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ABSTRACT

THE FEMALE COACH IN THE WORLD OF COLLEGIATE SPORT: ACCOMMODATION AND RESISTANCE TO THE DOMINANT SPORT CULTURE

by

Nita M. Lamborghini
University of New Hampshire, May, 1997

This research explores the nature and meaning of collegiate coaching as an occupation for women and the extent to which women coaches accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture. This study includes a brief historical analysis of the roots of coaching as an occupation for women and the emergence and nature of the "female model" of sport. To further explore the nature and meaning of coaching and the extent of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture, forty-six (46) in-depth interviews were conducted with women collegiate coaches currently employed at an NCAA affiliated institution. A brief survey and field observations were additional sources of data.

The findings of this research indicate that the occupational ideals of women coaches reflect the norms and values of the "female model" of sport, a model which emphasizes collegiate sport as an educational endeavor and the overall growth and welfare of student-athletes, and that their coaching practices reflect these same norms and values. This "female model" approach to coaching is conditioned, in part, by occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes. Findings further indicate that women both resist and accommodate to the dominant sport culture, a sport culture which reflects the influences of rationalization, capitalism, and patriarchy. Coaches in Division I, II were more likely than those in Division III to
accommodate in practice to the dominant sport culture; and "new" coaches were more likely to accommodate than those in the "old" or "established" cohorts.

A cultural studies approach was used to show that in the realm of sport, hegemony is never final; subordinate groups resist dominant meanings and struggle to control their sport experiences. This approach was combined with an adaptation of Bourdieu's structural constructivism to show that while actors actively construct their social worlds, objective social structures condition and constrain practices and meanings. The objective structures of gender and work were shown here to condition and constrain the nature and meaning of coaching, and the nature and extent of women coaches' accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture.

In applying these theories to research findings, I conclude that the sub-culture of norms, values, and practices among women coaches functions as a form of collective resistance to the dominant sport culture. Women coaches are, in effect, social carriers of a residual sport form, the "female model" of sport. Their resistance influences the shape of, but does not transform, the dominant sport culture; and reflects the constraints imposed by patriarchy.
CHAPTER I

AGENCY AND STRUCTURE IN THE REALM OF SPORT: THE DOMINANT SPORT CULTURE
AND THE NATURE AND MEANING OF COACHING AS AN OCCUPATION FOR WOMEN

Introduction

In this chapter I first deal with the aims of my research, proceed to discuss the
relation between sport and culture, then list the central questions for this dissertation,
the hypotheses, and the sample. This research explores the nature and meaning of
collegiate coaching as an occupation for women and the extent to which women coaches
accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture in American intercollegiate sport.
It includes a socio-historical analysis of coaching as an occupation for women and an
empirical exploration of women college coaches’ experiences, values, and practices.

The overarching theme of this project is that there is a dialectical relationship
between agency and structure in the construction of social meaning and the control of
work space. Here agency is defined as “the power of actors to operate independently of
the determining constraints of social structure” (Jary and Jary in McDermott, 1996);
structure as the recurring pattern of social relationships which grow stable over time,
or as Turner states, “social interaction and relations that endure over time”
(1991:489). Individual action and the meaning we assign it is at once an intersection of
individual choice and historically specific limits imposed by social structures.
However, because sport is an aspect of culture which exists independent of the political
economy of society, there is in the realm of sport greater opportunity for individual
actors to actively construct their social worlds, to resist dominant meanings, and
challenge dominant practices.
The structure under investigation here is the structure of American collegiate sport between 1970-1995. The actors of interest are women collegiate coaches. An analysis of the relationship between these two will construct a snapshot of a "process in time" (Abrams, 1982:XV) which will illuminate the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women; the extent to which the dominant sport culture has infiltrated the world of women coaches; the extent to which women coaches as social actors ascribe to values and engage in practices reflecting the dominant sport culture; and the complex reasons for and ways in which women coaches accommodate to, and resist the dominant sport culture of patriarchal/capitalist practices and values.

It is hoped that this research will contribute to our understanding of the struggle to define and control the realm of sport by showing how meaning in sport is produced, reproduced, resisted, and changed (Hargreaves, 1994:36). It is also hoped it will provide much needed data for understanding the social forces which influence the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women.

While there has been much discussion about the need for qualitative techniques which focus on women's actual sporting experiences (Blinde, 1989b; Boutillier and SanGiovanni, 1983), and the need to explore the nature and extent of women's resistance to the dominant sport culture (Birrell and Theberge, 1994; Dewar, 1993; Hargreaves, 1993b), few studies have yet to do so. Moreover, current research often utilizes radical feminist theory (Birrell and Richter, 1993), focusing on separatism and the oppression of patriarchal sport structures. While this approach contributes to our understanding of women's sport experiences, it gives us a less than complete picture of the varieties of oppression which exist in society and in the realm of sport. Moreover, the radical feminist approach fails to take account of the contributions of
capitalism in constructing sport structures, of the variety of forms of oppression among women, and of the ways patriarchal structures also oppress men.

**Sport and Culture**

Sport is an aspect of culture, which, like other aspects of culture, reflects the norms and values of the society in which it exists. Sport, however, does not simply "mirror" the political economy of society, as Marxist theory might imply; rather, it exists in dialectical relationship with it (Coakley, 1994). Sport, as culture, maintains a degree of autonomy from the mode of production in society (Hargreaves, John; 1982:117). While it reflects and reinforces the values of the society in which it exists, it is also a realm in which the values, ideologies, and meanings of the dominant culture may be contested (Birrell and Richter, 1993; Dewar, 1993; Donnelly, 1993; Gruneau, 1983; Hargreaves, 1982; Hargreaves, 1993; Theberge and Birrell, 1994).

The dominant sport culture in American society is characterized by an emphasis on rationalization, productivity, and instrumentalism; as opposed to playfulness, expressiveness, and non-instrumental relationships or bondedness (Whitson, 1984:75). It involves materialism, achievement, the work ethic, dehumanization of athletes, and a win at all costs attitude (Donnelly, 1993:122). Sport in American society reflects the American political economy: the world of work and the world of leisure are carriers of the same values and ideals. What were once undisciplined pastimes have become vehicles for inculcating American citizens in the dominant values associated with industrial capitalism (Whitson, 1984:67, 68). But American sport reflects more than the political economy, it reflects the patriarchal structure of society and the interests of privileged groups. It reflects the combined interests of "whites,
males, the wealthy and the powerful, and the able bodied" (Loy, McPherson, and Kenyon in Donnelly, 1993:119).

Dominant groups attempt to control culture, to shape it in their own interests. But their efforts to do so are never entirely successful, hegemony is never complete (Hargreaves, 1993; Hargreaves, 1982; Williams, 1977). Subordinate groups and actors contest taken-for-granted meanings (Gramsci, 1971) and struggle for control over meanings and practices. Alternative conceptions can and do exist in their residual and emergent forms and continually challenge, overtly or covertly, the dominant sport culture. Resistant groups are "historic blocs;" like women in a patriarchal world; they keep alternative conceptions alive.

To assert that all individuals are equally influenced by and accepting of the dominant sport culture would be to imply that individual actors are simply "social sponges," unable or unwilling to actively interpret and construct their own social worlds. Individuals can and do choose among alternative courses of action, and they actively construct and negotiate meaning; but they do so within the limits of historically specific social structures. Thus, there are forces outside the individual which act to constrain action and the construction of meaning, but these forces are constantly changing. As Philip Abrams explains, "The problem of agency is the problem of finding a way of accounting for human experience which recognizes simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant and more or less purposeful individual action, and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society" (1982:xliii).

The dominant sport culture in American society reflects capitalist and patriarchal values and control. However, sport is site of conflict and struggle whose meanings and
outcomes are historically situated. As John Hargreaves explains,

...The sport hegemony relationship cannot be understood simply as a means of maintaining or reproducing the dominant pattern of social relations, and against the view that it simply reflects, and is determined by the mode of production. In order to understand how sport forms part of the totality, the relevant processes must be analyzed in dialectical terms-as characterized by conflict and consent, coercion and struggle, the outcome of which is always problematic to some degree for all parties concerned. Sport must also be conceived and characterized in its own specific terms, namely as a central component in popular cultural tradition, with its own meanings, which though they may be ideologically significant, are not merely reducible to expressions of ruling class ideology (1982:134-135).

Research Questions and Method

To explore the nature of coaching, the meaning women coaches assign their work, and the extent to which women coaches accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture, the following research questions will be addressed in this dissertation.

1. How do women coaches experience their work; what values and meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport; what are the social sources of this approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?
5. To what extent does a woman's reasons for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?

It is hypothesized that:

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I: Female collegiate coaches believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport, but these beliefs are compromised by the dominant sport culture which dictates work tasks and the definition of occupational success.

Hypothesis II: Women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a female sport model, but they adapt their approach to meet the demands imposed by the dominant sport culture. This adaptation makes coaching more difficult: (1). Coaches must reconcile two different philosophical approaches to sport; one which focuses on the sports process, the other on the sports product. (2). They must spend more time on those tasks which they value least and find least rewarding. (3). They must focus
more on those tasks which produce winning teams, at the same time they attempt to
meet the athletic and emotional needs of their female athletes.

The social sources of the "female model" approach include: gender
socialization, socialization into the profession, and the nature and needs of female
athletes.

Hypothesis III: Coaches perceive two different models of sport, but the models are not
differentiated by gender. Women coaches describe two prevailing sport models in
intercollegiate sport: one is product oriented and the other is process oriented.
Women coaches believe that more men tend to fall in the first category and more
women in second, but they also believe that many female coaches are becoming
increasingly product oriented, while many male coaches are adopting a more process
oriented style.

Women coaches recognize that male and female athletes are different. So, despite
the convergence in coaching styles, coaching women is still different from coaching
men. They believe that while many male coaches appear to be focused more on
winning, this as related in part to the career orientation of male coaches, and the
nature of male athletes.

Hypothesis IV: Many women coaches resist the dominant sport culture, but they
do so in small ways which pose a challenge to but can not transform the dominant
sport culture. Resistance to the dominant sport culture varies according to
differences in: (1). socialization into the profession; (2). experiences as a player;
(3). the nature of the work role (coach, or teacher/coach); (4). the particular
college division of one's school; (5). the extent of commitment to and nature of the
occupational subculture; (6). number of years coaching.

Despite the growing commodification of sport and the "trickle down" of the
professional sport model, women who have stayed in coaching find ways both to
affirm humanistic values and implement player-centered approaches. While some
coaches may have accommodated themselves to the dominant sport culture, most
behave in ways and express values which can be characterized as resistance to
hegemony.

Hypothesis V: Women stay in coaching when their work experience is consistent
with their reasons for entering the field. They enter coaching because they love
the sport they coach, because they want to teach (they see coaching as a form of
teaching), and because they feel they can make a difference in young people's lives.
Women stay in coaching because they find working with young people extremely
rewarding. They consider leaving when they feel an erosion of the values and ideals
which led them into coaching in the first place, when they feel they no longer have
much impact on young people's lives, and when they feel that growing older is
affecting their ability to coach.

Data and Sample

The answers to these questions are investigated through a brief historical analysis of
secondary data on the history of women's collegiate sport and the emergence of coaching as an occupation for women, through analysis of in-depth interviews with 46 women college coaches currently coaching at colleges and universities affiliated with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), a short survey administered to these same 46 subjects, and field notes from observations of coaches' offices.

In-Depth Interviews

Membership in the NCAA is organized by Division, and institutions must abide by the rules and regulations which govern their Division. The interview sample includes 19 coaches from Division I, 5 from Division II, and 23 coaches from Division III. This roughly approximates the distribution of NCAA affiliated institutions in the country (Division I 305, Division II 246, Division III, 352) and is a function of the distribution of NCAA affiliated institutions in New England, the pattern of employment by women coaches at those institutions, and the availability and willingness of coaches to participate in this study. The individuals in this sample coach a total of 13 different sports.

Analysis Strategy. The interview data in this study were analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), and four basic strategies. The first strategy was to treat the sample as a single group in an effort to reveal those experiences and the meanings common to all coaches, and illuminate exceptions to general patterns. The second strategy was to analyze the data by cohort groups and included a comparison of "old", "established" and "new" coaches. This division reflects important differences among coaches along three different dimensions: sport experiences as young girls and adolescents; collegiate playing experiences and
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socialization into the profession as young adults; number of years in the occupation and accompanying life course changes and changes in the structure of women's collegiate sport.

Those who graduated from college before 1971 were categorized as "old" coaches. This is the group of coaches who faced limited opportunities for organized sport participation as young girls and women. Most of these opportunities were associated with high school physical education and were typically were presided over by a female teacher or coach. They attended college before the establishment of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW); thus, their collegiate sport experiences are characterized by loosely organized and informal opportunities for intercollegiate play. Often they competed outside the collegiate setting in amateur sports organizations. The "old" coaches in this sample had been coaching between 19-27 years.

Coaches who graduated between 1972 and 1984 were categorized as "established" coaches. As a group they had more organized sport opportunities as young girls and women, mostly in educational settings at the junior high and high school level. As collegiate athletes they played under the AIAW, or before National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) governance was fully established. They experienced a full array of opportunities for intercollegiate competition, but participated before athletic scholarships became the norm.

Coaches who graduated in 1985 or later were categorized as "new" coaches. As young girls in high school this group of coaches had a full array of organized playing opportunities both in educational settings, in town and city leagues, and in leagues sponsored by the Amateur Athletic Union or other private organizations. They grew up in a sports world full of opportunity, but which increasingly encouraged specialization
and was void of female models. Many did not have a female coach until college. They have known only one collegiate sport model, that provided by the NCAA. It has included media attention, scholarships, tournaments, and equipment and travel experiences on par with the men's programs at their institutions.

The experience of coaching, like all work experiences and living in general is historically conditioned. The nature of the experience is a combination of individual biography and social structure (C. W. Mills, 1959). Analyzing the data by cohorts helped to reveal the relevant details and conditions of coaching, and illuminated the extent to which patterns of accommodation and resistance are conditioned by historically specific social structures. It indicated the extent to which coaching has changed in recent years, the factors contributing to this, and potential trends for the future.

In the third analysis strategy interview data were analyzed by Division. This strategy was devoted to looking at how the experience of coaching is conditioned by the NCAA divisional affiliation of the college where the coach is employed. It was also employed in an effort to discover the extent of "trickle down" of the "male/professional" model. The fourth strategy used involved an analysis of interview data by Divisional affiliation within cohort group. This strategy was used to compare the relative influence of cohort group and Division affiliation on selected measures.

The Dominant Sport Culture in the Context of Intercollegiate Sport:

The "Male Model" vs. The "Professional Model"

Much of this research is devoted to exploring and explaining the extent and nature of accommodation and resistance by women coaches to the dominant sport culture in collegiate athletics. Therefore, it is necessary to define this term and explain how it
will be used throughout this thesis.

The focus of this research is not sport in general but collegiate sport; more specifically, it focuses on women coaches' work experiences in collegiate sport. What is of interest here, then, is not the nature of the dominant sport culture in general, but the dominant culture of intercollegiate sport. Two different approaches to understanding the culture of collegiate sport have emerged in recent years and are evaluated here: one asserts collegiate sport is controlled by men and thus reflects male norm and values, the other that collegiate sport has been infiltrated by the norms and values of professional sport and reflects the increasingly bureaucratized and commercialized nature of modern sport.

Those who ascribe to the "professionalized" school of thought argue that while the commodification of sport is most evident in professional sport, it is "trickling down" (Frey and Massengale, 1988) to the collegiate level. They argue that collegiate sport, like professional sport, is becoming an activity for "dis-play," a spectacle to be consumed (Sewart in Eitzen, 1993:119); that players are reduced to their labor value and profit (and winning which leads to profit) is the ultimate concern.

According to the "professional" theorists. The effect of "trickle down" is most evident in "big time" collegiate sport: in men's Division I football and basketball where the emphasis is on profit, entertainment, (Eitzen, 1993; Frey and Massengale, 1988:41-42) and winning. However, they argue that aspects of this model have infused sport at all levels, both men's and women's, including: increased emphasis on recruiting and scouting, and a decreased emphasis on the welfare (physical, emotional, and social; as well as academic development) of student athletes. Moreover, "professional" theorists are concerned that the trickle down of the "professional model" has been accompanied by
a decreased emphasis on the educational and intrinsic value of collegiate sport.

It is clear that "big time" collegiate programs make few apologies for their focus on winning; winning programs can lead to media contracts which in turn bring instant prestige and notoriety, increased applications for admissions, and booster and alumni donations. Even though most athletic departments don't generate profits from gate receipts, media contracts, or tournament appearances (Sperber, 1993; Staurowsky, 1995) the pursuit of these is the essence of big-time collegiate athletics. Because the win-at-all cost philosophy is the norm in big-time intercollegiate athletics, educational goals are compromised. Although athletic departments continue to claim that sport is educational, this rhetoric is used to conceal the fact many programs are in effect commercial and professional endeavors.

Contrary to popular perceptions among those who ascribe to the "professional" school of thought, the historical research on American sport reveals that it has always been commercialized and professional (Vincent, 1981), and that the professional model has been accepted in intercollegiate sport since the late 1800's. As Ronald Smith asserts,

One might say that Americans for well over a century have tended to profess amateurism while they have exhibited the professional spirit in most areas of "amateur" sport. This was no more apparent than in amateur sport...The historic amateur-professional dilemma in college sport required, as all dilemmas do, a choice between equally undesirable alternatives. The collegiate dilemma might be stated as follows: if a college has truly amateur sport, it will lose prestige as it loses contests; if a college acknowledges outright professional sport, the college will lose respectability as a middle class or upper-class institution. The unsatisfactory solution to the dilemma has been to claim amateurism to the world, while in fact accepting a professional mode of operation. (1988:165-166)

Thus, one could argue that the reaction against growing professionalism is unfounded, it has in fact been a part of the history of American collegiate sport since its inception. However, history and professionalism not withstanding, concern about "trickle down"
should not be discounted. Whether perceived as something entirely new, or as part of the history of collegiate sport, there is growing concern about the nature of collegiate sport. Whether this concern reflects actual changes is less important, for the purposes of this research, than the fact that it exists. In the final analysis what matters here is whether women coaches "feel" collegiate sport reflects a professional model, is growing more "professional," and how it affects their work.

Researchers who see collegiate sport as a "male" defined institution focus on male control of intercollegiate sport (Birrell and Theberge, 1994; Costa and Guthrie, 1994; Dewar, 1993; Hult, 1980, Hult in Costa and Guthrie, 1994; Theberge, 1990), the male dominated National Collegiate Athletic Association, the demise of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association for Women, and the absence of a governing structure which reflects women's interests and values (Acosta, 1991; Grant, 1989; Hult, 1993).

They argue that for most of the history of modern women's collegiate sport, women administrators, physical educators and coaches have espoused a more player centered approach than their male counterparts, emphasizing sport for all and the social values of play over high performance (Welch, 1993:73-74). Throughout the early part of the twentieth century, a cadre of influential leaders in physical education sought to protect women athletes and women's sport in general from the elitism and exploitation they observed in men's athletics (Cahn, 1994; Hall in Welch, 1993; Hult, 1985; Spears, 1983; Theberge, 1989). They institutionalized their values and beliefs in a variety of governing organizations through which they controlled girls and women's sport in the realm of education.

In the late 1960's the newly established Division for Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS) signaled the beginning of change. The philosophy of the DGWS straddled two
worlds. On the one hand it promoted traditional practices and philosophies such as the educational value of sport, informal socialization between opponents after games, and opposition to athletic scholarships; on the other, it recognized the growing interest in competitive sport among women, sought to develop guidelines for intercollegiate athletics for young women, and eventually organized regional and national tournaments in women's collegiate sport (Hult, 1991:282; Welch, 1993:60-61).

In the early 1970's women physical educators established the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) in response to changing conceptions of gender appropriate behavior and the growing interest in sport among women. They believed in the value of increased intercollegiate competition for women, but they also believed that sport should complement education, not detract from it. Joan Hult explains,

In 1971-72 the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) became the AIAW, an affiliate organization of American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Dance and Recreation (AAHPER) and a substructure of the DGWS. The association had its genesis within the educational domain, so its educational focus was not accidental. Its leaders knew what conflicts they wished to avoid and what educational purposes they wanted to achieve. \(1991:284\)

The original purposes of the association included: (1) To foster broad programs of women's intercollegiate athletics consistent with the educational objectives of member institutions. (2) To assist member schools in the extension and enrichment of programs for women. (3) To stimulate the development of quality leadership among persons responsible for women's athletics. (4) To encourage excellence in performance of participants in women's intercollegiate athletics (Hult, 1991: 284). In 1973 the purpose and function of the association as stated in the AIAW Constitution included: "conduct athletics within the spirit of the game" for achieving educational values from sport, "and increase public understanding and appreciation of the
importance and value of athletics in contributing to enrichment of life" (Hult, 1993:284).

