and reward is not something athletic directors my find comforting (Richman, 2010).

These barriers in place make it extremely difficult for females to navigate the world of coaching. Research on this topic is important to determine what can be done to help support, recruit, and retain female coaches and administrators. Discrimination is something that females have to overcome and research examining the decline of female representation is important. This research project will be useful in adding to the already vast literature surrounding the issue of the decline of female coaches but will specifically look at the Division II level, which has not been widely researched. This study is important so that comparisons can be made about the Division I and Division II levels. It will help determine if males are taking the highly sought after jobs in Division I and leaving females to coach at lower levels. Being able to understand this phenomenon is vital to the success of female coaches in the future.

**Method**

For this study a study completed by Dr. LaVoi (2014) titled *Head Coaches of Women’s Teams: A Report on Select NCAA Division- I FBS Institutions* was replicated. A detailed methodology section is completed in her 2013 study titled *The Decline of Female Coaches*. This study was used while creating the method of the current study. Using these two studies I have
created a method to look at the top football schools in Division II. According to NCAA.org, on average there are more female student athletes participating in sport at a school that has football. On average 165 females participate in sport at a football school in comparison to 128 women at a non-football school. This study looks at the top football schools in Division II (n=25) under the assumption that they will, on average, have more female athletes participating in sport compared to any other group of schools in Division II.

To complete this study each of the 25 Division II schools athletics websites that were voted highest in rank among AFCA coaches as of December 23, 2014 were visited. The schools are as followed:

1. Colorado State-Pueblo
2. Minnesota State Mankato
3. Minnesota Duluth
4. Ohio Dominican
5. Concord
6. West Georgia
7. Pittsburg State
8. Lenoir-Rhyne
9. Ouachita Baptist
10. Valdosta State
11. Ferris State
12. Bloomsburg
13. Delta State
14. North West Missouri State
Data were collected and the number of total programs; number of female sports teams and whether the head coach was a male or female was recorded. Each head coach, both male and female, was documented. If gender was unclear from the name given, the picture was examined. Similar to LaVoi (2013) the data were examined as followed: “data were collected for all women’s sports listed on the athletic Web site. Diving coaches were coded as head coaches. An individual who occupied the head coach position for two sports (e.g., head coach of track & field and cross country) was coded as two separate coaches” (p.4). Data were then compiled in tables and examined.

As part of the examination of data institutions were given grades surrounding their percent of females coaching female athletes. Because a basic grading scale skews the results, LaVoi created a scale that was used to determine the institution’s grade. The grading scale was determined as followed: “the mean percentage of female head coaches for all 76 schools was
40%—the midpoint of the data—which represents average achievement (i.e., a C grade). This mean was used to construct the grading system. If rounding up the decimal resulted in a grade change, the school/sport CONFERENCE was placed in the higher-grade bracket. The modified grading scale was as follows:

A=70-100, B=55-69, C=40-54, D=25-39, F=0-24” (p. 5).

For this study this scale was modified so that it related to the current results. The following section discusses the results found from Division II.

Results

For these results the mean or average data, percentage was 38%. While in the original study, the average was 40 with 14 points variance in grade letters B, C, and D. Two points were subtracted since the mean was 38 and had 12 points variance in between grade letters B, C, and D. With this information the modified grading scale is as follows:

A= 64-100, B= 51-63, C= 38-50, D= 37-25, F=0-25

These 25 schools have a total of 383 athletic programs male and female with a breakdown of 204 female programs and 179 male programs. While 53% of the total programs are female teams, only 38% of those coaches are females. This shows that 61% of coaches that coach women’s athletic teams for these 25 schools are male.