According to "male model" writers, an influential group of women leaders have always envisioned a model of sport distinct from that posed by men (Acosta and Carpenter, 1991:23). And, in their view, intercollegiate sport no longer reflects women's values and concerns. They argue that the "female voice" was marginalized when, as result of Title IX legislation which required equal treatment for women in institutions receiving federal assistance, male and female athletic departments were merged and male athletic directors assumed responsibility for both men's and women's programs. The "female voice" in coaching was further subdued in 1982 when after two years of fighting to survive the AIAW folded and the NCAA took control of women's athletics (Carpenter and Acosta, 1991; Hult, 1991). Male model theorists argue that the male sport model emphasizes winning, publicity, profit, and treats the student-athlete as an athlete first and a student second, thus compromising the student's education and the educational aspects of sport (Acosta and Carpenter, 1991:25).

The "Male/Professional" Model

It is clear that both approaches, professional and male model, describe the nature of collegiate sport in similar terms. Where they differ most is in their analysis of the cause. One asserts that the cause is capitalism and the profit motive, the other that it is patriarchy and male control. Both descriptions of the nature of collegiate sport are accurate and both assertions of causality reflect different aspects of the reality in collegiate sport; thus, the two interpretations of the nature of collegiate sport will be reflected in terms and concepts used in this study.
Following Blinde (1989) the dominant culture of collegiate sport will be conceptualized as the "male/professional" model. This conceptualization reflects the assertions stated above, and is in keeping with the socialist feminist approach of this project. It recognizes the interdependence of capitalism and patriarchy and their influence on sport structures and values, and also acknowledges the genderless realities which exist in the world of sport. It recognizes variations in values and beliefs among both men and women in intercollegiate sport, and the existence of collegiate sport organizations and structures (Division III, the newly formed University League and the North East Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC)) which actively reject the professionalized model and espouse an "amateur" and student-centered approach.

The "male/professional model" has been described as an intercollegiate sport program which includes: athletic scholarships, interest in recruiting, interest in number of games and contests, publicity and press coverage, availability of academic tutors, interest in number and sex of coaches, interest in hours per week spent in sport, and emphasis on team records and winning (Blinde, 1989:42). Moreover, Blinde identifies the following values as being reflective of the "male or professionalized model": serious, demanding, business-like, authoritarian, intimidation, and domination (42). While Acosta and Carpenter describe collegiate sport as reflecting a "male model," they also acknowledge the influence of capitalism and the "trickle down" of professional athletics when they state, "Perhaps the "male" model of athletics simply reflects our society as a whole without regard to gender or pervasive male dominance" (1991:25).
"Female" and "Male" Models of Sport

The notion of different models of sport appears to have emerged very early in the history of women's collegiate sport. The leaders in women's physical education and sport were aware early on that their own educational approach to games and sport differed in kind and degree from the collegiate sport form already in existence for men. In this dissertation the notion of "female" and "male" models resembles most closely ideas presented by Acosta and Carpenter (1991) and Blinde (1989b).

The "female model" of sport is defined here as a model of collegiate sport which emphasizes the growth of the individual through sport, mutual cooperation between athletics and academics, and increased opportunity for participation based on student interest. The student-athlete is treated as a student first, and the focus is on providing a positive athletic experience (Carpenter and Acosta 1991: 25). The "male model" of sport is defined here as a model of collegiate sport which emphasizes winning, publicity, profit, and a focus on those sports which generate these. The student-athlete is treated as an athlete first and a student second (Carpenter and Acosta 1991:25). As described above, following Blinde (1989b) I believe the so called "male" sport model may be influenced as much by capitalism as by patriarachy; thus, the term "male/professional model." The definition of the term remains the same, what changes is an understanding of its underlying source.

In general the "female model" is described as more "student centered" than the "male model." This term is used to indicate the focus of an athletic program. If a program is student-centered, then the focus is on making athletics fit in with the requirements and academic demands of student life, rather than asking the student to compromise his/her academic life for athletics.
Summary

This research explores the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women and the extent to which women accommodate and resist the dominant sport culture. The overarching theme of this project is that there is a dialectical relationship between agency and structure in the construction of social meaning, i.e., women coaches actively construct their work worlds within the context of the dominant sport culture; they challenge dominant practices and meanings, but do so within the limits of historically specific social structures.

The subject of this study combines my interest in the nature of power and hegemony theory with my interest in sport and women's work. The focus here is both on the evolution of an occupational category over time, and on the role of gender in constructing an occupational experience. The idea for this study emerged as a result of an early review of literature which revealed two persistent themes and several gaps in our understanding of coaching as an occupation for women. In the next chapter I present a review of this literature and show how this study is both an extension of, and fills some of the gaps, in earlier research.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

In the next chapter, Chapter II, I review the literature on the contemporary collegiate coaching experience and outline the empirical and theoretical gaps in the literature on coaching as an occupation for women. To understand the nature of coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's it is necessary to understand the historical roots of the occupation. Chapter III begins the analysis of coaching as an occupation for women by investigating it's emergence. The focus here is on the philosophical and
ideological notions associated with the training of women physical education instructors and the influence of early ideals and practices on the development of coaching as an occupation. Change in the structure of women's intercollegiate athletics is also addressed.

In Chapter IV a comprehensive theoretical perspective is developed. At this point the three different foci of this research are discussed: sport, women, and work. In an effort to theorize the behavior of women coaches as an example of human agency conditioned and constrained by social structures, a two theoretical approaches will be discussed including: cultural studies (cultural Marxism and hegemony theory), and structuralist constructivism. This section will set the stage for the analysis which follows by providing a theoretical framework for understanding the individual actions of women coaches in social and historical context.

In Chapter V the sample and methodology of the original research portion of this project is discussed in detail. The discussion and analysis of findings from the in-depth interviews are treated in chapters six through nine. Chapter VI focuses on socialization into the profession of coaching; in Chapter VII the work tasks associated with the occupation of coaching are explored, with special attention to changes in work tasks and coaches feelings about these. Here the increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented nature of work tasks is discussed with special attention to the influences of the "male/professionalized model." At this point accommodation and resistance are introduced as courses of action chosen by coaches in response to the increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented nature of intercollegiate sport.

In Chapter VIII resistance is explored in more detail, this time focusing more on women coaches resistance to dominant sport values, with some attention to actual
practices. Here the nature and meaning of the female coach's world is also analyzed with special attention to philosophy, definition of success, and coaching style. In addition, a brief analysis of the cultural objects that decorate her work space adds a subtle but rich texture to the emergent "picture" of the female coach's work world. In this chapter the norms, values, and practices which make up the social world of the female coach come more clearly into focus and lead to the question: To what extent do the norms, values, and material culture of the female collegiate coach constitute a "subculture" of resistance to the dominant sport culture?

In Chapter IX the female athlete's influence on the experience and meaning of coaching is analyzed. Here the concept of individual agency is recast in more social interactionist terms. Coaches do not act alone and coaching is not a job experienced in a vacuum; the essence of the work involves interaction with female athletes. Thus, the substance and meaning of coaching, and the practices of women coaches, can be better understood in terms of the female coach's relationship with her female athletes. In short, much of how coaches feel about what they do, and why they do it may be a reaction to the nature and needs of female athletes. In addition, in Chapter IX findings from Chapters VII and VIII are revisited in an analysis which integrates relevant points from both chapters. This approach reveals that the female coach is caught between two worlds: the world of the female athlete and the increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented world of women's intercollegiate sport. In addition, in Chapter IX findings from the survey of perceptions of intercollegiate sport and current coaching practices administered to each coach in the study are presented as further evidence of the extent to which coaches straddle two sport worlds. Findings from the survey are also used to address coaches' perceptions of "trickle down" and the extent to which they accommodate to and resist the dominant
In Chapter X the findings from this study are presented in summary form with special attention to research questions and hypotheses, and the theoretical framing of this thesis is re-visited and integrated with findings from earlier chapters. The future of women's coaching is also addressed in light of the empirical findings presented here. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II

COLLEGIATE COACHING FOR WOMEN: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter I review the literature on women and coaching beginning first with a discussion of coaching in general, then narrowing the focus to women college coaches. I then move on to discuss the two most prominent themes in the literature on women and coaching: the decline of women intercollegiate coaches and gender inequality in coaching. In the final section I discuss several questions raised by earlier studies, and point to the "gaps" in our understanding of women in coaching. I then show how these questions and "gaps" were used as guidelines in the development of research questions and themes for this study.

The purpose of this review is twofold: first, to show the need for a study on women and coaching which ties theories of sport to the lived experience of women's coaches; second, to show the need for more qualitative research on women in coaching. Moreover, the purpose of this review is to show how this study fits in with past and current thinking on topics related to women, coaching, and intercollegiate sport in American society.

The Nature of Coaching

A review of the literature between 1970 and 1995 on the nature of college coaching as an occupation for women produced a small body of research and relatively few studies which use sociological theory to analyze the experience of women coaches. Moreover, analyses of coaching in general appeared in journals and books representing two
different disciplines: physical education/sport studies and sociology, (more specifically, sociology of sport). While there was some crossover, for the most part the themes which emerged and the researchers associated with these themes were located in one or the other realm. Thus, this literature review is organized according to the field from which it emerged, in chronological order, and by theme.

Much of the literature in professional journals was devoted, in one way or another, to teaching others "how to" coach. Throughout the 1970's the literature focused primarily on effective coaching technique and strategies (Harris, 1979; Polvino, 1979), professional preparation and evaluation (Blake, 1976; Nathansen, 1979), philosophy (Smith, 1971; Zeigler, 1980), the relationship between teaching and coaching (Dougherty and Hebel, 1972; Lindholm, 1979), the coach-player relationship (King, 1972; Snyder, 1975), coaching styles (Penman et al., 1974), and certification programs (McKinney and Taylor, 1970; Meinhardt, 1971). Several papers also addressed employment issues such as: career mobility (Sage and Loy, 1978), pay equity (Stein, 1979) and Title IX compliance (Blaufarb, 1972).

With the exception of Massengale's (1974) analysis of coaching as an occupational subculture, Sabock's (1975) analysis of the high school coach, and Sage's (1975) analysis of college coaching, there were few early attempts by professionals in the field of physical education at comprehensive analyses of coaching as an occupation. While these studies represent early attempts to study and explain the nature of coaching as an occupation, they focused almost exclusively on the male experience.

Opening photographs of women coaches do not belie the fact that, Sabock's (1975) early analysis of coaching is about male coaches. He begins Chapter 5: The Coaches Family, this way: "It makes little difference whether a coach wants his wife and children..."
to become involved in his job or not, because in spite of his wishes, they will become one way or another" (1975:121). The focus of the chapter is on the role of the coaches' wives' and husbands' reactions to coaching as an occupation for their husbands.

The problem with these early studies is not that they focused on male coaches, but that they take the male experience to be the "norm." The implication is that coaching is for men and that where women coaches are found, the woman coach's experience models her male counterparts.

Throughout the late 1970's and 1980's the interest in coaching education and coaching certification remained a concern of physical education and sport science professionals, but new themes and more sociological analyses were also evident. Role conflict among teacher coaches received significant treatment by scholars during this period (Anderson, 1985; Decker, 1986; Lock and Massengale, 1978; Templin et al. 1980), as did the concern with pressures related to coaching (Andrews, 1986; Lackey, 1986). Gender equity received more attention too as scholars began to address the impact of Title IX (Greendorfer, 1989), the decline of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics For Women (AIAW) (Grant, 1989; Hult, 1980), sex discrimination in coaching (Dessem, 1980), and the decline in women coaches (Acosta and Carpenter, 1985a, 1985b, 1988; Hasbrook, 1988; Hart, Hasbrook, and Mathes, 1986; Holmen and Parkhouse, 1981; Sisley and Capel, 1986).

Despite the growing interest in issues of concern to women coaches, and the steady inclusion of women coaches as subjects for research, the most comprehensive analysis of the nature of coaching as an occupation during the 1980's, a study by Sage (1987), focused exclusively on men. Acknowledging this bias Sage asserts,

"Originally I had planned to include both male and female teacher/coaches in the study because I wanted to compare and contrast the social world of teacher/coaches of both"
sexes. Research from a variety of occupational settings suggests that organizational life and career contingencies are experienced differently by males and females in the same occupation (Bain, 1979; Berch, 1982; Reskin, 1984; Spitze & Waite, 1980). But there were so few female teacher coaches at each school that I did not have a large enough sample of them to make sound comparative analyses, so I decided to concentrate on male coaches. (1987:216)

Although there was evidence that women were included in studies on coaching throughout the 1970's and 1980's, and that issues of concern to women coaches were also dealt with, the development of a literature which focused exclusively on the experiences of women coaches did not appear until the 1990's. Much of this literature was written by scholars whose interests cross both the disciplines of physical education/sport studies and sociology, and most was published in sociology journals.

This literature had its beginning in the late 1960's and early 1970's in books by Neal (1969) and Miller (1974). Neal's Coaching Methods for Women, and Miller's Coaching the Female Athlete are both primarily "how to" manuals written by physical educators for aspiring high school coaches. They focus on teaching sport skills and organizing sports teams. However, Neal also devoted an entire chapter to the role of the coach as leader, focusing on issues such as philosophy and the characteristics of a good coach. Miller spent two chapters on coaching: one devoted to dimensions of coaching including a discussion of the relationship between teaching and coaching; the other on current issues facing women coaches including crowd control, legal aspects of coaching, and public relations.

Feminist approaches to coaching appeared in Boutilier and SanGiovanni's (1983) The Sporting Woman. Like Carole Oglesby's (1978) Women and Sport before it, The Sporting Woman presents a feminist analysis of women in sport. However, it also includes original participant observation data and an analysis of feminist approaches to coaching. Boutilier and SanGiovanni challenge the patriarchal nature of sport...
criticizing its emphasis on competition, aggression, rationalization, and its highly
organized nature; however, they also assert,

It is not enough to criticize male oriented sport. One must have a set of values,
structures, processes and goals for sports which would incorporate those human
qualities that until now have polarized women and men. Strength with grace,
competition with compassion, rationality with intuition, product with process have
yet to merge into the sport experience and fulfill its potential for both sexes and for
sport itself. (1983:8-9)

Thus, beyond arguing that it is in "women's nature" to be process-oriented,
compassionate, and cooperative; Boutilier and SanGiovanni aver that these attributes are
available to both men and women. However, they suggest that if sport is to change, then
it is up to women to change it. According to this formula, women must carry their
attributes into the world of sport and transform it from the ground up. Using their own
experiences as coaches, the authors document that there are alternative orientations to
sport, and that women coaches and athletes often experience sport differently from men

The review of literature revealed that the interest in women coaches increased during
the 1980's and into the 1990's resulting in a steady growth of papers and research
devoted exclusively to women coaches. Much of this literature attempted to describe and
explain the declining numbers of women in interscholastic and college coaching (Acosta
and Carpenter, 1985a, 1985b, 1988, 1992b, 1994; Hart, Hasbrook, and Mathes,
and Capel, 1986; Weiss and Stevens, 1993), and emerged both from the disciplines of
physical education and sociology. It is both descriptive and theoretical and helped to
foster an interest in and the development of new research on gender inequality in

Concluding Word When the review of literature is narrowed to include only those works which focus on college coaching as an occupation for women two themes clearly dominate: the decline in women college coaches and gender inequality. These two themes reflect current knowledge about the contemporary coaching experience. They are also a reflection of individual interests and of the contingencies which influence the questions researchers ask and the studies they pursue. These two themes are the foundation of the literature on women in coaching, and are the starting point and a frame of reference against which my own questions have emerged. Each of these two general themes is explored here in more detail.

The Decline of Women Intercollegiate Coaches

Acosta and Carpenter (1985, 1992b, 1994) have followed the decline in women college coaches for over fifteen years. In 1972, 90% of the coaches for women's teams were women, in 1977 only 58% of coaches of women's teams were women, in 1990 the number was 47.3%. In between 1990 and 1994 the percentage of women coaches increased 2.1% to 49.4%, an increase the authors attribute to legal rulings which allow plaintiffs in Title IX lawsuits to sue for compensatory and punitive damages, thereby empowering individuals to take action against gender discrimination. The recent Supreme Court ruling, Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools (Feb. 26, 1992), asserts that colleges and universities must comply with Title IX (Acosta and Carpenter, 1994:2). Since 1994 there has again been a decline in women coaches: in 1996 47.7% of coaches for women's teams were women, a decline of 1.7%.
The decline in female intercollegiate coaches over the past twenty years is usually described in terms of percentages. However, this way of reporting change can obscure the nature of the change. Reported this way the decline may be an indicator both of female coaches who left the profession, and an indicator of an increase in coaching positions which were filled by men. It is therefore important to describe the decline both in terms of numbers and percentages.

The implementation of Title IX in 1972 led to a 37% increase in intercollegiate coaching positions for women's teams between 1974 and 1979 (Holmen and Parkhouse in Hasbrook, 1988). However, the number of female coaches could have remained the same while the percentages declined if in fact the new coaching positions were filled by men. Research by Holmen and Parkhouse (in Hasbrook, 1988:59) reveals this was not the case. During that same time period the number of female head coaches declined from 1,485 to 1,191 (The number of male head coaches of female teams increased from 319 to 756.). This is a 20% decline for women and a 137% increase for men. This research leads to the conclusion that during the 1970's, the decline in women intercollegiate coaches reflects: three different patterns: (1). women leaving the field of coaching; (2). men filling the jobs that women leave; (3). men filling newly created coaching positions in women's athletics.

The overall purpose of this study is to understand what coaching means to women and how women feel about and respond to changes in the structure and culture of intercollegiate sport. Thus, the decline of women in coaching is of interest to this study, especially the portion of that decline related to women leaving the profession. However, the purpose here is not to explain this decline; rather, the decline has led me to ask: Why do women choose coaching as an occupation? How do women coaches feel about what
they do? How have recent changes in women's intercollegiate sport changed the job of coaching, and how do women coaches feel about those changes?

The Decline in Women Coaches and Gender Inequality in Coaching

Drawing on theories from the sociology of work and occupations, researchers have attempted to explain the decline in women coaches in terms of the difficulties they face. Following the organizational model which asserts that the structure of the workplace shapes the behavior of workers (Kanter, 1977), Knoppers (in Birrell and Cole, 1994) asserts that opportunity, power and proportion are important structural determinants in the work behavior of women coaches and help to explain gender differences in work behavior. Moreover, Knoppers uses this theory to try and explain the decline in women coaches. In doing so she not only sheds new light on the problem of decline, but raises important questions about gender inequality. Many of the findings and analyses presented by Knoppers are supported by other researchers. Thus, while this discussion focuses on Knoppers (1989) analysis of coaching as an occupation for women, other researchers are cited where and when their findings concur with Knoppers.

Knoppers argues that as minorities in a male dominated profession, women coaches are often faced with the problem of unconscious discrimination. Their exclusion from informal workplace networking inhibits their opportunity for advancement. The "old boys network" (Acosta and Carpenter, 1985; Theberge, 1988) is a strategy (whether intentional or unintentional) of exclusion which insures only males will have access to valued resources (Parkin, 1979). As a result women coaches have few opportunities for advancement (Acosta and Carpenter, 1985, 1988,1992b; Knoppers, 1989, 94).

While both men and women can find it difficult to balance the demands of family
responsibilities with the demands of coaching (Sabock, 1975), this problem bears more heavily on women. Most male coaches have a two person single career, while female coaches, regardless of marital status, tend to have single person dual careers (Knoppers, 1987:125). Women who coach, like all women who work, still assume most of the responsibility for household chores and child care (Hochschild, 1989: 277-279).

Moreover, because coaching is a male dominated profession women in coaching are usually outnumbered by men. Thus they are often marginalized and treated as tokens (Kane and Stangl, 1991; Martin in Statham, 1988; Theberge, 1993). This not only reduces their power and their ability to mobilize resources, it can lead to performance pressures (Theberge, 1993), boundary maintenance, and stereotyping (Kanter, 1977).

The consequences of these structural determinants are that women coaches have lower aspirations and are far less satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts, and they are much less interested in continuing to coach until retirement (Knoppers, 1991). When workers have few opportunities for mobility and growth they are more likely to experience only moderate satisfaction, to lower their aspirations, and to exit the occupation (Kanter, 1977).

Knoppers (1987, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1993) uses Kanter's (1977) theory of gendered work behavior in male dominated organizations to argue that patriarchy in collegiate sport bears on the work environment and everyday lives of women coaches. While the argument is a sound one it clearly omits those social processes, institutions, and systems other than patriarchy which also shape the female coaches experience. Specifically, capitalism and the associated process of commodification, and the more general long term process of rationalization associated with modern society. Moreover,
while the patriarchal structure of collegiate sport marginalizes women, constrains their opportunities for financial gain and career mobility, levels their aspirations, and limits their autonomy and power; much of the dissatisfaction women coaches feel about their work may have less to do with access to upward mobility, overwork, and feelings of powerlessness, than it does with a deeply rooted conflict over sport values and emotional exhaustion (Pastore and Judd, 1993).

In an effort to explore this notion of conflict over sport values a number of different items were included in the interview guide used in the empirical portion of this study. Under the broad category "Philosophy" coaches were asked to describe their coaching philosophy, allowing me to then compare the norms, values, and beliefs discussed by coaches with the norms and values associated with the dominant sport culture. In the section on "Sport in American Society" coaches were asked to differentiate between the various levels of sport experience in American society, opening the way for them to comment on what they value and do not value about those levels. This line of questioning also gave coaches the opportunity to consider the extent to which norms, values, and practices they disapprove of influence the sport level they work in, how the various levels have or have not changed in recent years, and how they feel about that. The section in the interview guide on "Tasks and Role Conflict" includes items on work-task likes and dislikes and feelings about changes in work-tasks. Here again, coaches were given the opportunity to discuss how they feel about their work: what they value about it, and what they have conflicts over. These sections of the interview guide were developed to explore among other things, what coaches value about coaching and whether their work tasks allow them to practice what they believe in, and whether what they value in coaching is consistent or inconsistent with the dominant sport culture and how
they feel about that.

In addition, the section on "Choosing an Occupation" was designed both to explore coaches reasons for entering the field, and to uncover deeply held values about coaching. Finally, the section on "Staying/Leaving Coaching," particularly the item about thoughts of leaving the profession, was designed to further explore the issue of emotional exhaustion related to coaching.

Nancy Theberge (1990, 1993) approaches the issue of gender inequality among women coaches from a different angle. Although the subjects in her research are Canadian elite women coaches, not American college coaches, there is enough similarity between the two groups to include her work here. Using a social feminist and cultural studies approach, Theberge argues that sport is a site for the construction of ideas about gender and gender difference (Theberge and Birrell, 1994:328). Theberge's approach extends the analysis of experience beyond the bounds of primary group relations to the socio-political forces of culture. Using the concept of hegemony, Theberge shows that the ideology legitimates the status quo. She asserts,

Hegemony and ideology work through the construction of common sense and the conflations of cultural constructs with natural forces. In other words, those who are not well served by a particular system or practice are less likely to challenge their inferior status and deprivation if they can be made to think and feel that (a) their inferiority is a result of their own individual failings and not some systematic discrimination; and (b)the patterns of such inequality are really a natural condition of life. (1994:32)

In another paper "Gender, Work, and Coaching: The Case of Women in Coaching" Theberge finds that although women prefer to view their coaching role as one which is empowering, they continue to accept the dominant ideology. Thus, their alternative view of power is not realized in their coaching practices. Theberge attributes this mismatch between values and practices to the power of the dominant ideology and women's relative
powerlessness within sport institutions (1990:59).

In her paper, "The Construction of Gender in Sport: Women, Coaching, and the Naturalization of Difference," Theberge examines the construction of gender in the work of women coaches. She finds that despite their efforts to meet the standards of male dominated sport, "their differences are continually reconstructed" (1993:308). Male superiority is re-affirmed in assumptions about natural differences between men and women; in sport men's natural superiority is evident in size and strength, physical differences between the sexes. And, the natural superiority of men is reinforced by stereotypes about the nature of men and women: men are more instrumental, women more affiliative and emotional.

Theberge's research shows that women coaches, like other women who constitute a minority in a work environment, are marginalized and treated like tokens, and that as tokens their "differences" become more salient. Most importantly, Theberge shows that rather than challenge the dominant sport ideology which legitimates their inferiority and keeps them in subordinate work roles, women coaches accept the dominant sport ideology. She explains why:

Most women recognize their token status and the pressure to demonstrate their competence in the face of heightened visibility and scrutiny. For the most part they accepted this condition as something they must deal with and did not actively challenge it. Two factors account for this response. The first is the marginal status of women coaches which handicaps efforts to challenge their position and work conditions, including the devaluation of their qualifications and their abilities. The second is the ideology of sport and the view that sport, perhaps more than any other area of social life, is a setting in which effort and performance are rewarded. Women coaches subscribe to this belief and focus their efforts on demonstrating their abilities, or "producing" in the expectation that their accomplishments will be justly recognized (Theberge, 1990). Lacking an alternative to the dominant view of gender and sport most of the coaches have 'taken up the challenge totally within the terms of the preferred ideological definition' (Willis, 1982:130). (Theberge, 1993:311-312)

In response to Theberge's work (which makes clear that the experience of coaching
can not be separated from it socio-political context), coaches' perceptions of their coaching role are explored throughout this study. In the section of the interview guide "Early Athletic Experiences" coaches were asked to explain why they decided to go into coaching, who if anyone was a role model for them, and what those individuals modeled. This line of questioning, along with questions in the section on "Philosophy," was included, in part, to get at coaches' perceptions of the function of coaching and the extent to which they attempt to empower female athletes. Questions pertaining to coaching style, and the question on the nature and focus of their sport programs included in the survey portion of the study, were included in an effort to reveal actual coaching practices. A comparison of answers to these questions allowed me to uncover, as much as might be possible with this methodology, the extent to which coaches' feelings about the functions of coaching match actual coaching practices. Moreover, the questions in the interview guide on philosophy, coaching style, and definition of success, as well as questions about work tasks, were used to explore whether coaches accommodate to the dominant sport culture as much as Theberge suggests.

While Theberge's research is instructive, my guess is that the questions she asked did not allow her respondents to talk about the ways in which they do resist dominant sport ideologies and practices. In focusing on power, Theberge's study may have overlooked its subtle forms. In contrast, the interview guide used in this study was purposely designed to be broad in scope; it was designed to reveal the nature and meaning of coaching for women with the hope that in doing so I might learn something about how they accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture. In other words, rather than ask specifically about the dominant sport culture or feelings of power, I asked coaches about why they chose coaching as an occupation, what they actually do in their jobs, and how
they feel about it. In doing so I hoped to reveal rich data about the nature and meaning of coaching, and coaches feelings about and reactions to changes in women's collegiate sport and the dominant sport culture.

Recent research in the sociology of sport documents active resistance (Birrell and Richter, 1993; Boutiller and SanGiovanni, 1983) by women to the patriarchal values and structure of American sport. Like these studies, a central tenet of this research is that women coaches do more than simply "accept" the dominant sport culture. Agency, can take a variety of forms including: privately accommodative, privately oppositional, collectively accommodative, collectively oppositional, and radically transformative (Morgan, 1994: 99-100). And resistance to hegemony is never an either or condition; rather, individuals interact with the dominant sport culture in complex ways, the aggregation of which creates a complex pattern of accommodation, resistance, and incorporation to patriarchal/capitalist practices.

In contrast to Theberge's findings, I argue that there are limits to the hegemony of the dominant sport culture, and that individuals challenge and resist dominant sport meanings. In the world of women's collegiate coaching, dominant meanings and practices are both negotiated and contested. Acts of resistance may not transform the dominant sport culture, but in small and important ways they influence its overall shape. However, I also argue that the nature of those challenges are ultimately shaped by dominant meanings and practices (Willis, 1982).

Gaps in the Literature on Women and Coaching

The literature reviewed here is a first step towards understanding the nature of women's coaching. However, most of the research on the decline in women college
coaches is descriptive and atheoretical (Acosta and Carpenter, 1985, 1988, 1991, 1992b, 1994; Pastore, 1991). While it is extremely valuable to the study of coaching as an occupation for women (it documents the declining percentages of women coaches and the perception of athletic administrators regarding that decline), there is clearly a need for more research, and for research which utilizes sociological theory. Perhaps the most important contribution this body of research makes to my own study is that it raises important questions about the nature and meaning of collegiate coaching for women and the affect of recent changes in women's collegiate sport on women coaches.

The literature on gender inequality, much of this written and researched by Annelies Knoppers and colleagues (1987, 1989, 1991, 1992, 1993) focuses on the work behavior of women coaches in the context of a male dominated profession. It is a first attempt to use sociological theory to explain how coaching is experienced, and raises important questions about the relationship between the patriarchal structure of sport, opportunity for mobility, and the decline in women coaches. By focusing on the important structural determinants of work behavior Knoppers makes clear that there is gender inequality in coaching and that for women, coaching can be both difficult and frustrating.

The problematic of gender inequality in coaching is further explored by Theberge (1988, 1990, 1993). Her research reveals how gender ideology is constructed and reproduced in coaching. Like Knoppers she acknowledges male dominance in sport, but she presents a more subtle analysis of social structural variables. In "Gender, Work and Power: The Case of Women in Coaching," Theberge ventures into the subjective world of elite level coaching. Her study reveals women coaches see themselves in empowering roles, rather than in positions of power. They seek to influence their
athletes through encouragement, cooperation, and support. According to Theberge, female coaches view their positions differently from their male counterparts, both because they accept the male dominated ideology of sport, and because they are powerless in this male dominated world.

What is missing from this relatively new body of research is an analysis of college coaching as an occupation for women which illuminates the subjective experience of women coaches in the context of a changing sport structure. Theberge's work is a first step towards a comprehensive analysis of coaching as an occupation for women which reveals the relationship between subjective meaning and larger structural forces. However, despite the similarities, there are important differences between Canadian elite level coaches and American college coaches. Moreover, any analysis which attempts to say something about the intersection of agency and structure and the construction of meaning must take account of historically specific conditions and opportunities.

The interview guide used in this study was designed to uncover both the micro level world of coaching and the macro level world of collegiate sport in an effort to understand the nature and extent of human agency in coaches' construction of meaning in their work. In addition, I made the decision to include an historical analysis of the origins of coaching as an occupation for women so as to create an historical context and point of reference from which to compare the data collected in the empirical portion of this study. The historical analysis also allows me to chart the lines of continuity and discontinuity in philosophy, values, and practices associated with women's coaching.

In choosing subjects to interview for this study I purposely attempted to include coaches of all ages so that in the analysis portion of the study I could make comparisons by cohort. These cohort groups provide yet another opportunity to consider the
influence of historical context on the experience of coaching and to analyze the continuity
and discontinuity in values and practices of women coaches over time.

The questions developed in the interview guide, survey, and field notes were designed
to produce a "snapshot" of coaching in 1995/96. The sampling procedure was designed
to produce cohorts which would allow me to analyze changes in women's collegiate sport
and coaching over the past twenty five years. The historical research was included in an
effort both to reveal the roots of coaching as an occupation and the extent to which women
coaches continue to act as carriers of values and practices traditionally associated with
women's sports; to reveal the extent to which coaches accommodate and resist the
dominant sport culture; and to reveal the extent to which there is a subculture of values,
norms, and practices in the work world of women coaches-a social space constructed and
protected by women coaches.

These three elements of the empirical portion of this project combine to illuminate
the subjective experience of women coaches in the context of a changing sport structure,
and uncover the complexities of the relationship between subjective meaning and larger
structural forces in the occupation of collegiate coaching for American women.
Moreover, this project is designed to produce data which will allow me draw conclusions
about the intersection of agency and structure, and the construction of social meaning in
historical context.

Implications of Changing Sport Structures for Women Coaches

Women's intercollegiate sports have undergone philosophical and structural changes
over the past twenty years, and increasingly reflect those values and practices
associated with men's athletics (Acosta and Carpenter, 1991; Blinde, 1989a, 1989b;
Women may in fact leave coaching because of things like lack of opportunity, inequitable pay and lack of support, and because they now have other opportunities; and the feelings of relative deprivation may well have increased since Title IX and the NCAA takeover of women's athletics. But a more in-depth analysis of the subjective nature of coaching reveals that in addition to the above mentioned problems, women coaches experience a deeper conflict over the increasingly rationalized and product oriented nature of collegiate sport.

In a recent study by Weiss and Stevens (1993) the authors concluded that both current and former female high school coaches see coaching as an occupation which has many "costs." The costs rated highest by respondents included: substantial demands on time, anxiety and stress, and lack of program support. The benefits rated highest by respondents in their study include: enjoyment of seeing athletes achieve a goal, enjoyment associated with working with athletes, and fun; the challenge of building a successful program, feelings of competence, and opportunities to continue their own athletic experience.

In another important study, Hart, Hasbrook, and Mathes (in Hasbrook, 1988) addressed the impact of Title IX on women high school coaches. These authors concluded that while Title IX opened up new opportunities for women coaches, it also created a sport structure which carried increased demands on time and skill. Moreover, Title IX brought with it a more competitive philosophy which some women embraced, and others were forced to accept. The findings from their study revealed a difference in value orientation among pre-Title IX and post-Title IX coaches.

Pre-Title IX coaches reported that working with athletes was an important reason for entering coaching, while post-Title IX coaches sited desire to maintain involvement in
athletics, challenge of producing a winning team, and competition of coaching. In addition, the authors found differences in socialization and training: pre-Title IX coaches participated in sport and were trained as physical educators during an era which did not emphasize, and in some cases rejected, the competitive aspects of sport; post-Title IX coaches were trained in an era which embraced competitive athletics for girls and women. The authors assert that the decline in women interscholastic coaches can be explained in part by the loss of pre-Title IX coaches who felt uncomfortable with the new structure and role demands of sport (in Hasbrook, 1988:61).

Both the Weiss and Stevens, and Hart, Hasbrook, and Mathes' studies are of high school coaches. However, despite the differences between high school and college level coaching, there is enough overlap to suggest that their findings may be relevant for analyses of college coaching.

In their study, "Opportunity and Work Behavior in College Coaching" Knoppers et al. reported that "changes in administration philosophy" (1991: 12) is cited by college coaches as the third most important reason for exiting coaching. What exactly do these women mean by philosophical conflicts? Respondants in Acosta and Carpenter's study of the perceived causes of decline in women college coaches and administrators cited "females burnout and leave coaching/or administration sooner than males" (1988:1) as the fourth most important reason for the decline. When the results were categorized according to male and female perceptions for the decline, the only reason cited by both men and women was "females burnout and leave sooner."

Although "burnout" may be the result of role conflict, (Acosta and Carpenter, 1992) it may also be an indicator of values conflict, a kind of emotional fatigue which results from trying to juggle, even reconcile, opposing world views. This idea of opposing world
views is supported in research by Pease et al. (1988). In their study of the "Pre-
Entry Coaching Expectations of Women and Men," the authors find men and women have
different expectations of and beliefs about their profession. The logical next question is:
Whose expectations are met? And then, which set of expectations do existing sport
structures support? If men and women have different beliefs about and expectation of
the coaching profession, it makes sense that their coaching experiences will be different.
This idea is supported by Pastore and Judd (1993). In their study of burnout among
male and female coaches of women's teams at two year colleges Pastore and Judd find
significant gender differences in their Emotional Exhaustion subscale.

Conflicts over "changes in administration philosophy," and "burnout," may be more
than indicators of the time commitment required in coaching, or women's inability to
adapt to new philosophies. They may be signifiers of a more fundamental social process
and its influence on women: the extension of the dominant sport culture to the world of
women's collegiate sport, and women coaches' conflicts with the work tasks and values
imposed by this culture. These themes are investigated in the empirical portion of this
study. The section of the interview guide on "Sport in American Society," and the survey
of sport values was designed to reveal coaches perceptions of the extent to which
dominant sport values have encroached on women's collegiate sport and women's
coaching, as well as their feelings about it. The section on "Work Tasks and Role
Conflict" was designed to allow coaches to explain what they actually do in their jobs, and
how they feel about it. Moreover, the opened ended questioning used throughout the
interview guide was designed to allow me to probe for deeper meanings associated with
the experience of coaching.

In 1985 college administrators cited the following as causes for decline in college
coaches and administrators: (1). The belief by women that the current philosophy is to win at the expense of educational principles. (2). Women's unwillingness to proceed under the philosophy of the NCAA (Acosta and Carpenter, 1985:35). In a 1988 follow-up study these reasons were not mentioned. Three years after the first study was conducted male and female administrators no longer felt that philosophical conflicts had any bearing on a woman's decision to leave the field (Acosta and Carpenter, 1988:1). Where have these philosophical conflicts gone? Have all the coaches who felt conflict already left? Have those who stayed accommodated to a new sport model? Do most experience conflict yet still continue to coach? Moreover, as important as this research is, it is second hand information: administrators speaking for coaches. There is clearly a need for research which allows coaches to speak for themselves.

**Filling Gaps in the Literature**

The long term decline in women in coaching, particularly the portion related to women leaving the profession, led to my interest in the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women. After reading the literature on the decline in women coaches I was not satisfied that the experience of coaching, especially its underlying meanings, had been adequately described. Moreover, the literature on the decline of women in coaching made me aware that few studies had attempted to uncover the deep meanings associated with coaching, or to think about coaching theoretically, as an occupation for women situated in a larger sport structure.

Attempts to explain the decline in women coaches have extended our understanding of the difficulties women coaches face, and the benefits and drawbacks of coaching for women. Drawing on theories developed in occupational sociology and gender studies,
researchers have begun to consider the ways in which social structural arrangements and structures of power impact women coaches. These studies are critical because they are a first to attempt to use sociological theory to explain the nature of coaching for women. My own study is an effort to extend our understanding of coaching as an occupation for women using sociological theory. Informed by researchers like Knoppers, Birrell and Richter, Boutillier and SanGiovanni, and Theberge I present what I believe is a more in-depth and comprehensive look at the female coach in an effort to reveal the complex details of coaching in the context of a changing sport structure. In short my purpose in conducting this study is to understand and uncover both the meaning women coaches assign their work, and the nature and extent of their accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture.

Summary

While there are several "gaps" in the literature on women and coaching, two in particular have influenced the focus of this project. One is the need for "more in-depth analysis of the meanings workers attach to their jobs and the categories with which they experience their work" (Vallas, 1990:346). The other is the need to tie the subjective experience of coaching to the wider culture in which it exists. Occupational sociologists have recognized the dearth of such approaches and the consequent gap in our understanding of the symbolic aspects of work and their influence on work behavior.

The need to analyze work in terms of the wider environment is expressed by several occupational sociologists including Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Arthur Stinchcombe, and Rose Coser (in Erickson and Vallas, 1990). Moreover, as Steven Vallas makes clear, "We are not likely to understand how work structures emerge, persist, or change unless we
take into account the ways in which workers act back on and negotiate their work situations" (1990:357).

What is missing from this literature then, is research which ties a more in-depth analysis of the subjective world of women college coaches at the micro level, to the macro world of institutional structures. There is need for an analysis which focuses on the intersection of agency and structure; that is, an analysis which focuses on how social actors assign meanings and construct their own culture in the context of structural constraints. A classic example of this is E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class*.

Moreover, there is a need for research which makes clear the historical, as well the social context of coaching as an occupation; that treats the experience of coaching not only as an intersection of agency and structure, but as a process in time: a continuous unfolding of actions and contingencies which actively construct experience. As Philip Abrams argues, the problem of agency and structure is best resolved by thinking of it in terms of historically specific structures and conditions. He asserts, "...the most promising move I can envisage from the point of view so far as the dilemma of human agency is concerned is to insist on the need to conceive of that dilemma historically: to insist on the ways in which and the extent to which the relationship of action and structure is to be understood as matter of process in time" (1982: XV).

The occupation of coaching is analyzed here from two perspectives, the combination of which will ultimately produce a picture of coaching as a "process in time." The first perspective starts with the structure of intercollegiate sport and asks: How does the structure of intercollegiate sport shape the coaching experience, and how do women coaches accommodate to and challenge that structure? The second begins with the micro
world of coaches and asks: How do coaches actively construct the meaning they experience in their work, and to what extent does this pose a challenge to existing sport structures?

In Chapter III I present an historical analysis of the roots of coaching as an occupation for women. More specifically, I explore the relationship between physical education, women's coaching and the "female model" of sport. The purpose of chapter three is to give some historical perspective to our understanding of the female coach, and to attempt to better understand the historical roots of the norms, values, and practices associated with the "female model" of sport.