It was found that only three schools received an A for a grade. These were the only schools that employed more than 64% female head coaches for a women’s sports team, and only one school earned a B. Most of the schools received the grade of C and D. These 16 institutions employed between 38%-50% of female head coaches of women sport teams. There were five schools that received an F. These schools had less than 27% women employed as head coach for a woman’s sport team.
Below are tables 1 and 2 with the totals from the data collection.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A 100-64%</th>
<th>B 63-51%</th>
<th>C 50-38%</th>
<th>D 37-28%</th>
<th>F 27-0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem (86%)</td>
<td>Minnesota Duluth (63%)</td>
<td>Minnesota State Mankato (44%)</td>
<td>Lenior-Rhyne (36%)</td>
<td>West Georgia (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson State (71%)</td>
<td>Virginia State (44%)</td>
<td>Harding (33%)</td>
<td>Valdosta State (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester (64%)</td>
<td>North Alabama (43%)</td>
<td>Souix Falls (33%)</td>
<td>Michigan Tech (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State (40%)</td>
<td>Colorado State-Pueblo (30%)</td>
<td>Ouachita Baptist (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Dominican (38%)</td>
<td>Azusa Pacific (30%)</td>
<td>North West Missouri State (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord (38%)</td>
<td>Delta State (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State (38%)</td>
<td>Colorado Mines (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomsburg (38%)</td>
<td>Angelo State (29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Programs</th>
<th>Total Female Programs</th>
<th>Female Coaches</th>
<th>Male Coaches</th>
<th>Percent of Female Coaches</th>
<th>Institution Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State- Pueblo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State Mankato</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Duluth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Dominican</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Georgia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenoir- Rhyne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita Baptist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomsburg</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Alabama</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Wins</td>
<td>Losses</td>
<td>Ties</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mines</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo State</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Tech</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia State</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa Pacific</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston- Salem</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson State</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications**

This is important information to discover because it can lead to policy change. There is currently no rule similar to the Rooney Rule in the NFL requiring NCAA institutions to interview female candidates. With the information founded in this study, pressure can be placed on athletic departments to use affirmative action in employment of female coaches. This information can be used to reduce the decline of female coaches.

When issues are brought to public attention often times change follows. For example, in O’Bannon v. the NCAA, a complaint made by one class of former college players lead to a case ruling the NCAA has been violating The Sherman Anti-Trust Act. The decision “permits institutions to compensate FBS football and Division I basketball student-athletes up to the cost of attendance while in school and provide for payments to these student-athletes upon leaving
school or when their eligibility expires (Glazier & Avery, 2014). However, the issue with this ruling is that Title IX was not taken into consideration when the decision was made.

Budgets and funding are already a big issue for many athletic departments. This ruling forces athletic departments to consider budget cuts from other programs and even possibly cutting programs as a whole. Because of this ruling Women’s sports and non-revenue generating sports are at a disadvantage and schools could be in violation of Title IX especially if similar financial aid is not offered to women (Glazier & Avery, 2014).

This case could hurt the coaching staff of women sports teams as well. We have already seen a female’s contract not renewed because of “financial reasons” I.E. Minnesota Duluth’s Head Female Hockey coach, athletic departments under pressure to find more money sources my look at female coaches’ salaries as a way to save money. This puts the coaches of non-revenue making sports at a great disadvantage.

A number grade is a visual that can be a positive or negative when it comes to recruiting future student athletes. A low grade could deter prospective student athletes from attending a university. While players may not have a preference in coach gender some may. Coach and recruiter characteristics is the most influential factor on a student athletes decision on where they chose to attend college (Magnusen, Kim, Perrewe, & Ferris, 2014). According to Blom, Abrell, Wilson, Lape, Halbrook, & Judge (2011) “the NCAA (2009) surveyed 8,900 intercollegiate female athletes in an attempt to better understand the reasons behind a lack of female head coaches and approximately 20% identified a lack of female role models in intercollegiate athletics and family commitments as barriers to entering the coaching profession.” Removing barriers is something that athletic departments should be taking seriously.

According to Moran-Miller & Flores (2011) “career research has demonstrated that role
models positively influence women’s self-efficacy beliefs, especially those related to nontraditional careers (Greene & Stitt-Gohdes, 1997; Quimby & DeSantis, 2006), and the sport literature has suggested that female role models may encourage women to pursue careers in sport (Lee, 1999; Nelson, 1991). If female athletes had more interaction with female coaches and seeing successful female coaches they may start seeing coaching as a viable profession. When females start seeing coaching as a viable profession there will be an increase in female role models.