Throughout this thesis I argue that coaches construct the meaning they assign their work. However, this meaning is not created anew, as if from thin air. Rather, the meaning coaches assign their work is related, in part, to the complex mixture of norms, values, and ideologies associated with the profession of women's physical education which has been handed down over time. In Chapter III I attempt to establish what those norms and values are, where they originated, and how they have and have not changed over time.
CHAPTER III

PROFESSIONAL ROOTS: PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND THE FEMALE MODEL OF SPORT

This chapter explores the historical roots of coaching as an occupation, the emergence of the female model of collegiate sport, and the evolution and decline of women's governance in collegiate sport. The purpose of this chapter is to uncover the ideals and ethos of the physical education profession and the extent to which early female educators were carriers of the ideals established by the founders of the profession, to reveal the intentions and motivations underlying the emergence of the "female model" of sport, and to explain the evolution and decline of women's governance in women's intercollegiate athletics. The overall aim of this chapter is to establish an historical base from which to then ask: To what extent do women coaching in the 1990's approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport? To what extent are the social sources of this approach related to the ideals and philosophies of the physical education profession? If the governing structure of women's athletics embodied the ideals of early physical educators, to what extent is this approach to sport, the "female model," still carried by female coaches despite the loss of an organizational structure to reinforce it?

A primary focus of this study is the investigation into patterns of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture by female coaches. However, uncovering the nature and extent of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture produces a simple description of behavior. A more theoretically interesting question is, why? Do coaches accommodate and resist dominant sport structures because they believe in and follow a different sport model? Moreover, do they follow a different
model because they are women, because of the influences of professional socialization, or for some other reason? Finally, is the nature of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture in the 1990's related to changes in the organizational structure of women's intercollegiate athletics which took place in the early 1980's?

To answer these questions requires an understanding of the history of physical education in general and the relationship between women's physical education and collegiate sport in particular. Thus, this chapter is divided into three parts: The first part is a description and analysis of the emergence of the physical education profession and women's physical education, focusing on the early teacher training schools and their founders; the second part looks at the emergence of games and sports within physical education, the beginning of women's governance in intercollegiate sport, and the underlying motivations for control over women's intercollegiate sports; the third and final part of the chapter focuses on the rise and fall of the AIAW and the establishment of the male controlled NCAA as the governing body for both men's and women's intercollegiate athletics.

The historical roots of coaching as an occupation for women lay in the field of physical education. Organized sport for women did not emerge until after the profession of physical education was firmly in place at institutions of higher learning; thus, as sports grew more acceptable for women they were slowly added to the physical education curriculum. Physical education instructors then, were the first to teach sports and games to women. As students became more interested in games and sports, students, under the guidance of the physical education instructor, organized the first intramural games (Cahn, 1994: 16,26). As interest in "extramural" sports grew among female students, they were slowly and in some cases reluctantly added; however, they too came
under the direction of the physical education instructor or director. Thus, intercollegiate or "extramural" sports for women emerged from within physical education departments and came under the direction of the women's physical educator director. The leaders in women's physical education made the rules, set the policies, and established the organizations and philosophies which shaped the early years of women's intercollegiate sport. In shaping women's intercollegiate sport they also shaped the occupation of coaching.

For most of the short history of women's intercollegiate sport, female coaches have been trained as physical educators. As intercollegiate sports were added for women, physical educators became coaches, and their jobs entailed both teaching and coaching. Until recently women intercollegiate coaches were almost exclusively physical educators. The separation of coaching from teaching and the decline in physical educators in women's coaching, is a relatively new occurrence and at this point most prevalent at Division I institutions. Physical education professionals dominate women's coaching positions in Division II even where their jobs don't entail teaching; and they dominate the coaching positions at Division III institutions where their jobs typically entail teaching and coaching and/or some other administrative duty within the physical education or athletic department.

All professions have an ethos made up of the ideologies and code of conduct for group members. Some would argue that the purpose of a professional education is not so much the acquisition of knowledge, as the indoctrination into the professional ethos (Khleif, 1975). Certainly a professional education contributes to the acquisition of individual knowledge and skills used in the profession, but it is also clear that a professional education socializes students in the norms and values of the occupational field. If in fact
the female coach approaches her work with a "female voice," as suggested by the hypothesis developed in this study, then perhaps the "source" of this approach lay in the values, ideologies, and practices of her profession.

Researchers concur (Hult, 1985; Spears and Swanson, 1983; Theberge, 1989) that since its inception women's intercollegiate sport has followed a slightly different model than the one organized by men. This alternative form is often referred to as the "female model" and is described as emphasizing the following: growth of the individual through sport, mutual cooperation between athletics and academics, increased opportunity based on student interest, emphasis on the student portion of the student athlete, and focus on providing a positive athletic experience (Acosta and Carpenter, 1991). The purpose of this brief historical analysis of the physical education profession is to uncover the roots of the female model of sport, to gain a more in-depth understanding of its meaning, and to construct a social context from which to understand the female coach. If, as the literature on work and occupations suggests, professional socialization shapes work behavior and beliefs (Becker, 1971), then to understand the female coach it is necessary to understand the profession which has trained her: physical education.

In a classic paper on the nature of professions, Abraham Flexner asserts that six criteria separate professions from other kinds of work. He suggests that professional activity is based on intellectual activity which is carried out with a sense of great responsibility, it is learned, it is practical, the technique could be taught—thus professional education, it is strongly organized internally, and it is motivated by altruism—the professionals viewing themselves as working for the good of society. Flexner states,

What matters most is professional spirit. All activities may be prosecuted in the genuine professional spirit. In so far as accepted professions are prosecuted at a
mercenary or selfish level, law and medicine are no better than trades. In so far as trades are honestly carried on, they tend to rise toward the professional level...The unselfish devotion to those who have chosen to give themselves to making the world a fitter place to live in can fill [social work] with the professional spirit and thus to some extent lift it above all the distinctions which I have been at such pains to make. (Flexner in Becker, 1971:88)

What follows is an effort to uncover the "professional spirit" in physical education, trace this "spirit" through to the construction of the "female model" of sport, the development of women's coaching, and the female intercollegiate coach.

The Early Years of Women's Physical Education:
Training Programs, the Normal Schools, and their Founders

Throughout the Victorian era ideologies regarding gender appropriate behavior were counterweights to the nascent movement in support of women's physical education in institutions of higher learning. Social Darwinism and the cult of domesticity combined to foster an ideology which relegated women to the home in the role of wife and mother (Hargreaves, 1993). Women were important not only for their reproductive abilities, but because they were the "moral guardians" of the nation. In assigning women the domain of the family this ideology sought to restrict women's movement into the public sphere.

Throughout this period related ideas regarding women's "natural" role in society were used to restrict women's sport participation. Underlying the various ideologies and dictums was one essential theme: for women, biology is destiny. Medical experts and social reformers alike argued against women's participation in leisure activities. Their views centered on the idea that women were simply too weak and too frail to engage in vigorous physical activity (Theberge, 1989). The vitalist theory of physiology, in vogue at the turn of the century, asserted that there was a limited and non-renewable
amount of energy in the human body. This theory, combined with the Social Darwinist ideas regarding women's role in the survival of the species, worked to proscribe sport activities for all responsible young women. For women, the only justifiable way to spend limited physical energy was in procreation. Women were simply not "naturally" equipped for physical activity (Lenskyj, 1986).

Despite these and other related ideologies (Women's proper role, the monthly incapacity, women's delicate organs, it's not in women's nature to compete; see Lenskyj, 1986) which were used to restrict women's physical activity and their entry into the leisure sphere, a somewhat less prominent but equally emphatic group of reformers and medical professionals argued for women's participation in physical activity. Beginning as a response to the Industrial Revolution, an increasingly sedentary lifestyle, and a growing concern for health; social reformers and medical professionals voiced support for and claimed the benefits of physical activity. Despite Victorian Ideology, a small group of activists and radicals argued that women were capable of engaging in physical exercise, or "gymnastics" as it was known, and other forms of physical activity.

Upper class women were the first to have access to leisure activities; they played gentle, respectable games like croquet, table tennis, and tennis mostly in elite clubs in urban areas. These activities were consistent with attitudes regarding women's proper role and gave upper class women an opportunity to display the popular costumes of the day. Moreover, by participating in acceptable leisure activities the bourgeois woman separated herself from her middle class contemporaries (Hargreaves, 1993a). Beginning in the 1870's national sport organizations sponsored women's national championships in archery in 1879, tennis in 1887, and golf in 1895. Although these championships involved high level competition, the activities themselves were well
within the boundaries of acceptable sports for women (Cahn, 1994:15).

The active support by medical professionals and reformers for "gymnastics" for women was directed more towards the middle class, even so, it carried with it the overtones of the bourgeois ideal regarding "proper" activities for women and girls. At mid-century support for women's physical activity, known variously as gymnastics, hygiene, physical culture and physical training, was based on its curative effects. By the 1880's the emphasis changed from curing health problems to preventing them.

Throughout the late nineteenth century women's enrollment at institutions for higher education grew dramatically: the number of women in college jumped from 11,000 in 1870 to 85,000 in 1900 (Cahn, 1994:13). However, according to some physicians of the day, higher education posed a threat to a woman's health and well being. They believed women could not handle the demands of higher education, either physically or emotionally, and that higher education would strip a woman of the "vital energy" needed in childbirth. Thus, if a woman was not deterred by tales of emotional and physical breakdown; then surely the accusation that college was a selfish and irresponsible pursuit for woman would make her reconsider.

Throughout this period, women had to continually justify their enrollment at institutions for higher learning. In response to admonitions by men and women who sought to deter women from entering college, supporters argued that gymnastics and calisthenics would establish in women the strength necessary to endure and thrive under the stress and intellectual demands imposed by the college setting (Kennard, 1994:51). Thus, physical education would be both a restorative and preventive activity. It would restore a woman's "vital energy which might be drained in intellectual activity, thereby insuring her continued reproductive capability; and it would be a preventive activity,
insuring that women had the strength and health which would enable them to cope with
the challenges and demands of college life.

At the turn of the century the focus in physical education changed, away from
gymnastics and calisthenics towards sports and games. In this transformation was born
yet another challenge: how to justify sports and games for women in a society which
associated sport and athletics for women with immorality and masculinity (Cahn,
1994). Fortunately for the supporters of women's physical education the shift from
gymnastics to sports was accompanied by an equally important shift in ideology: the
cannon on prevention and the health functions of physical education gave way to
Progressive ideals regarding the social benefits of games and sports.

Early Support for Women's Physical Activity

Catherine Beecher's physical education program for girls was specifically adapted to
meet the needs of women and was an alternative to the German system of gymnastics
which stressed heavy weights and calisthenics more fitted to the male physic. As a
proponent of the curative and healthful benefits of physical activity Beecher's ideas were
somewhat radical in their endorsement of fun and games. A supporter of outdoor sports,
she believed that college students should be required to have courses in physical training
taught by a knowledgeable and competent instructor (Beecher in Lockhart and Spears,
1972:3-4).

Beecher's program stressed posture exercises, light chest weights, calisthenics and
drills set to music, as well as archery, swimming and horseback riding (Weston,
1962:30). Although Beecher's program was not well accepted at the time, her approach
to physical education for girls was published in 1859 in Physiology and Calisthenics for
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Schools and Families. Moreover, as a leader among women educators, she was Director of the Hartford Seminary for Girls and founder of the Western Female Institute in 1837, Beecher’s early advocacy for women’s physical education, set the stage for others to follow. In keeping with the times Beecher also emphasized the benefits of physical activity for the development of beauty, health, and longevity.

Like Beecher, Dioclesian Lewis was an early proponent of the curative benefits of physical culture. His wife’s affliction with tuberculosis was the impetus behind Lewis’ interest in hygiene and exercise and lead him "to a concern for the mental and physical emancipation of women" (Schwendener, 1942:81). He sought to reform the German gymnastics system then in vogue and created a system more easily accessible to men, women, and girls of all shapes and sizes, and more readily adaptable to a variety of settings (not requiring a gymnasium). Lewis combined Beecher’s calisthenics with the Swedish gymnastics system of Per Henrik Ling. The Lewis system included exercise for all body parts through calisthenics and games, and emphasized the importance of fun and the social aspects of physical activity. Activities included bean bag and ball games, calisthenics to music, social games, and dance routines (Schwendener, 1942:83).

Lewis actively advocated for girls physical education in the public schools. As a result of his efforts, in 1860 at the thirty first annual meeting of the American Institute of Instruction a committee from the Institute unanimously approved a resolution to introduce the Lewis system into all schools (Welch, 1994:29).

Lewis is most noted for founding the Boston Normal School for Physical Education (1861) the first preparatory school for future physical education instructors, and for publishing the first American periodical, Gymnastics Monthly and Journal of Physical Culture (Weston, 1962: 31). The Boston Normal School for Physical Education (1861-
1868) was very influential in fostering the early growth of physical education as a discipline and profession. The curriculum included anatomy, physiology hygiene, gymnastics and the Swedish approach to the treatment of chronic disease. Students were required to perform the various exercises in the Lewis program, and to teach these skills each day in small class sessions where their methods and effectiveness were evaluated. The first graduates of the institute in 1861 included seven women and six men, and by the time three classes had graduated a dozen women were teaching in female seminaries and several others were involved in itinerant teaching (Welch, 1994:30).

Lewis believed strongly that all individuals, men, women, young and old, would benefit from participation in gymnastics. Moreover, his program called for "a transformation of the gymnasium which favored the athletic individual to one that offered exercise apparatus for everyone" (Welch, 1994:31). In sum, the Lewis program combined these elements: an interest in the emancipation of women, the idea that exercise should be fun and enjoyable, a focus on inclusion and exercises available to all, and a belief in the importance of the social aspects of exercise and games.

While Lewis' program reflected a variety of underlying concerns, it is clear that high on his list was a democratization of physical activity. He asserts,

My object is to present a new system of gymnastics. Novel in philosophy and practical in details, its distinguishing peculiarity is a complete adaptation, alike, to the strongest man, the feeblest woman, and the frailist child. The athlete finds abundant opportunities for the greatest exertions, while the delicate child is never injured...The true educator sees in the present public interest in physical education, a hope and a promise...The question is not what shall be done for these few extraordinary persons. Each has instinctively sought and found his natural specialty...But the question is, what shall be done for the millions of women, children and men, who are dying for physical training? My attempt to answer this momentous question will be found in this work. (Lewis in Lockhart and Spears, 1972:37-38)

A radical and a visionary, Lewis was convinced that people should be taught gymnastics from knowledgeable instructors. He was among the first to see the need for
teacher preparation in physical education and the first to include women in that cause. Despite his energy and early success, Lewis' program for gymnastics and his Normal school were short lived. The Civil War and war time concerns constrained the development of innovative approaches to physical education during this period. The focus turned to military preparation and thus military style drills. Nonetheless, Lewis' program for gymnastics and his Normal Institute for Physical Education lay the foundation for teacher preparation in the United States. He established a curriculum which included both scientific courses and teaching practicum, and his faculty included the leading medical professionals of the day. As Paula Welch asserts, "Students enrolled in teacher preparation in the 1990's study subjects that their predecessors were exposed to in the Lewis institute" (1994:31).

Together Beecher and Lewis were early proponents of the health and curative benefits of gymnastics, of qualified instruction in the health benefits of and skills in gymnastics, of the inclusion of a program of gymnastics within the educational curriculum at schools and colleges, and of physical activity for girls and women. However, the push for physical education in colleges was tied more specifically to the idea that college might pose undue strain on women's frail nature. Physical education, it was argued, was required to make women fit for the strains associated with intellectual activity. Despite the claims of physicians like E.H. Clarke in the early 1870's that the "demands of higher education would damage a woman's reproductive system, leaving her incapable of performing her womanly duties" (Remley, 1994:47; see also Theberge, 1989), activists and reformers who believed in the benefits of physical activity simply used the ideology of women's physical inferiority to justify women's physical activity (Cahn, 1994:13). Thus, amidst the ideology of women's physical inferiority, and in part
because of it, women's physical education was born.

**Teacher Preparation in Physical Education**

Several factors combined to influence the emergence of the early training schools for physical education: the growth of the public school system after the Civil War, the federal governments support for public institutions of higher learning through the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 (Weston, 1962:31), and later, compulsory public education laws. In addition, and perhaps more important, public awareness and belief in the health benefits of physical activity, and popular interest in games and sports, combined to created a climate of support for the addition of physical education at schools and colleges. With the institutional structure in place, proponents for gymnastics and calisthenics quickly lay claim to an institutional space for the development of their field, and began to lobby for inclusion of physical education in educational curriculums. As physical education was added to curriculums in public and private schools, and at colleges and universities, the need for trained instructors became increasingly apparent.

The inclusion of women at schools for training future teachers in physical education was tied to the growing belief in the benefits of calisthenics and gymnastics and increased acceptance of physical activity for girls and women. In addition, teaching was one of the few occupations open to women in the late nineteenth century. Three avenues for the study of physical education were available to women who aspired to enter this new occupation at the end of the nineteenth century: one could obtain either a certificate or a diploma from a normal school which typically required two years of study; attend a summer school for physical training; or attend one of the few four year institutions which granted a baccalaureate degrees in addition to a certificate in physical education.
(Davenport, 1994:26). These early training schools for physical education instructors have, among other things, one thing in common: their graduates were mostly women.

In 1903 Delphine Hanna (in Weston, 1962:188-191) prepared a status report of early teacher preparation schools in physical education. This report listed all of the normal schools of physical training and summer schools of physical training in existence in the United States at the time, and reveals how important the normal schools were for training future women physical educators. During the 1902-1903 academic year (the date of the study) 275 female students were enrolled at one of the four most popular normal schools compared to just 42 men (see Table 1a). A comparison of the number of male and female graduates of the earliest normal schools reveals that schools with graduating classes in 1903 had mostly female graduates: of the 1,430 graduates 1,051 were women (See Table 1b for a comparison of graduates by sex for four normal schools focused on in this chapter.). The situation at the summer schools was similar. Of the twelve summer schools, nine had mostly women students. In 1903, 567 women were enrolled at summer schools for physical training compared to 247 men (Hanna in Weston, 1962:188-191).

The philosophies and ideals of the founders of these institutions, and the programs they established, laid the foundation for the training of future generations of female physical education instructors and coaches. Their ideals regarding the purpose of physical education, its role in an education a curriculum, and the necessary knowledge and skills required to become a qualified physical education instructor created a set of criteria and established a framework for the profession within which the field in general, and women's physical education in particular, would evolve.

Five of the most influential leaders, and the institutions they founded, are discussed
Table 1a. Selected Normal Schools of Physical Training in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date Est.</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Boston Normal School for Physical Education</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Dio Lewis</td>
<td>*250</td>
<td>(1861-68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>The Sargeant Normal School of Physical Training</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>D.A. Sargeant</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>The New Haven Normal School of Gymnastics</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>E.H. Arnold</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Boston Normal School of Gymnastics</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>A.M. Homans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Department of Normal Physical Education, Newcomb College</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>C. G. Baer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>Harvard Summer School of Physical Education</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>D.A. Sargeant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment for Selected Normal Schools in 1902/1903 42 275

*Sex of enrolled students unavailable.

Table 1b. Selected Normal Schools of Physical Training in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># Graduates</th>
<th># Graduates</th>
<th>Final Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  E</td>
<td>M  E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Normal School for Physical Education</td>
<td><em>250</em></td>
<td><em>80%</em></td>
<td>Closed in 1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1861-1868)</td>
<td>(1861-1868)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sargeant Normal School of Physical Training</td>
<td>- 215</td>
<td>- 172</td>
<td>Affiliated with Boston University in 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Haven Normal School of Gymnastics</td>
<td>6 208</td>
<td>6 156</td>
<td>Affiliated with School University of Bridgeport in 1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Normal School of Gymnastics</td>
<td>7 255</td>
<td>7 155</td>
<td>Affiliated with Wellesley College in 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Normal Physical Education, Newcomb College</td>
<td>- 24</td>
<td>- 10</td>
<td>Became 4 yr. degree program in 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Summer School of Physical Education</td>
<td><em>5,086</em></td>
<td><em>698</em></td>
<td>Closed in 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1887-1932)</td>
<td>(1887-1932)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates of Selected Normal Schools</td>
<td>1 3 702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sex of graduates unavailable.

here in an effort to establish the early philosophies, ideals, and practices of this emerging profession. It is important to note that while four of the six institutions to be discussed were co-educational (only the Sargeant Normal School of Physical Training and the Department of Normal Physical Education a Newcomb College did not have male students in 1903), in the early years the graduates from these schools were mostly women. The leaders and their schools include: Dioclesian Lewis and the Normal Institute for Physical Education established in 1861 (discussed above), Dudley A. Sargeant and the Sargeant School for Physical Education established in 1904, William G. Anderson and the Brooklyn Normal School for Physical Education founded in 1888, Amy Homans and the Boston Normal School for Gymnastics founded in 1889, Clara Gregory Baer and the Newcomb College Physical Education Program established in 1886, and the Harvard Summer School of Physical Education established in 1887.

Dr. Dudley A. Sargeant and the Sargeant School for Physical Education

In 1879 Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, armed with medical degree from Yale, was appointed Assistant Professor of Physical Training and Director of the Hemenway Gymnasium at Harvard University. In 1881 at the request of the Society for the Collegiate Instruction for Women, known then as the Harvard Annex (which later became Radcliffe College in 1893), Sargeant established a private gymnasium to conduct classes in gymnastics for women students. Soon after, he added a program in teacher training. Sargeant's private training school became the Sanatory Gymnasium in 1883, and in 1891 the school took a decided turn in the direction of fulfilling Sargeant's dream of training teachers for newly emerging women's colleges. Upon relocating to Everett Street in 1904 the school assumed the name, Sargeant School for Physical Education (Cottrell, 1994:33).
The motto, "Influenced by all, prejudiced towards none," was soon adopted, expressing Sargeant's openness and the school's inclusion of all the current gymnastics methods. Upon entering the school students were required to undergo a physical diagnosis and received prescriptions for diet and exercise. They took courses in biological sciences, anthropometry, teaching methods, practice instruction, and learned how to teach the most current activities and sports including: basketball, swimming, battle ball, diving, rowing, running, field hockey and dancing (Makechnie, 1979:45; Muzzey, 1931; Sargeant, 1927:201-204; all in Cottrell, 1994:34).

Although his life work had a tremendous impact on women physical education professionals, and his ideas and methods have influenced the foundations of the profession, Sargeant was a somewhat ambivalent advocate of women's gymnastics. While he was considered an authority on the physical and health status of American women, Sargeant was a cautious proponent of women's physical activity. Staying within the bounds proscribed by society, Sargeant's approach to physical exercise for women emphasized moderation and the contribution of physical health to a woman's reproductive duties. However, this moderate view of women's role in society, reflected in articles for Scribner's, Ladies' Home Journal and the New York Times (Cottrell, 1994:33), was tempered by his recognition that motherhood did not keep women of earlier epochs from working hard and long alongside men (Twin, 1978:180).

Sargeant, like many men and women of the era seemed to waver in his stance on women's physical activity. As a result, the moderate side of his approach was only partially absorbed by his most prominent early students who went on to become leaders in the field. Stepping outside their primary duties as mothers, several of Sargeant's early students were advocates for women's physical activity and sports. The included:
Delphine Hanna, Sargeant's most influential student, who went on to become a prominent and influential physical education instructor at Oberlin College; and Harriet Ballentine, a physical education instructor at Vassar College, who introduced field hockey to students at Vassar after learning about it at the Harvard Summer School in 1902, and who promoted the Sargeant system and helped it to spread to other women's colleges.

In as much as Sargeant (and the gymnastics system he advocated) may have appeared to champion the Victorian ideal of womanhood and woman's proper role in society; the school itself did little to insure that woman graduates would learn, much less assume their "proper role in society." Women students were introduced to activities which toed the line of respectability at the time. For example, field hockey, although eventually accepted as a more refined game, was believed to be too rough a game for women and to promote unladylike behavior (Dobbs in Hargreaves, 1993:80). And yet it was part of the Sargeant curriculum as early as 1904. Moreover, if the goal of physical education was to prepare a woman for motherhood, and this is what Sargeant espoused, then those he trained to become future instructors, did little to lend credence to this theory. As Joan Hult explains,

Many women who entered some type of public occupation chose not to marry and thus escaped the exclusive domestic experience which late Victorian values had assigned to females. As many as 10% of all women in the first generation of the group [of women in public vocations] born between 1860-1890 remained single. Statistics indicate that nearly half of the women teachers, and 90% of the women physical educators who ultimately assumed leadership positions in women's athletics were not married during their years of service. Most successful female physical educators in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were celibate [sic], relatively unburdened by domestic chores, and able to channel their energies into teaching and dealing with women's athletics. (Hult, 1985:64-65)

The ideology of woman's proper role was inconsistent with the establishment of an institution whose mission was to train women for public vocations involving physical activity. Thus, although Sargeant asserted that physical education for women should
contribute to their role as mothers; his plan to train women as instructors in physical education revealed the inconsistencies in his beliefs regarding women. Veiled in a cloak of ideology, Sargeant's real feelings regarding women's proper role are revealed in the action he took to provide opportunities for women to engage in the latest games and sports, to train for this new profession, and to establish careers as teachers.

In addition, the Sargeant School for Physical Education was not an elite institution, it was an institution attended by individuals from the middle class (Dr. Sargeants, 1894; 1899-1900; Hanna, 1903; Records, 1902:6-7; all in Cotrell, 1994:35). Thus, the class based underpinnings of Victorian ideology found little support in this more plebeian environment. Moreover, because it was accessible to middle class women, its influence was far reaching. Cottrell explains,

The Sargeant School experienced constant growth from 1881, when one woman completed its course work, to 1929 when average enrollment numbered 400 students. By the 1920's the Sargeant School claimed more than 3,000 graduates, which constituted almost one-third of the trained physical educators in the United States. (1994:35)

While part of the purpose of the Sargeant School for Physical Education was to train women in their proper roles, a bourgeois notion of woman's place; both the curriculum and the middle class nature of the institution suggest that at least in practice, there were limits to which Sargeant actually helped to extend this ideal. Perhaps more importantly, Sargeant made training in physical education available to the masses, thus creating a downward pressure and democratizing influence on the emerging profession.

While Beecher and Lewis emphasized gymnastics for all under the guidance of qualified instructors, Sargeant's physical education school for women did much to put this theme into practice. In 1929 the Sargeant School for Physical Education became part of the School of Education at Boston University and in 1958 was renamed the
Sargeant College of Allied Health Professionals (Cotrell, 1994:35).

Cotrell asserts that Sargeant's approach to physical education can be gleaned from the popular article, "Gymnastics" authored by Thomas Wentworth Higginson and published in the Atlantic Monthly in 1861. This article made an early impact on Sargeant. She asserts,

In this article and in several others, Thomas Higginson articulated themes which Sargeant would return to in his own career: the physical superiority of civilized peoples, the connection between muscles and morals, the need for educators to embrace physical culture, a moderate view on intercollegiate athletics, and concern for the health of females. (1994: 32)

Amy Homans and the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics

While tuition at the Sargeant School for Physical Education made it a middle class institution, Amy Homans Boston Normal School of Gymnastics attracted students from more elite backgrounds. Founded on the Swedish Ling system of gymnastics made popular in America by Baron Nils Posse, the Boston Normal School could not have been started were it not for wealthy philanthropist Mrs. Mary T. Hemenway, the widow of a prominent Boston shipowner (Schwendener, 1942:118).

Mrs. Hemenway agreed to finance a course of instruction in gymnastics for Boston school teachers, taught by Baron Nils Posse, on the condition that the Swedish system be introduced in the Boston public schools on an experimental basis (Weston, 1962:35). These courses, and those that followed, formed the basis for the Boston Normal School for Gymnastics which was established by Hemenway and Homans and endowed by Mrs. Hemenway. In 1889 when the school opened Posse, a graduate of the Royal Gymnastic Central Institute in Stockholm was the only instructor and Homans, a former teacher and principal, was director and chief administrator (Remley, 1994:48). The school became the Department of Hygiene and Physical Education at Wellesley College in 1909.
The curriculum at the Boston Normal School of Gymnastics was on the cutting edge of teacher training. It included courses in the biological and social sciences, theory, the art of teaching, practice teaching, and skills courses in Swedish gymnastics as well as all the popular sports of the day including: tennis, basketball, track and field, and field hockey.

Citing Homans influence on teacher preparation Remley (1994) asserts,

Long before the progressive education movement when sports, games, and dance were added to public school physical education programs, BSNG students learned the skills and strategies of a variety of sports. By 1908, swimming, track and field, hockey, canoeing, fencing, and basketball had been added to the basic drills in Swedish gymnastics. The sole purpose of BSNG education was no longer to train teachers in the Swedish system of gymnastics, but to prepare them for the expanding profession of physical education for women. (Remley, 1994:48)

While Homans had strict standards of decorum for her students, and demanded proper dress and grooming at all times, her expectations reflected her desire to prepare her students for the world they would encounter outside of the BNSG (Spears, 1986). Homans knew her students would meet resistance in the outside world on two accounts: First, they were women pursuing a profession at a time when the home was considered the domain of women. Second, they were venturing into the realm of leisure and physical culture, a male domain. Thus, she demanded the most from them on every measure, from intellectual ability, to physical skills, to proper dress and manners (Remley, 1994:48).

Despite her emphasis on proper manners and dress for young women, Homans was not intent on restricting the physical activity of her students to "proper" levels of exertion. She expected, even demanded her students engage in strenuous physical activity, and placed students on probation if they failed to meet rigorous physical standards (Remley, 1994:48). Despite proof to the contrary, Susan Cahn argues that women physical educators took a "cautious approach" to women's physical activity as a way of "averting
charges of masculinity (1994:8). She explains,

Between 1890 and World War I they gradually articulated an athletic philosophy captured in the word moderation. On the assumption that zealous competition threatened female health and morality, they sought to replace it with moderate competition based on "the smallest amount of exercise which will call out a vigorous response." With this approach physical educators endeavored to protect their own professional interests and shield young women from the supposed moral dangers of uncontrolled masculine games. (1994:23)

The philosophy of "moderation" espoused by women physical educators will be addressed in the next portion of this chapter; however, it is important at this point to take issue with claims that early leaders in the field sought to restrict or limit activity for women. While there was clearly a transformation in approach among women physical educators at the turn of the century when women established separate rules for women's games and established the early governing organizations; it is important to point out that the assertion that they sought "moderation" is both too general a characterization, and does not fully capture the ideals, beliefs, or practices of the earliest women leaders.

In addition, the motive for this approach is characterized by Cahn as a mixture of turf battle, class interest, and reaction against charges of masculinity. While all of these may have influenced the evolution of the distinctly female approach to games and sports; Cahn's analysis of the motives underlying the female physical educator's approach misses the fact that the women who shaped women's physical education and women's sports were educators; their interests and aims reflect those of educators. Women physical educators' efforts to extend women's rights in the area of physical activity may have been couched in the rhetoric of moderation; but to see this as the essence of their approach is a misinterpretation. For many, the rhetoric of moderation was simply an adaptation to the demands of Victorian culture and patriarchal society, the sine qua non
for acceptance as "women." Here Cahn concurs,

The tension between sport and femininity led, paradoxically, to educators' insistence on women's equal right to sport and on inherent differences between female and male athletes. Balancing claims of equality and difference, physical educators articulated a woman-centered philosophy of sport that proposed "moderation" as the watchword of women's physical activity. Moderation provided the critical point of difference between women's and men's sport, a preventive against the masculine effects of sport. It was this philosophy with its calculated effort to resolve the issue of "mannishness," which guided the early years of twentieth-century athletics. (1994:8-9)

Charges of masculinity were most vehement after the turn of the century, well after Homan's Normal School had been established. And while educators may have found the charges of "mannishness" problematical, to assert that reactions to this shaped their approach is to misunderstand, or perhaps miss entirely, the meaning, as educators, they attached to sport and games. In other words, women physical educators were not simply women, they were educators, and their efforts to shape the world of women's sport reflects the interests of educators. Moreover, their approach to sports and games for women should be understood not only from the standpoint of women in sport; but from sport itself, and their beliefs regarding the value of sport and its impact on participants.

Homan's students filled positions at colleges and universities throughout the country. True to her plan, her students became leaders in the field and included individuals like Senda Berenson, the director of physical training at Smith College, the editor of the first official women's Basketball rules in 1901; Mabel Lee, Professor of Physical Education at the University of Nebraska and an outspoken proponent of the amateur approach to women's athletics; Ethel Perrin, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation, and the head of the Department of Physical Education for the Detroit Public Schools.
William G. Anderson and the Brooklyn Normal School

The Brooklyn Normal School founded by William G. Anderson in 1886 created yet another avenue for teacher education. It was the fourth Normal School established exclusively to prepare teachers in physical education instruction (Schwendener, 1942:114). Anderson earned his M.D. degree from Cleveland Medical College in Ohio and after a short period of teaching physical education at Adelphi Academy organized the Brooklyn Normal School (BNS).

Anderson was himself an accomplished gymnast and his school reflected his interest in creating a curriculum which included a variety of exercises, movements, and sports. He was a proponent for women's physical activity, and although the Brooklyn Normal School was co-educational, the majority of graduates during its early tenure in Brooklyn were women (Ray in Carpenter, 1994:41). In as much as Anderson was a proponent for physical activity for women, he was an even more ardent advocate of the need for qualified and proficient teachers in physical education.

Anderson's early writing makes clear that he felt strongly good athletes do not necessarily make good teachers. This early distinction made by Anderson (and others) between proficiency in gymnastics and proficiency in teaching reveals his intention to ground physical education in the teaching profession. Moreover, it helped set the boundaries for inclusion in and exclusion from this newly emerging field, set in place standards for teacher education, and reinforced the need for teacher preparation.

While Anderson believed strongly in the need for teacher preparation, he had a far more catholic approach to physical activity itself. Linda Jean Carpenter asserts that part of Anderson's legacy is the acknowledgement that one form of activity is not privileged over another, that all forms of physical activity are legitimate. She asserts,
"Anderson found joy in movement. That joy knew no artificial boundaries of team sport, dance, gymnastics, individual sport, aquatics, or lifetime activities. The development of grace, strength, confidence, health, rhythmic awareness, vigor, or endurance is not determined so much by the form of exercise as by the fact we exercise" (1994:42).

The Brooklyn Normal School moved with Anderson to Yale University in 1892 and became the Anderson Normal School. Through the Anderson school Yale students could pursue courses leading to teacher preparation in physical education, receiving instruction in dance, the various gymnastics systems, and student teaching. In 1901 a new director was named and the school took a new name, the New Haven Normal School of Gymnastics; in 1903 it was renamed again when Anderson sold his interest in the school to Ernst Arnold. The Arnold College of Hygiene and Physical Education became a four year degree granting institution and eventually merged with the University of Bridgeport in the late 1940's (Carpenter, 1994:42).

While the Brooklyn Normal School became the embodiment of Anderson's approach to physical education, he is most noted for another contribution. The founding of a national association for physical education professionals. Anderson's early teaching experiences, and his desire to offer his students the best in the way of instruction, lead him to realize the need for a unified voice among physical educators. Thus he set out to organize the first meeting of leaders in the field on November 27, 1885 at Adelphi Academy. As a result of this meeting a permanent organization was formed and named, the Association for the Advancement of Physical Culture, later known as the American Association for the Advancement of Physical Education. Dr. Edward Hitchcock of Amherst College was named the first president, and three vice presidents were selected: Dr. Dudley A, Sargeant, then Director of Hemenway Gymnasium at Harvard, Helen C, Putnam, Director...
of the Gymnasium at Vassar College; and the Reverend P. Thwing. Anderson was elected secretary and T.D. Andrews of the Brooklyn YMCA was elected treasurer (Weston, 1972: 36).

Early members of the organization came from a variety of backgrounds and professions, and women were well represented as leaders and in the membership. Among the first charter members of the organization there were, "three practicing physicians, two ministers, an anthropologist, eleven college teachers, thirteen academy and seminary teachers, six YMCA directors, and an apparatus manufacturer (Weston, 1962:37).

Although Anderson was not involved in the Association after 1892, it was his foresight, initiative, and creative energy which lead to the founding of the organization which remains the leading association for physical education professionals in the United States. From its inception the association reflected a belief in physical education for women. Three out of five of the first officers for the association, Sargeant, Putnam, and Anderson were directing normal schools whose students were mostly women.

**Clara Gregory Baer and the Newcomb College Physical Education Program**

While women in the Northeast could choose from among the Sargeant School, the Brooklyn Normal School, and the Boston Normal School for Gymnastics, those in the South had far less choice. One school however, did offer a certification program for teachers of physical education in 1893-94, H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College in Louisiana. Under the direction of Clara Gregory Baer the Newcomb College Physical Education Program grew into a four year degree granting program in 1907. Clara Baer and her Newcomb College teacher preparation program were influential throughout the
South. Baer recognized the increasing popularity of physical activity, and growing acceptance of the benefits of physical education. Moreover, she recognized that as physical education became an accepted part of the school curriculum, there would be a need for qualified and competent instructors. Like early pioneers before her, Baer insured the spread of physical education by contemporaneously influencing legislation which made gymnastics a required course in the public schools and founding a school to prepare teachers to teach the newly required courses.

Through initiative and advocacy Baer made an indelible mark on physical education in the South. Joan Paul credits Newcomb College and Baer with the following:

1. The passage of state legislation in 1894 requiring physical education in the public schools of Louisiana (first in the South and second in the nation).
2. Development of a game called Newcomb Ball in 1894, accompanied by published rules in 1895.
3. The first written rules for women's basketball published six years prior to the "official" Spalding rules of 1901.

The curriculum for teacher preparation at Newcomb College evolved over the years. The very first students were taught the Swedish gymnastics system, anatomy and physiology, chemistry and the principles of the Delsarte philosophy of expression, in later years courses in medical gymnastics and psychology were added. The first students to earn a four year bachelor's degree took courses in biology and advanced biology, anatomy, Posse's Special kinesiology of Educational Gymnastics, chemistry, supervision of games, medical gymnastics, history of gymnastics, hygiene, general kinesiology, psychology, and practice teaching (Paul, 1994:55).

A proponent for women's sports, Baer provided her students with a full array of sport opportunities. In 1893 Newcomb students played basketball as well as most of the other popular sports known at the time. They formed the Newcomb Athletic Association.
in 1908, and organized field days beginning in 1914 (Paul, 1994:56). Despite its early impact, declining numbers lead to the decision to stop granting degrees in physical education in 1925.

The Harvard Summer School of Physical Education

Throughout the 1880's and into the 1890's Normal Schools for teacher preparation in physical education continued to emerge (Hanna in Weston, 1962). However, these schools met only the needs of those individuals who had the could afford and had the time to be full-time students. Sensing the need for a program of instruction for teachers already working in the field, Dudley Allen Sargeant established the Harvard Summer School of Physical Education in 1887. More than 75% of the programs participants were practitioners in physical education or education, and many were leaders at colleges, universities and public schools throughout the country (Lupcho, 1994:45).

Although the summer school was popular among male students, especially non-physical educators interested in coaching after school sports, two thirds of the students who attended the Harvard Summer School were women. Through these graduates the Sargeant System and Sargeant's ideas were carried to women's colleges including Vassar, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr (Lupcho, 1994:44).

The curriculum at the Harvard Summer School reflected Sargeant's belief that physical education as a discipline should be grounded in a body of theoretical knowledge, and that teachers should acquire this knowledge before pursuing a teaching career. The curriculum included anatomy, kinesiology, physiology, exercise physiology, history, philosophy, and educational theory. In addition, students received instruction in the latest trends in exercise, sport, and movement. Track and field instruction for women
was introduced in 1896, and field hockey in 1901. True to his ideal of inclusion, students at the Summer School learned all of the leading gymnastics methods.

In 1899 students were offered courses in Swedish and German gymnastics, along with courses in free movements, fencing, military drill, school exercises, aesthetic dance, and games. By 1910, practical work was expanded to fencing, clubs, Swedish tumbling, calisthenics, marching tactics, wands, dumbbells, apparatus, dancing, football, voice training, athletics for women, boxing, wrestling, games, field hockey, tennis, track and field, fancy steps, and ball work. (Van Wyck in Lupcho, 1994:43)

Sargeant's relationship with Harvard enabled him to procure the talents of the national and international leaders in the field of medicine to teach courses and give lectures at the Summer School (Van Wyck in Lupcho, 1994). Thus, the Harvard Summer School was more then a school for individuals seeking certification because it attracted leaders in the field from around the country and abroad. It was a place where educators and advocates exchanged ideas, discussed methodology, and generated enthusiasm for the future of the profession.