Similar to LaVoi’s original study, the purpose of the current study is to record and analyze the percentages of the top 25 football schools in Division II; “to provide evidence that will help retain and increase the percentage of women who are in the coaching profession; to track the effectiveness of initiatives aimed at reversing the decline of the percentage of women in coaching; and to bring awareness while providing an evidence-based starting point for a national discussion on this important issue (LaVoi, 2015). The ultimate goal for this study is to bring knowledge to those who are in charge of the hiring of NCAA collegiate coaches. The decline of female coaches is an issue that needs to be addressed and these studies are a way to achieve awareness of the major issue.

**Future Studies**

This information, while time and labor extensive, would be best used if every institution from Division I, Division II and Division III had a grade. Knowledge can bring change and put pressure on an institution to expand job searches to include women who may be less experienced but just as qualified as their male counterpart, breaking down the old boys club that is currently in place.

Recommendations for future studies include: looking at this study from a quantitative
perspective and comparing the different divisions and using longitudinal analysis. Determining these differences can lead to understanding reasons, if any, of differences between the divisions. Knowing this information can lead to change and can help prospective female coaches determine where they want to apply.

Longitudinal analysis for this issue is extremely important. Being able to analyze the issue year to year could help determine if the problem is being fixed or not. Longitudinal analysis is conceptualized as a method to look at the change over time and being able to use the information to predicate (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). This is an important method to use analyze the theory of change. This research method “can often provide more depth than one-shot survey, experimental, or case study research” (Bronner, 2001). When conducting longitudinal research one has to be committed to the project over an extended period of time, whether it is one person or someone that takes on the task after the first person lays the groundwork. Dr. Nicole LaVoi is a good example of this. She has created the groundwork and is committed to the research, she has published research surround the decline of female coaches for the past two years and because her information is so detailed others can join in and collaborate on the research. When conducting longitudinal research learning from previous years, making changes and adjustments as necessary are an important step.

The current study can become a longitudinal study with the following steps:

1. Data collection from November to December each year. This is when researchers will look at the different schools websites and collect the information needed to determine a grade.

2. Keeping the same schools in the study. While it is important to expand the study, it is also important to look at the changes schools previously studied have made year by
year. This will help determine if the decline of female coaches is worsening or not.

3. Noting the changes made year by year. Keeping track of the changes, as mentioned above can help illustrate this issue year by year.

4. Keeping the framework of determining the letter grade the same each year. This is an important step because it makes analyzing data easy and efficient.

5. Being committed to obtaining information about the lack of female coaches. Understanding the issue at hand and spreading research surrounding the topic can lead to others picking up interest in making change.

By following the steps above this study can help create change in policy and will help determine the differences between the different NCAA levels. These steps can be followed each year to help add to the literature surrounding the current decline of female coaches in the NCAA post Title IX.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to determine what percentage of women occupies head coach positions for women’s sport teams at the top ranked 25 football schools at the Division II level for the 2014-2015 academic year. These twenty-five schools currently employ 125 male coaches to coach their female athletes. 38% of women occupy the head coach position for female sports teams for these schools. This means there are approximately 1200 female student athletes that lack female role models in athletics. Males are not only dominating athletics as players and athletes they have taken former female coaches jobs. As previously discussed, barriers are preventing females from becoming head coaches. Currently, female coaches are being paid less than their male counter-part, and fewer in number than their male counter-part, and have less support surrounding their career.
This is an issue that needs to be addressed at the highest level of the NCAA because women are disempowered in both society and in sport. Research has been consistent in showing the decline of female power and status within sport as a whole (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Title IX has helped create opportunities for female athletes however, this amendment which was supposed to create equality, as future alienated the female coach occupation.

The NCAA is currently not an inclusive occupational domain where women and men are seen as equals. College sports can be used for good and can help women find identity and socialization, however current issues, such as the decline in female coaches, are limiting this achievement (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007; Blinde, Taub, & Han, 1994). Different groups such as the Tucker Center and Alliance of Women Coaches are trying to spread awareness however studies similar to this one can spread the actual numbers that implicate the major decline. Giving an institution a grade puts a numerical tag on the athletic program. This leads to education awareness and can lead to change. Change is the ultimate goal of this study.
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