In 1889 the Summer School offered a certificate in physical education to students who completed two summers of course work. In 1902 the requirement for a full certificate was raised to four summers of study. Throughout its thirty year history the Summer School continued to grow from a class size of 57 students in 1887, to 200 in 1919 when Sargeant retired as director. From its inception in 1887 until its closing in 1932, the Harvard Summer School of Physical Education was the most important and influential program of its kind. The significance of this school for later generations is described by Schwendener who asserts, "As long as the school endured it was vital in influence to both men and women. Many of the outstanding physical education proponents of the present owe at least some part of their inspiration and preparation to this school" (1942:94).
Summary

The foundation for the profession of physical education was laid in the 1880's. The national organization was founded by Anderson in 1885 and the most important conference of the century was convened in 1889. During this period the first enduring Normal Schools for training women in physical education were founded. These schools were important not only because they trained the women who went on to become the first teachers and leaders in this newly emerging profession, but because they carved out a space, a niche, for an approach to physical activity for girls and women. This approach to physical activity and sport for women, and to the training of physical educators, would be subject to change in ensuing years. However, the core elements of this approach, those set in place by Beecher, Lewis, Sargeant, Homans, Anderson, and Baer, would continue to be reflected in curriculums, methods, and philosophies of teacher preparation programs for physical educators throughout the twentieth century.

What were those elements? It is clear that this brief exposition can not substitute for a more in-depth analysis of the ideals and philosophies of these individuals, the impetus behind their actions, or the complex motives which influenced the founding of these institutions. However, there are several underlying themes which reveal that for the most part, they spoke with a unified voice. As proponents for physical activity these individuals agreed on these points:

1. A belief in the benefits of and support for physical activity for girls and women.
2. A democratic and inclusive approach to physical activity.
3. A belief that schools and colleges should include programs of physical education.
4. A belief that women should and could be instructors in physical education.
5. A belief that women should be exposed to the latest sports and games and engage in vigorous activity.
6. A belief that women should conduct themselves in a manner which would command respect from those who might question their activities.

Whether by design, or as an unintended consequence, women, more than men, filled...
the classrooms and gymnasiums of the early Normal Schools. The women who attended these schools would become the first generation of professionals in this newly emerging occupation; they would become the leaders for the next generation. More importantly, they would carry the ideals and beliefs about the value of physical education and its place in higher education, established by the founders of these institutions, to a new generation of students and a new era of physical activity. The early female educators were in essence, social "carriers" of the ethos established by the founders of the profession. This ethos would soon become associated with women's physical education and sport as governing organizations run for and by women physical educators slowly emerged, making the sphere of women's collegiate athletics more distinct, and the line between men's and women's athletics more salient.
In this section of Chapter III the emergence of games and sports in higher education is explored. Here the historical roots of the notion that sport is educational is uncovered, as is the relationship between this ideal and women's physical education and sports. Moreover, this section makes clear that the governing structure for women's athletics which emerged at the turn of the 20th century embodied this educational approach, and that this is the context within which women's coaching emerged.

Unlike men whose collegiate sports grew up as extracurricular activities (Smith, 1988), outside the formal curriculum; women's collegiate sports and games emerged from within physical education. Women learned sports and games and had opportunities to participate in them primarily through physical education classes (Paul, 1993). Moreover, sport participation by women in higher education was shaped by the interests and values of physical education professionals, first by both men and women, and later more exclusively by women physical educators. It is in this context that coaching as an occupation for women slowly evolved.

Coaching as a profession developed along side the growth and changes in women's sport. Because intercollegiate competition was relatively limited in the early years of collegiate sport for women, and because women physical educators espoused a more democratic approach to games and play, early women coaches differed from their male counterparts. The first women coaches were, first and foremost, teachers of games and sports. They were also, "tutors who prepare students" (Webster's Dictionary, 1988).

With the growing interest in intramural competition, women physical educators became organizers, schedulers, and presiders overseeing their female students in the
growing number of Women's Athletics Associations (WAA's) (Cahn, 1994; Gerber, 1974). Because they believed that sport was an avenue for developing leadership skills, and that this was a goal consistent with their educational focus, women physical education instructors advocated allowing students to assume a large proportion of the responsibility for organizing and running games and contests (Frymir, 1930:249). The "coach" served as an important guide whose "influence, advice, and tactful supervision are needed at all times if the student leadership organization method is to function ideally" (Frymer, 1930:248-249). As extramural sports grew more acceptable, coaches became the organizers and presiders over team competitions at Play Days and later Sport Days, again handing a good deal of the responsibility to student leaders.

Throughout the early years of women's collegiate sport, women educators were cautious in their support of "coaching," sanctioning certain forms and rejecting others. Coaching elite level athletes in intercollegiate varsity competition was often disapproved of because it was associated with men's athletics, professionalism and commercialism. It was frowned on because it focused attention on the gifted few at the expense of the many, and often changed the focus in sport from "play for play sake" to a focus on winning. Women physical educators feared that varsity competition would lead coaches to lose sight of their educational goals and the overall welfare of all student-athletes. In the 1930's women physical educators banned the coaching of teams at Sports Days.

Physical educators were consistent in their belief that the "coach" was an educator first and foremost, and most believed that the most desirable setting for coaching was the intramural athletic program. And, they were very clear that the coach should teach sportsmanship. In her chapter titled, "The Coach: Social Ideals" Alice W. Frymir
(1930) explains,

Good sportsmanship is a moral quality like honesty, truthfulness, loyalty, cooperation, all of which it in fact includes, and is in no way biologically inheritable. In the beginning it can be induced only through a definite program of education, combined with willful practice...The coach has a greater influence on the development of sportsmanship than perhaps any other person with whom the player comes in contact...The development of these character traits in the players is partially obtained by the example of the coach in setting a high standard of conduct. (1930:30-31)

Frymir goes on to say,

The coach should ever be mindful that the joy of playing should be the goal and ultimate reward of the players. Winning the game is desirable and commendable, but should not be held paramount. Players should be selected who are good sportswomen. (1930:33-34)

Throughout the 1940's and into the 1950's as Play Days lost prominence and the most popular form of intercollegiate competition became the Sports Day, coaches remained mostly organizers and presiders. At the same time students and younger physical educators grew more ardent in their support for varsity team competition. As a result there was slow but growing acceptance of intercollegiate competition between varsity teams in the late 1950's and 1960's. This lead to a concern for the development of qualified coaches who would have charge over the physical and emotional preparation of student athletes. As a result, "coaching" grew more acceptable; and the roles and duties of the "coach" became more well-defined and took on new importance.

Jay Coakley (1994) asserts that the purpose of coaching and the goal of the coach is to prepare athletes for competition, and that it is this that differentiates the coach from the physical educator. He also asserts that the underlying values of this new profession were shaped by the growth of organized competitive sports rather than by the field of physical education, and that the profession of coaching grew out of a commitment to competitive success (1994:90). But this definition reflects the history of men's athletics and the emergence of the professional male coach, an occupation which
developed, in part, outside of the educational realm. From the standpoint of the history of women's athletics, the female coach was a teacher and educator first, and the two cannot be differentiated. As sports and games were introduced the female physical education instructor became a teacher of skills and strategies, and organized first intramural and later extramural contests, or presided over students who did so. She was in fact a coach, but a coach whose approach reflected the educational ideals and interests of women physical educators. She saw sport as a vehicle for promoting health and well being and for teaching cooperation, put the interest of individual students above the outcome of the contest, and was more interested in the intrinsic and educational benefits of play for players than in pleasing a crowd of spectators or in gaining notoriety for herself or her institution.

**Early Sports and Games at Women's Colleges**

The transformation from gymnastics to sports and games was most prominent between 1900 and the first world war. However, many Eastern and Midwestern colleges and universities had some type of sports for women in 1885; "golf, tennis, crew and swimming were well established sports for college women by 1900" (Hult, 1986:64). In 1892 women college students at Smith played the first game of collegiate basketball; shortly thereafter, in 1896, the first collegiate varsity game took place between Stanford University and the University of California.

Even while gymnastics dominated most physical education curriculums in the late 1800's, there was early support for sport at women's colleges. This support was influenced by two pioneers in higher education for women: Mathew Vassar, founder of Vassar College and Henry Fowle Durrant, founder of Wellesley College. Both men
challenged the popular opinion among medical experts of the day that women were not fit for college; moreover, both believed that exercise and sports would contribute to physical health, making women more fit for college life. They also believed that physical health would contribute to intellectual growth and thus included physical education in their early curriculums. Mathew Vassar argued that, "Good health is essential to the successful prosecution of study and to the vigorous development of either the mental or moral powers." (Quoted in Spears, 1983:133), and in 1861 Vassar built a Calesthenium and established a School of Physical Training. Upon opening its doors in 1865 Vassar College had among its faculty a Professor of Physiology and Hygiene, and in 1877 sports were included in the physical education curriculum.

Like Vassar, Henry Fowle Durant believed that women could withstand the rigors of college life, and would thrive if given the opportunity. Believing in the benefits of exercise and sport, Durant required his female students to take exercise classes and provided equipment for students to experience the joys of rowing, skating, and tennis. From the beginning in 1874, Wellesley College students were required to take classes in exercise and sport; throughout the late 19th century and into the twentieth sports were increasingly substituted for gymnastics in the curriculum (Gerber et al., 1974:52).

Vassar and Durant's inclusion of exercise and sports as part of the curriculum in higher education set a standard which would soon be followed by other colleges and universities. Archery, fencing, rowing, crew, cycling, track and field, and bowling were all introduced in the 19th century, and by 1890 fourteen different sports were being offered to women at institutions of higher learning (Gerber, 1974:51-52).

The inclusion of sports for women at women's colleges and at other institutions for higher learning was both a reflection of the growing popularity of sport in American
culture in the late nineteenth century, and the belief among certain influential leaders in medicine and education in the health benefits of exercise and sport. However, access to sports was available mostly to women who attended the prestigious women's institutions. At the turn of the century, the development of a "new physical education" focusing on sports and games, introduced by Dr. Thomas D. Wood, Clark Heatherington and Luther Halsey Gulick, insured that women attending less bourgeois institutions would have more access to basketball, volleyball, field hockey and other popular sports.

**Sports and Games: The New Physical Education**

By the turn of the century it was clear that physical education was in fact a profession in its own right and that there was growing need for physical education instructors. It was also clear that while there was growing interest in physical activity, sports and games were gaining in popularity over gymnastics and calisthenics. The introduction of sports and games in physical education is credited to three men: Dr. Thomas D. Wood, the first director of the Department of Physical Education at the University of Stanford, Luther Halsey Gulick, an instructor and eventually the head of physical education at the International Young Mens' Christian Association at Springfield, Massachusetts, and Clark W. Heatherington an assistant of Wood's at Stanford. These three men helped change the focus in physical education from formal gymnastics and physical training, to a natural program of physical education based on sports, games, and outdoor activities. Physical training, once seen as an end in itself became a means to pursue other educational goals. During this period the relationship between physical movement and education became inextricably linked; physical training which was once thought of as "education of the physical," came to be viewed as a means to an end.
Physical education, as it soon became known, was, according to its proponents, an avenue for educating the individual physically, morally, and socially. No longer simply "education of the physical"; physical education professionals took as their slogan, "education through the physical" (Schwendener, 1942:132). From this point of view, physical education would contribute not only to the health and well being of students, but to their education overall; and most importantly, to their education as citizens in a democratic society.

Thomas Wood developed a program of "natural gymnastics" based on sports, games and outdoor activities. The focus of his approach was the individual needs, age and interests of the students involved. Clark Heatherington shared Wood's interest and enthusiasm for games and sport. Like Wood he believed in the educational value of sports and games and advocated for physical education programs which reflected American needs and interests. Consistent with the educational philosophers of his day, particularly John Dewey, Heatherington believed that physical education should teach children the values of democratic citizenship, and should therefore focus on a uniquely American approach to physical activity (Schwendener, 1942).

Upon graduation from Oberlin College, Luther Halsey Gulick began work for the International Young Men's Christian Association in Springfield, MA. Gulick's approach to sport and games reflects both his training at Oberlin and the Y's religious foundations. Steven Reiss explains,

Unlike early Y leaders, Gulick advocated sport in Y programs, although he opposed intense competition, specialization and professionalism. Gulick played a key role in replacing gymnastics with sport as the cornerstone of YMCA athletic programs, and his students invented such new sports as basketball (1891) and volleyball (1895) that could be played in small indoor spaces...Instead of emphasizing competition and victory, the new YMCA philosophy encouraged a comprehensive program of athletics for the greatest number of participants. (1991:158)
Through his association with the YMCA, and through his leadership as director of physical training for the New York City public school system, Gulick promoted "natural gymnastics" and games and sports. During his tenure at the International School, Gulick helped transform the focus of physical activity from muscular Christianity (based in the German system of gymnastics) to a biological theory of play which stressed the innate play instincts (Reiss, 1990:158). Like Heatherington, Gulick believed in the educational value of sport and games, especially social values like cooperation, loyalty, respect for authority, and self control.

Together, Wood, Heatherington, and Gulick helped to transform the focus in physical education from gymnastics and calisthenics to sports and games. In the process they also developed a philosophy which justified the inclusion of sports and games in physical educational curriculums; thereby insuring an alignment between sport and education in American society. The meaning of physical training was transformed from an activity for educating the body, to an activity through which education occurred. Physical education, it was argued, would train individuals in skill, values and knowledge which could be used in everyday life. It was a vehicle for educating children and adults in, among other things, democratic citizenship, American values, and the American way of life. The leading doctrine of the day was that, "physical education possessed inherent educational values capable of transforming the mental, physical, emotional and social qualities of an individual to approach more closely the ideal of an educated man" (Weston, 1972:52).

Women physical educators embraced the educational approach of the "new physical education," but it is not clear they fully accepted Gulick's biological theory of play which extended Victorian ideas about gender appropriate physical activity. Gulick
recommended, "girls play be directed toward areas that would help them learn how to manage a home, but not towards competitive athletics" (Radar in Reiss, 1989:155).

While Gulick's approach to games and sport and his interest in ethics and sportsmanship was consistent with the philosophical approach of early women physical educators, his advice against competitive games for women appears to have been ignored as women physical educators eagerly introduced competitive sports and games into their curriculums. Basket Ball, a game invented by a student of Gulick's at Springfield College in the fall of 1891 was appealing to women from the start. As Bell explains, "Within two weeks after the first game at Springfield College, a group of young women teachers from a nearby school asked to play" (1973:1). The first game for women was played at Smith College in 1892, less than one year after it was invented (Hult, 1986:65).

The Beginning of a Female Model of Sport: The Vision of Female Educator's

The growth of sports for women from the late 1800's until the early 1960's was accompanied by changing concepts of competition among women physical educators. These interpretations of the value and impact of sports competition for women can be grouped into three distinct periods. In general and despite a small bastion of ardent supporters, the earliest period, between 1870's and 1900, is best characterized by "informal and cautious disapproval" of interscholastic and intercollegiate sport because it was deemed by many to promote unwomanly behavior. Instead they supported a broad based program of instruction in sports and games and intramural competition in an effort to insure all participants would reap the benefits of sport participation. Despite widespread disapproval, intercollegiate competition took place at a growing number of colleges and universities until the early 1920's when opposition to varsity competition
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became more vocal.

In the second period, between 1920-1940 women physical educators formalized their vision of broad based participation and appropriate sports for girls and women through the establishment of rules and governing organizations. In this period intercollegiate and varsity competition were deemed incompatible with the goals of physical education and the overall welfare of female students. The feeling among educators was that travel to other schools would take time away from a student's academic pursuits, and that varsity team competition focused too much energy and attention on elite athletes at the expense of the less gifted player. Instead women physical educators promoted and organized Play Days, Telegraphic Meets, and Sports Days as an alternative to varsity intercollegiate competition. Again, the focus was on broad participation and the intrinsic value of sport participation. This vision began to change between 1940 and 1950 and lead the way to the third and final period, between 1950 and 1970, characterized by adaptation to the growing interest in intercollegiate competition and a new recognition of the value of intercollegiate sports for women (Gerber, 1974:68-69; Hult, 1994).

As sports for women emerged in institutions for higher learning in the late 1870's and into the 1900's, the first leaders in women's physical education, among them Senda Berenson, H. Sophie Newcomb, and Amy Homans stood as spokesmen for women's physical education and sport. Their ideas about why and how women should participate in sport were reflected in their writing, teaching, and in their administrative decisions. As leaders in their field they shaped the early years of women's sport in their own image and in the interests of women physical educators. Their ideas reflect an interesting blend of sentiments, at times paradoxical, but consistent with the period and their
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position as women leaders with an interest in the welfare of women. While it is beyond this project to attempt to ascertain the exact genesis of these sentiments, one thing is clear; they are rooted in a complex and integrated set of beliefs about the value of sport, the nature of women, and the role of physical education.

Senda Berenson's ideas are explored here in an effort to show that her efforts to influence women's sport are consistent with her role as an educator. The discussion which follows shows that Berenson believed that sport, as part of physical education, should contribute to the physical, social, and emotional education of students. In looking at one of Berenson's early publications, themes touched on in the first part of Chapter III are further explored.

Several studies (Cahn, 1994; Gerber, 1974; Hargreaves, 1993a) have described the influence of early physical educators as a reflection of their class based interests and Victorian ideology. In essence they argue that women physical educators accepted the ideology of women's proper role and insured that female college students who participated in sport would be properly socialized regarding gender appropriate behavior in and around sport. In addition, Cahn (1994) argues that women physical educator's motivation to control women's sports was rooted in a quest for professional power and authority, and that making decisions in their own interests they inhibited the growth of women's athletics.

While it is clear that Victorian ideology shaped the early years of women's collegiate athletics, and that women physical educators fought for and gained substantial influence over the emerging shape of women's sport, the struggle by physical educators to define and control women's collegiate athletics was not only a reflection of class based and professional interests of women physical educators; but a more genuine interest in the
welfare of young women and in preserving the intrinsic and educational value of sports and games. The effort by physical educators to shape the nature of collegiate athletics was very much a struggle by a small yet influential group of women to establish their view as the "norm." However, it is argued here that these women were motivated by more than class and professional interests or Victorian ideology.

Ideologies are tools used by the powerful to insure the oppression of the powerless; to argue that the women physical educators were uncritical supporters of Victorian ideology is to assert that as women they colluded in their own oppression, never recognizing it as such. In addition, as a class based analysis, the idea that women physical educators supported Victorian ideology because it was a reflection of bourgeois notions of womanhood, is to argue that they had a sense of their shared interests as members of the upper class, and that this class consciousness was not only shared but more salient than other bases of identity, including their identity as educators. To overlook the fact that they were educators is to miss much of the underlying meaning of the female model of sport and the motivations of women physical educators.

An early paper by Senda Berenson, "The Significance of Basket Ball for Women," written in 1903, makes clear the general feeling among physical educators of the day. In it, the rhetoric of Victorian ideology stands out, but a closer analysis reveals that Berenson’s "appeal" is a call to preserve the "spirit of play." There is also a decidedly moral theme throughout; sport, and team sports in particular are seen as vehicles for teaching cooperation, community, fair play, and inclusiveness. Far from attempting to limit participation by women, Berenson sought to promote it, but she believed that sport should be played in a way which would allow all involved to derive the most benefit from it. Berenson asserts,
I have no sympathy with narrow minded people who see no good in athletics because of the few objectionable features in them. I would not be understood as believing that hard, earnest play is objectionable. Just such playing is the best to bring out manliness and fearlessness in youth. But it is because I believe that competitive games are such tremendous forces for good as well as for evil that I would have those elements in them encouraged which bring out the love of honor, courage and fair play, and eliminate those which encourage the taking advantage of laws, cruelty, brutality, and unfairness. (Berenson, 1903:33)

While Berenson makes reference to proper behavior for women, and the need to avoid "unwomanly things," her notion of separate spheres and natures is not intended to imply a limit to sport or sport competition. Rather, Berenson’s vision of sport for women is that it should be vigorous and physically challenging and that the athleticism required for excellence include physical control. Unbridled roughness and aggression is clearly outside the boundaries of what Berenson has in mind for women; however, this approach appears to be motivated as much by an interest in team play and cooperation, and a distaste for individualism as it does by Victorian ideals about proper behavior for women.

Much has been made of Berenson’s disdain for "rough and vicious play" and her development of modified rules which, it is believed, restricted and inhibited women’s athleticism. First and foremost it should be noted that basketball was never intended to be a rough game, quite the opposite. Dr. James Naismith, the inventor of basketball, intentionally placed the baskets above the heads of players so as to avoid the rough play inherent in soccer and football. Moreover, Luther Halsey Gulick, Naismith’s teacher was also disdainful of "rough and vicious" play and a win-at-all-cost attitude in basketball, and attempted to contain it through his development of a code of conduct for amateur sports known as the Clean Sport Role written in 1896. The Clean Sport Role was designed to reinforce the intrinsic value of athletic competition, and to promote sportsmanlike conduct; it was an effort to ward off the professionalism encroaching on amateur
athletics and the ethical problems associated with it. Shortly after publication it was adopted by colleges and athletic clubs across the country.

Berenson’s comments regarding “rough and vicious play” are often taken out of context and fail to take into consideration her perspective as an educator. Berenson exclaims, “The great danger lies in the fact that rough and unfair play, the results at first of impulse and carelessness, become strong forces in vitiating the characters of the players by developing another standard of morals for athletics than the one held for conduct in life” (1903:31). The problem with “rough and unfair play” is not so much that it entails physical exertion and is unladylike but that it is incompatible with the educational goals of physical educators. From the perspective of physical educators, sport that is “rough and unfair” teaches individuals to be “rough and unfair” in everyday life.

As this quote makes clear, far from wanting to limit physical exertion, Berenson promoted it.

One who supposes it is a simple or weak game would be surprised to see the dash and vigor with which it is entered into...The amount of physical strength and endurance which is cultivated is readily apparent...True there is no slugging or exhibition of roughness, but the play is extremely vigorous and spirited, and is characterized by a whirl and dash which is surprising to the uninitiated. (1903:45)

While the physical educators of the late 19th and early twentieth century did, for the most part, accept the medical profession’s guidance, advice and authority as truth, they also saw themselves as authorities on appropriate activities for young women (Hult, 1994:85). Thus, Berenson is interested not only in insuring women engage in “appropriate activities” (the medical professions interpretation of gender appropriate activity for women steeped in the Victorian ideology of the period), but in insuring that the game of basketball be an avenue for promoting democratic values. From this point of
view, basket ball as a game for women (and men) should contribute to education in a
democratic society, and teach values such as: self reliance and self control, cooperation,
fair play, democracy, and community as opposed to "cruelty, brutality and unfairness"
(1903:33).

Berenson's interest in promoting cooperation over individualism is further
illustrated in the following comment "...the selfish display of a star by dribbling and
playing the entire court, and rough housing by snatching the ball could not be tolerated"
in Hult, 1994:86). Her promotion of the "modified" court for women was motivated by
an effort to encourage teamwork and cooperation, social goals within the purview of
physical education; not an endorsement for the belief that women are too frail and weak
to travel the length of the court. Moreover, it is a fact of history that the three court
women's game was not designed to limit physical activity, but occurred by chance, and
was later interpreted in light of the Victorian ideology of the period. Mary Bell (1973)
explains that Clara Bear of Newcomb College interpreted the dotted lines on a 1893
diagram of rules to imply restraining lines; when in fact they were intended as a guide
for player positioning. Consequently, until 1938 women's basketball would be played
with six players: two guards, two forwards and two centers, each restricted to a specific
area of the court; and not until 1971 would the five player full court game be adopted
(Various styles and formation were in existence throughout the country up until this
time).

Finally, Berenson is writing in part out of a reaction to growing problems associated
with competition and commercialism in men's athletics. She asserts,

In competitive games one of two strong forces must become all important. One will
either abandon one's self to instinct and impulse in the quickness of action and intense
desire for victory, and hence develop rough and vicious play; or, eliminating brute
and unfair play, one's powers are put into developing expert playing, quickness of
judgement and action, and physical and moral self control....Much of the element of rough play in games comes more from excitement and the desire to win at all and any cost than from inborn viciousness of character. Many players are ashamed of their conduct in games in their calmer moments. That is as it should be. (Berenson, 1903:31)

While elements of Berenson's paper appear to reinforce the ideology of women's proper role, much of it asserts the exact opposite. Claiming that "women's sphere of usefulness is constantly widening" and that women are proving themselves equal to men in a variety of occupations, Berenson asserts that a woman, "needs more than ever the physical strength to meet these ever increasing demands. And not only does she need a strong physique but physical and moral courage as well" (1903:33). She also claims, "Games are invaluable for women in that they bring out as nothing else, just these elements that women find necessary today in their enlarged fields of activity...It develops physical and moral courage, self-reliance and self-control and the ability to meet success and defeat with dignity" (1903:35). Moreover, as if to mock those sports which inhibit and exploit women Berenson asserts that, "Certain elements of false education for centuries have made women self-conscious. She is becoming less so, but one finds women posing in tennis and golf. It is impossible to pose in basketball. The game is too quick, too vigorous, the action too continuous to allow any element to enter which is foreign to it" (1903:35).

As sports for women were added to physical education curriculums, concern over problems associated with men's athletics escalated. In 1905 the problems associated with college football shocked the nation, and prominent politicians and writers, including President Theodore Roosevelt, called for reform (Smith, 1988: 191-192). Alexander Meiklejohn the dean of Brown University exclaimed, "its influence for evil is becoming so apparent in the forms of unfairness, untruthfulness, and brutality as to threaten the most vital interest of the college training" (Quoted in Smith, 1988:191).
As Ron Smith explains, men's collegiate sport was destined for problems.

Intercollegiate sport, after that first meet grew up with the emerging industrial America. Colleges and their sports took on many of the features of the larger America and its capitalistic rush for wealth, power, recognition, and influence. In the years between 1852 and the initial meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1905, the basis for the highly commercial and professional sports in colleges was established. (1988:4)

In light of the increasing criticism of men's athletics, women educators sought to protect women's sports from the vices associated with elite competition, the quest for victories, and increasing professionalism. Although they were but one constituency speaking out against the ethical problems associated with the increasingly commercial nature of men's athletics, they were among the most vocal; and over time their protests would prove to be the most sustained.

It is clear that as sports for women became increasingly popular, women physical educators set out to influence the shape of women's intercollegiate athletics and to protect it from the vices which grew from the increasingly professional aspects of men's collegiate sport. However, they were not so much against increased competition for women as they were against anything which might divert women's collegiate sport from its educational purposes and intrinsic values, towards professionalism and commercialism. They sought to protect their democratic ideals and to insure that all women, regardless of skill, would have the opportunity to engage in and benefit from sport activity. In this, and in the ways mentioned above they remained true to the philosophies and principles of the founders of their field.

While women physical educators were instrumental in establishing the boundaries for women's sport, and their ideals reflect their commitment to sport as an educational endeavor. Moreover, the principles they espoused mirror those laid out by early leaders in physical education: a democratic and non-elitist approach to physical activity;
participation for all; and the physical, emotional, and social benefits of physical activity. The transformation to sports and games within physical education called for an approach to sport that was educational. Determined to maintain the ideals sanctioned by their profession, women physical educators set out to insure that sports and games for women would retain their educational and intrinsic values and be open to all.

In 1903 Lucille Eaton Hill spoke for women physical educators when she asserted that women should avoid the "evils" evident in men's athletics, and that sport should provide the greatest good to the greatest number. Using as their motto, "A sport for every girl and every girl in a sport," (Spears, 1986:230), women physical educators set out to insure that their ideals would shape the contours of women's sport. By establishing the first rules boards for girls and women's sports they began the process of institutionalizing and legitimating their values and beliefs.

The Organizational Dimensions of the Female Model of Sport

In 1901 Senda Berenson edited the first official women's Basketball rules in the Spalding Athletic Library Series. In doing so she set a precedent which asserted that sports and games for women were the purview of women physical educators. The main modifications made in the rules were:

1. The division of the court into three equal parts.
2. The elimination of "star playing."
3. Encouragement of combination plays.
4. The equalization of team-work.
   (adapted from Frymir, 1930:8).

In addition Frymer explains, "The changes included the elimination of snatching and batting as a means of obtaining possession of the ball, limiting dribbling to three consecutive bounces, and allowing from five to ten players, depending on the size of the
In 1905 the National Women's Basket Ball Committee was formed from within the American Physical Education Association (APEA) with Berenson as chair; its purpose was to oversee and revise rules for women's Basket Ball. Early rules were designed to reduce contact and promote fair play as well as team play (Hult, 1986:65; Berenson, 1903); these changes reflected the educational approach to sport espoused by women physical educators. Through Basket Ball women physical educators sought not only to improve their student's health, but to teach them the values of team work and cooperation. In 1903 Berenson exclaimed, "Within the last few years athletic games for women have made such wonderful strides in popularity that there are few directors of physical training who do not value them as an important part of their work. They have become popular, too, not as the outcome of a "fad," but because educators everywhere see the great value games may have in any scheme of education" (33).

In 1917 the Committee on Women's Athletics was formed and the National Women's Basket Ball Committee became a subcommittee of CWA. The CWA established subcommittees for four other sports including: field hockey, swimming, track and field, and soccer. The function of each sport subcommittee was to oversee standards within the sport and to make, revise, and interpret rules (Hult, 1986:65; Theberge, 1989:509). Through its alliance with and influence within the American Physical Education Association (APEA), and by virtue of its sport subcommittees and their jurisdiction over rules and conduct, the CWA established itself as the authority in concerns related to girls and women's sports in schools and colleges.

Much has been written about the CWA's efforts to "restrict" competition for women, particularly resistance to affiliation with the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) and to the
inclusion of women’s athletics in the First Women’s International Track and Field Meet to be held in Paris in 1922 (Hult, 1986; Spears, 1983; Theberge, 1989). Efforts to uncover the underlying reasons for their desire to "restrict competition include both gender and class based interpretations: one theory suggests that track and field was too "masculine" for women physical educators who were carriers of Victorian ideologies regarding proper female physical activity; another is that they rejected track and field because of its lower class connotations and popularity among the lower classes. While their may be some merit to these "theories" they seem inconsistent with the fact that track and field was a sport taught at both Wellesley College and at the Sargeant School for Physical Education before the turn of the century.

What is more likely, and what these authors also suggest, is that women physical educators were leery of the commercial exploitation surrounding track and field and the AAU (Spears, 1986: 65; Theberge, 1989:510). As Stephanie Twin explains, "As advertisers and promoters marketed the female form with increasing imagination, sport became one way of packaging women to sell something else" (1978:191). As educators, women physical educators were concerned about the overall welfare of their students; as leaders in a growing field in an era of changing roles and rules for women, they were tentative about the contribution elite level competition would make to the health, growth, and general well being of all of their students. Moreover, they were leery of male control of women's sports, and feared that male leaders of women's sports would exploit young women for their own ends; thus they argued women should control and organize all aspects of women's sports.

Women physical educators did not reject competition as summary conclusions often assert; rather, they knew from observing men's athletics that elite level competition
could produce negative consequences. As Agnes Wayman, Chairperson of the Executive Committee of the Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) stated,

The Women's Division does believe wholeheartedly in competition...What it disapproves of is the highly intensive specialized competition such as exists when we have programs of interschool competition, intergroup track meets, or open swimming meets, with important championships at stake. (Quoted in Gerber, 1974:73)

And, as Ethel Perrin, former Chairperson of the Executive Committee for the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) and the Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA) asserts,

The Women's Division is more concerned about the promotion of a fine inclusive program for all girls, than it is with a destructive campaign based upon opinions of what may or may not happen to Olympic participants. (Quoted in Gerber, 1974:74)

Women physical educators were not simply rejecting competition, in fact they promoted it. What they rejected was elitism, commercialism, and the exploitation of female athletes. They saw clearly two ways of approaching sport: one reflected an educational approach benefitting all young women, the other an elitist and professional approach benefitting the few at the expense of the many and opening the way for the commercial exploitation of women.

With vision and courage women physical educators chose the later over the former, not out of self interest, class interest, or because they retained a myopic vision of women's place left over from Victorian times. Rather, women physical educators chose dignity over exploitation, inclusion over elitism, and the collective good over individualism because they were educators who cared about women. They believed in the educational value of sport activities and sought to make these available to as many young women as possible. As Joan Hult explains,
Fearing that women's collegiate athletics would soon incorporate the elitism and exploitation that they-and numerous male critics-felt had infiltrated men's intercollegiates, the AAU, and the Olympics, the women physical educators intensified their efforts to become an official section of APEA. They rushed to complete their first publication concerned with standards in girls and women's sports, the Official Handbook of the National Committee of Women's Athletics which was published in 1923...The members of the Women's Committee were especially devoted to the concept of a varied yet comprehensive program of athletics activities for girls and women, and they gave particular attention to those activities that would provide students with all around preparation necessary to fit them to meet with power and equanimity the varied emergencies of life. (1986:66)

The women who formed the CWA were adamant that the rules and standards for sport which had been set for men should not automatically be applied to women.

In 1923 the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) established a Women's Division to "act as a clearinghouse for problems in athletics for girls and women, and to establish the standards set forth in their platform statement" (Spears, 1983:231). The Women's Division of the NAAF was dominated by women physical educators and so its first set of resolutions published in 1923 reflected the interests and concerns of physical educators. The first fourteen resolutions are included below, resolution fifteen is a formal thank you to members of the committee, and resolution sixteen requests the publication and distribution of the Resolutions by the NAAF.

Resolutions

1. Resolved, That it be noted that the term "athletics" as used in this conference has often included the problems connected with all types of non-competitive as well as competitive physical activities for girls and women.
   Whereas, The period of childhood and youth is the period of growth in all bodily structures; and
   Whereas, A satisfactory growth during this period depends upon a large amount of vigorous physical exercise; and
   Whereas, Normal, wholesome, happy, mental and emotional maturity depends in large part upon joyous, natural, safeguarded, big-muscle activity in childhood and youth; therefore, be it

2. Resolved, That vigorous, active, happy big-muscle activity be liberally provided and maintained and carefully guided for every girl and boy; and
That all governments—village, county, state and national—establish and support adequate opportunities for a universal physical education that will assist in the preparation of our boys and girls for the duties, opportunities and joys of citizenship and of life as a whole.

3. Resolved, That there be greater concentration and study on the problems and programs of physical education for the pre-pubescent as well as the adolescent girl.

4. Resolved, In order to develop those qualities which shall fit girls and women to perform their functions as citizens,
   a. That their athletics be conducted with that end definitely in view and be protected from exploitation for the enjoyment of the spectator or for the athletic reputation or commercial advantage of any school or other organization;
   b. That schools and other organizations shall stress enjoyment of sport and development of sportsmanship, and minimize the emphasis which is at present laid upon individual accomplishment and the winning of championships.

5. Resolved, That for any given group we approve and recommend such selection and administration of athletic activities as makes participation possible for all, and strongly condemn the sacrifice of this object for intensive (even though physiologically sound) training of the few.

6. Resolved, That
   a. Competent women be put in immediate charge of women and girls in their athletic activities, even where the administrative supervision may be under the direction of men.
   b. We look toward the establishment of a future policy that shall place the administration as well as teaching and coaching of girls and women in the hands of carefully trained and properly qualified women.

7. Resolved, That the teacher training school, the colleges, the professional school, and the universities of the United States make curricular and administrative provisions that will emphasize
   a. Knowledge of cause and effect in hygiene that will lead to the formation of discriminating judgement in matters of health;
   b. Habits of periodical examination and a demand for scientific health service, and
   c. Habits of vigorous developmental recreation.

To this end we recommend that
   a. Adequate instruction in physical and health education be included in the professional preparation of all elementary and secondary school teachers;
   b. Suitable instruction in physical and health education be included in the training of volunteer leaders in organized recreation programs;
   c. Definite formulations of the highest modern standards of professional education for teachers and supervisors of physical education and recreation, and the provision of adequate opportunity for the securing of such education.

8. Resolved, That in order to maintain and build health, thorough and repeated medical examinations are necessary.
9. Resolved, Since we recognize that certain anatomical and physiological conditions may occasion temporary unfitness for vigorous athletics, therefore effective safeguards should be maintained.

Whereas, We believe that the motivations for competitors in athletic activities should be play for play sake; and

Whereas, We believe that the awarding of valuable prizes is detrimental to this objective; be it

10. Resolved, That all awards granted for athletic achievement be restricted to those things which are symbolical and which have the least possible intrinsic value.

11. Resolved, That suitable costumes for universal use be adopted for the various athletic activities.

Whereas, We believe that the type of publicity which may be given to athletics for women and girls may have a vital influence both upon the individual competitors and upon the future development of the activity; be it

12. Resolved, That all publicity be of such a character as to stress the sport and not the individual or group competitors,

Whereas, Certain international competitions for women and girls have already been held, and

Whereas, We believe that the type of publicity which may be given to athletics for women and girls may have a vital influence both upon the individual competitors and upon the future development of the activity; be it

13. Resolved, That it is the sense of this conference that in the future such competitions, if any, be organized and controlled by the national organization set up as a result of this conference.

14. Resolved, That committees be appointed for study and report on the following problems:

a. Tests for motor and organic efficiency
b. The formulation of a program of physical activities adapted to various groups of the population;
c. The relation of athletics to the health of pre-pubescent and post-pubescent girls
d. Scientific investigation as to anatomical, physiological and emotional limitations and possibilities of girls and women in athletics, and careful keeping of records in order that results may be determined. (Frymir 1930:12-18)

The Original Resolutions of the Women's Division of the NAAF were endorsed by the CWA at the annual convention of the American Physical Education Association at Springfield Massachusetts on April 11, 1923. The Committee on Women's Athletics approved of the Resolutions with particular attention to their bearing on inter-institutional competition and drew up the following endorsement:
Resolutions 4.5.6.10.11.12

Whereas, We endorse the foregoing resolutions; and
Whereas, We believe them to express the fundamental policies upon which any competition in athletics for girls and women should be based; be it

1. Resolved, That no consideration of inter-institutional athletics is warranted unless
   a. The school or institution has provided for every girl to have a full season's program of all-around athletic activities of the type approved by this committee;
   b. Every girl in the school or institution (not merely the proposed contestants) actively participates in a full season of such activities and takes part in a series of games within the school or institution;
   c. These activities are conducted under the immediate leadership of properly trained women instructors who have the educational value of the game in mind rather than winning.

2. Resolved, That in cases where the foregoing conditions obtain, and the proper and responsible authorities (preferably women) deem it desirable educationally and socially to hold inter-institutional competitions, the following requirements should be observed:
   a. Medical examinations for all participants
   b. No gate money.
   c. Admission only by invitation of the various schools or institutions taking part, in order that participants may not be exploited.
   d. No publicity other than that which stresses only the sport and not the individual or group competitors.
   e. Only properly trained women instructors and officials in charge.

Note-The committee feels that it is questionable whether inter-institutional athletics are ever warranted for children under high school age, except when such competition is conducted by the chart system, or communications by mail, telegraph, etc. (Frymir 1930:19-21)

While the CWA held jurisdiction over rules for girls and women's sports in educational institutions and influenced sport conduct; the NAAF influenced girls and women's sport outside the educational context. Working through these two institutions women physical educators (many of them holding positions in both organizations) acted to resist commercialism, professionalism, and elitism in women's sport. Joan Hult asserts that, "Together these two organizations formed a united front that opposed the AAU, collegiate, and any other efforts to provide elite and varsity level competition for
women" (Hult, 1986:66). However, their efforts were not directed at restricting opportunity; rather, they were directed at insuring the greatest numbers would have access to opportunities for sport and games; that the nature of those experiences would be educational and beneficial to the athlete, and would contribute to her overall well being. As Betty Spears explains, "Women physical educators did not disapprove all competition in sports, but rather devised several forms of competition which they believed promoted their philosophy. The most popular were play days or sport days. The events were usually informal and the program planned for mass participation" (1983:234).

Whether or not these organizations reflected the view of the majority of women physical educators, the fact is their views were most influential. When Mable Lee, Professor of Physical Education at the University of Nebraska, published her follow-up study on support for and against varsity competition for women in 1931 her findings were taken as representative of women physical educators. Lee's follow-up study ends with the concluding statement,

Many of the suggestions, especially concerning play days, will probably sound utterly naive to most men and to some women but they prove how absolutely determined are the women of the physical education profession and, judging from the report of A.C.A.C.W. for 1930, how determined also are the women college students of today, not to permit women's athletics to follow in the footsteps of men's athletics. They are determined to keep them free of all taint of professionalism and commercialism-to keep them quite informal, entirely sane, and absolutely wholesome. (Lee, 1931:127)

Joan Hult argues that Lee's survey was sent only to women physical educators who were members of the National Section on Women's Athletics (NSWA, the organization which replaced CWA) and the Women's Division of NAAF, and thus was more likely to have reflected opposition to varsity competition. She suggests that the survey may not
have been representative, and that there was more support for varsity sports within higher education than Lee's study reports.

If in fact there was more support for intercollegiate varsity sports than Lee's study claims, it also makes sense that those programs were most likely organized and run by men or women who were not physical educators, since they were not members of NSWA. In essence, it is a moot point. Women physical educators still come out on the side of wanting to limit varsity competition. However; again, their objections to varsity competition are not objections to sport opportunities, but to the impact of certain organizational forms of sport on the overall well being of all female student athletes. Women physical educators believed that sport should be physically and mentally challenging, but they also believed that sport as part of the educational environment should compliment the student's educational experience and not detract from it. Thus, sport competition should invoke the spirit of play, foster cooperation, and insure broad participation; it should not be elitist, nor should it be a commercial and professional endeavor.

Despite their concerns about certain forms of intercollegiate competition for women, women physical educators did not wholly reject high level competition or strenuous sports for women. They both promoted and supported the first international team competition for women in 1920; a field hockey game between the All Philadelphia team and Great Britain. And they supported club field hockey, an amateur system of team competition developed by the United States Field Hockey Association (USFHA). Moreover, as discussed earlier, there is also early evidence of intercollegiate competition between nearby schools in both field hockey and basketball (Hult, 1985:72). Women physical educators did support elite competition, where and when it
was controlled by women, and reflected the values embodied in their vision of sport for women.

An early challenge to the CWA by the AAU for jurisdiction over girls and women's sports in 1923 galvanized women physical educators and fostered the cooperation among their professional organizations including: the Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA), the Women's Division of the NAAF, the Athletic Federation of College Women (AFCW), and National Association of Physical Education for College Women (NAPECW). In the years that ensued these organizations changed both form and focus, but their vision for women's athletics—despite adaptations to the growing demand for more intercollegiate competition—would remain clear and focused: "a sport for every girl, and every girl in a sport." Moreover, in the years that ensued women physical educators would work to insure that women, not men, would govern and control women's athletics. They feared that if men governed, coached, and officiated women's intercollegiate sports, women's sports would fall prey to the same problems affecting men's intercollegiate sports: commercialism, professionalism, and the negative consequences which might follow. As a respondent to Lee's (1931) study states,

Men's athletic departments are struggling now with their difficult situation and are not as yet making much progress. In the present unhealthful state of public and alumni opinion, intercollegiate athletics for women would be subjected to the same pressure from the outside as are men's, i.e. to make the game a good spectacle, to have a highly specialized team, so that it would be worth paying to go see, and very likely worth betting on." (a leading physical education director quoted in Lee, 1931:100)

In 1932 the CWA was granted section status in the APEA and became the National Section of Women's Athletics (NSWA). Throughout the 1930's and 1940's the NSWA, and the women physical educators who played leadership roles in it, extended their influence in the world of girls and women's sports in educational institutions. The NSWA
approach to sport was laid out in the organization's constitution and promoted through a variety of publications, the most important of which were Sport Guides. The guides were "powerful educational and proselytizing devices and served as the basis for claimed authority over various sports" (Hult, 1985:66). In addition the NSWA set standards for players, coaches, officials and administrators; formed officiating boards and promoted research in girls and women's sports. In 1940 when the Women's Division of NAAF merged with the AAHPER (formerly AAPER) the NSWA became the sole and mostly uncontested authority regarding girls and women's sports in the realm of education. Bolstered by the influential National Association for Physical Education of College Women, an outgrowth of early meetings among physical directors organized by Amy Homans and officially established in 1924, women physical educators held fast to their ideals and continued to extend their influence.

Thus, while it is clear that women physical educators intentionally constructed a model of collegiate sport which was different in approach from the one existing for men, and which retained the values of the physical education profession, it is incorrect to assert that women physical educators were against high level competition. Rather, they were against what they considered the wrong kind of competition (Gerber, 1974:74; Hult, 1985:69): competition which reaped rewards for the few at the expense of the many and exploited women in the process. It is also incorrect to assert they espoused cooperation over competition; rather, they believed in competition which promoted cooperation; and in the value of sport for sport sake—not for the sake of the prize or profit.

In 1949 the NSWA published Standards for Desirable Practices, a testament to its slow but growing acceptance of "extramural sports" for girls and women. At the root of
these practices was a concern for the well being of the female athlete. Women physical educators within the NSWA believed that, a program of athletic activities should, among other things:

1. Be taught, coached, and officiated by qualified women whenever and wherever possible.
2. Stimulate the participants to play for the enjoyment of playing and not for tangible rewards or because of artificial incentives.
3. Include a variety of sports, both team and individual, and provide opportunity for all girls wishing to participate or to be a member of a team in those sports for which teams are organized.
4. Promote informal social events in connection with competition.
5. Educate girls and women concerning appropriate costume for sports.
6. Limit extramural competition to a small geographic area.
7. Provide safe transportation in bonded carriers.
8. Limit the total length of the sports seasons and the maximum number of practice periods and games to be played in a game or a week. (Spears, 1983:299)

The NSWA was a "pivotal link" between two eras in women's sports (Hult, 1985:73). As the popularity of girls and women's sports continued to grow, leaders in the field of physical education began to adapt their policies while still retaining the ideal of "the good of the participant." In 1952 the National Section on Women's Athletics became the Division of Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS), and in 1957 the DGWS, the National Association for Physical Education of College Women, and The Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women (an association of students) joined to form the National Joint Committee on Extramural Sports for College Women. The committee undertook to sanction tournaments and establish standards of conduct in extramural events for college women. After eight years of joint control the National Joint Committee disbanded and in 1965 the DGWS assumed control of women's intercollegiate athletics (Spears, 1983:300-301).

The DGWS revised the Statement of Policies and Procedures laid out by the NSWA and asserted, "For the college women and high school girls who seek and need additional..."
challenges in competition and skills, a sound, carefully planned, and well-directed program of extramural sports is recommended" (Spears, 1983:300). These programs were to be conducted from within departments of physical education, were not to interfere with a student's academic endeavors or progress, and could not award scholarships based on athletic skills.

As the DGWS moved to support extramural sports and elite level competition it soon became clear that women who had been schooled in the philosophy of "sport for all" were not well trained, nor were they philosophically or psychologically prepared to coach elite level athletes. Thus the DGWS in conjunction with the US Olympic Development Committee sponsored institutes to promote Olympic Sports. Through a series of clinics at the state and local level selected teachers would receive then give instruction in current techniques and tactics, in an effort to improve girls and women's sport performance (Spears, 1983:300).

In 1967 the DGWS began sponsorship of national championships for college women, although it remained committed to broad based participation and the philosophy of "a sport for every girl and every girl in a sport." The body formed to organize and promote championships was the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW). In 1971 the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) replaced the CIAW and assumed its mission of promoting appropriate intercollegiate sports programs for women and sponsoring intercollegiate championships.

Coaching and the Female Model of Sport

This section has endeavored to make clear that collegiate sport for women has reflected an approach consistent with the ideals of the physical education profession, and
that women physical educators were instrumental in crafting a model of sport which emphasized an educational approach to sport and broad participation over elite competition. According to women of this era, coaching was first and foremost an educational endeavor, the purpose of which was to insure the teaching of sportsmanlike conduct and values as well as skills and techniques.

In the early 1920's and into the 1930's coaching often carried negative connotations. That this was the case is made clear in the following statements taken from Mabel Lee's 1931 study, "The case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and the Situation Since 1923." In citing the disadvantages of intercollegiate competition on the teaching staff of physical educators, one of Lee's respondents had this to say: "It breeds a poor type, the 'coach type' who is not 'professionally minded' and does not have the educational attitude toward her work. Another stated, "The sense of values of the coaches would become distorted as now happens with coaches of men's intercollegiate athletics" (Quoted in Lee, 1931:98).

Throughout this "reactionary" period the idea of "coaching" often carried negative connotations, in large part because it was associated with elite level competition and the problems in men's athletics. Respondents to Lee's survey expressed concern that intercollegiate competition would lead the instructor to focus her attention and efforts on the gifted athletes, at the expense of other students. As a result, when Play Days gave way to Sport Days, a form of intercollegiate competition by class, informal agreements by participating schools insured that coaching would not take place (Hult, 1994:90).

This early disdain for "coaching" is described by Katherine Ley in her article, "What is Coaching?" written in 1966. She explains,

The question "What is Coaching?" has aroused controversy among women physical educators for years. Many women after observing the behavior and performance of
the few persons they knew who were "coaches" decided not to be coaches and
investigated no further. These women physical educators adopted an attitude that
coaching and teaching are two different things: teaching is desirable, coaching is not" (1966:4)

It took a change in attitude towards competition among women physical educators to
change attitudes towards coaching. This change is evident in the following commentary
on competition in Lawrence and Fox's (1954) Basketball for Girls and Women. In their
chapter "Competition," the authors claim,

Competition in sports is the effort to excel. Inherently it is neither good nor bad. It is
good or bad depending upon the actions and interactions of the individuals involved.
Competition is good if players are learning to recognize and appreciate the abilities of
their teammates and opponents, and are growing in their tolerance of faults and
shortcomings in themselves and others. It is good if they are learning to accept
winning with humility and not to look upon losing as a failure. It is good if
opportunities for learning these vital lessons are provided in a wholesome
environment. Competition is bad if one individual is crushed that another might be
exploited; if values are destroyed that selfish ends might be attained; if ideals are
sacrificed that goals might be reached at any cost...The educational implications of
athletic contests must be recognized by the leader and sound practices thoroughly
understood if maximum total growth of each player is to be realized. (1954:11-12)

For physical educators, only certain kinds of competition were considered "good":
competition that was educational and served as a vehicle for individual growth, was
ethical, and that fostered democratic ideals. In short, competition imbued with values
reflected in the female model of sport.

The sanctioning of competition which emerged in the 1950's was accompanied by
assertions about its educational value, the coaches role as a teacher, and examples of
sportsmanlike behavior. Extolling the responsibility of the coach to teach good
citizenship through sport, Lawrence and Fox state,

Behavior is learned. No one is born a good citizen. No one is born a good sport. By
the time some players reach adulthood their patterns of behavior may be deeply set
but they are still capable of change. Herein lies the challenge to the coach-to place
above all else the growth of each individual in those qualities which will contribute to
making her a more worthwhile citizen of today...The concept of good sportsmanship
presented here is one of behavior in relation to sports. It applies to players actions
which are related to the observance of the 'spirit of the rule' rather than just the letter of the rule. It applies further to acts of courtesy commonly connected with the game. (1954:3-4).

In a section titled "Hints to Coaches on Sportsmanship" Lawrence and Fox (1954) recommend that coaches,

1. Be an example of courtesy to your players. Be courteous to your players at all times.
2. Encourage your players with constructive criticism. Sarcasm seldom is effective.
3. Recognize the good playing of your team. Bear in mind that not all games are lost because of poor playing.
4. Be courteous of the coach of the other team. Meet the visiting coach upon her arrival and provide for her needs and the needs of her team.
5. Take care of the visiting coach and team until they leave. They are your guests until they leave your grounds.
6. Be courteous to the opposing team. Make them feel welcome from the time they arrive until the time they depart.
7. If you are a visiting coach, introduce yourself immediately upon arrival. Keep in mind that you are a guest of the host team and conduct yourself in a courteous manner.
8. The host coach should meet the official upon their arrival and show them where they are to dress.
9. Be courteous to officials. Both coaches should meet the officials and decide together and regulations which govern them.
10. Respect the playing ability of your opponents. Do not alibi for the shortcomings of your team.
11. Use a combination of players that will equalize competition if possible. A game is not usually fun to either team when there is too wide arrange in score. No team enjoys winning or losing by fifty points.
12. Address the officials on matters of interpretation in a courteous way. They may be approached only at half time or after the game is over. Do not approach the official if you are angry. Nothing is gained, decisions are not reversed, and you have only created an unpleasant situation. If you feel the officiating has been poor or biased you have the right to refuse to use that official in later games. If you feel you must discuss the game with the official, wait until you have your temper under control and can discuss the issue intelligently rather than emotionally.
13. Thank the officials for handling the game.

Resigned to the fact that times were changing, and that more and more students wanted varsity level competition, physical educators began re-shaping the meaning of competition in women's sport and with it the nature and meaning of coaching. In 1966 Katherine Ley claimed,

Women who have made, and are making, a career of physical education must decide on
their attitude toward coaching. What problems should we be aware of and concerned about? Should we allow ourselves to be swept into the world of coaching, or continue to pride ourselves in being teachers? Is there a discernible difference between teaching and coaching?

She also stated,

In examining what coaching is, let me first state my belief that coaching is teaching and that teaching includes coaching. The two terms are overlapping; they are similar in process but different in purpose. To teach, to teacher-coaching, teaching-as verbs imply doing something to or for someone. Whom one teaches and when one coaches become the primary issues. (1966:4)

The growth of elite level competition brought with it the need for qualified "coaches." Holding firm to their vision of sport as a vehicle for education and their rejection of the "male model," women physical educators imbued coaching with the ideals reflected in the "female model" of sport. Coaching, from their point of view, was an educational endeavor, and was defined in terms of its educational value. Thus, coaching and teaching were simply two ends of the same occupational continuum. Again, Ley explains,

If you accept that coaching and teaching are part of a continuous and total process, we can begin to determine at what point teaching is emphasized, and at what point coaching is emphasized, and to what degree each overlaps the other. (1966:5)

As the 1960's progressed women physical educators grew more forthright in their claims regarding the values of competition. At the same time they reaffirmed their educational vision of women's sports. In her book Basketball Techniques for Women Patsy Neal explains, "The past few years have also brought about many changes in the educator's philosophy concerning women in athletics, and it is now widely accepted that competition for women is good, and it is a right that should be enjoyed by all girls of all skill levels" (1966:iii). In a chapter titled, "The Contribution of Sports to Life" Neal asserts,

So the values of competition are countless. Some of the better known ones include: 1. self control 2. physical fitness 3. better use of leisure time 4. ability to work with a group 5. mental and emotional release 6. increased skills 7. status, and 8. a challenge to the individual...When supervised properly the playing field is as good a
place to learn the principles of citizenship as the schools or the homes. (1966:4)

In the same year in Basketball for Women, Frances Schaafsma informs women there are "unwritten rules" which should be followed when playing basketball including: greeting opponents, avoiding physical contact and intentional fouling, a short yell of appreciation for opponents followed by intermingling and exchange of greetings and appreciation for several minutes after the game, thanking the officials, and a general atmosphere of mutual respect and goodwill which makes basketball more rewarding for all involved (1966:57-58).

By the time intercollegiate sport for women exploded in the early 1970's, coaching had been transformed from an occupation with marginal acceptance to one with educational, moral, and civic value. As women's teams were added to intercollegiate programs, women physical educators already employed as instructors at colleges and universities, took on coaching assignments in addition to their teaching duties. It was not until the late 1970's and into the early 1980's when intercollegiate coaching emerged as an occupation in its own right, when coaching and teaching as occupations for physical educators began to be separated. More importantly, most female collegiate coaches continued to enter coaching via the field of physical education and were trained as physical education instructors.

Summary

The early introduction of sports and games into the physical education curriculum at women's colleges reflected both the belief in the physical and health benefits for women of physical activity, and the Victorian ideology of the period. In an effort to promote sports for women, the earliest leaders in women's physical education were cautious in their appeals for women's sports. In an effort to insure the continued extension of sport
for women they tempered their enthusiastic support of vigorous activity with an approach which emphasized control and appropriate demeanor.

At the turn of the century as sports and games grew increasingly popular in America a new philosophy of physical education was introduced by Wood, Heatherington, and Gulick. Women physical educators embraced this "new physical education" and its assertions regarding the educational benefits of games and sports. As sports grew more popular for women, men's intercollegiate athletics was faced with a series of crises culminating in a call for reform. At issue was the increasing commercial and professional nature of men's intercollegiate athletics and the perception that the quest for victory precipitated unnecessary violence and injury, cheating, and other forms of unethical conduct.

In an effort to protect women's sports from the problems associated with commercialism and professionalism which appeared to pervade men's athletics and to keep young women from being exploited, women physical educators articulated a different vision of sports for girls and women and developed the institutional vehicles to carry this vision. In doing so they both legitimated and extended their authority and control over women's collegiate sport. These organizations promoted a set of athletic ideals which were in keeping with the original philosophies professed by the founders of physical education. Accordingly, sport was to be an extension of physical education, not separate from it; and competitive athletics would be organized so as to insure educational benefits to the greatest number of participants.

The early leaders in women's physical education were carriers of the ethos of their profession. As sports and games for women emerged they institutionalized these ideals in organizations whose function it was to make rules, set standards and policies, encourage women's leadership, and promote participation in women's sports. Because their efforts
were made on a sport by sport basis, and because they were in conflict with other sport organizations, they never fully realized effort to control all of women's sport (Hult, 1994). However, they did, for the most part, control women's sport in the realm of education, especially women's intercollegiate sport; in doing so they insured that their model for women's collegiate sport would be carried to future generations.

Throughout the 20th century the core values associated with this model were carried from decade to decade in rules committees and governing bodies controlled by women physical educators. Increasing student interest in varsity sports and the call for more elite level competition for girls and women lead to the development of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports in 1952 and eventually a new interpretation of competition. The clamor by college students for intercollegiate competition lead to the development of the National Joint Committee for Extramural Sports for College Women, the purpose of which was to sanction intercollegiate events. The NJCESCW was short lived and soon the DGWS assumed the role of sanctioning events. Seeing the breadth and scope of the task before it, in 1966 the DGWS set up a separate organization, the Commission on Intercollegiate Sports for Women (CIAW) for the sanctioning and sponsorship of intercollegiate contests and national tournaments. In 1971 the CIAW handed its tournament sponsorship role to a new organization, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The purpose of the AIAW was to set policies and standards for intercollegiate sport, to organize and run regional and national tournaments, to encourage the development of women leaders in sport, and to promote the "female model" of intercollegiate sport. In short, the AIAW became the governing organization for intercollegiate sport for women. Despite adaptations and the sanctioning of intercollegiate championships, the AIAW embodied the core ideals of the physical
education profession and early women educators.

The purpose of this section of Chapter III has been to show that coaching as an occupational endeavor for women has been influenced by the "female model" of sport crafted by the early leaders in physical education and carried by women's governing organizations. The women whose interviews form the basis for the empirical portion of this study are descendants of this legacy. In one way or another they have been influenced by the "female model" of sport, some more so than others.

If women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and if their approach is consistent with the values, beliefs, and ideals espoused by early leaders in physical education, then we can conclude that as coaches they have been socialized in the ethos of the profession. In other words, the social source of this approach may be related, in part to, their socialization as physical education professionals. If as coaches they resist the dominant sport culture, this too may be related to their socialization as women physical educators, and may be an indicator of an occupational subculture of resistance.

The final section of this chapter is a brief description of the rise and decline of the AIAW, the purpose of which is to set the stage for asking: Without an institutional vehicle for the "female model" of sport, have women had little choice but to adopt the "male/professional model"? Moreover, can coaches resist dominant values and practices without the support of organizational structures to legitimate their own alternative values and beliefs? If so, how is this resistance sustained and what role might culture play in helping individuals and groups to sustain oppositional meanings?
The Rise and Fall of the AIAW

The preceding portion of this chapter makes clear that as sports for girls and women grew more acceptable in the late 19th and early 20th centuries women physical educators worked to insure that women's sports would be both educational and reflect democratic ideals, and that they would, for the most part, remain within the boundaries of gender appropriate behavior. As the decades of the 20th century progressed, the myth of female frailty came under new scrutiny as medical professionals challenged the lack of scientific support for the notion that strenuous exercise was harmful to women. In the early 1940's women entered the workforce in unprecedented numbers often serving in jobs typically considered men's work. This experience in the public realm gave women a new sense of confidence and served to re-affirm what many already felt: women were physically, emotionally, and intellectually capable of engaging in strenuous physical activity, including competitive sports.

In this last section of Chapter III I briefly explain the emergence and fall of the AIAW, the governing organization for women's intercollegiate athletics throughout the 1970's. The AIAW is significant in that it was, in a sense, the culmination of seventy years of work by women physical educators and reflects both their steadfast convictions regarding an educational approach to sport, and their decision to compromise this approach in an effort to create sport opportunities for women.

As a carrier for the "female model" of athletics the AIAW shaped the first generation of women athletes and coaches to fully experience high level intercollegiate competition, including most of the women in this study. Of the forty six women coaches interviewed, thirty of them, or 65%, were coaching between 1971 and 1981 when the AIAW governed women's intercollegiate athletics. Twenty three of those thirty also attended
college and participated in intercollegiate athletics during that period.

Like its predecessor the NSWA, the AIAW promoted the intrinsic value of sport and an educational approach to sport for women, and a program of broad participation and leadership by women. Unlike the NSWA which went before it, it did all of this with new convictions regarding the benefits of competition for women athletes; organizing state, regional, and national championships in nineteen women's sports.

The roots of the AIAW go back to the Women's Basketball Committee in 1899; it is a direct descendant of the DGWS, the Joint Committee on Extramural Sports and the CIAW. Although it moved closer to a commercial model of sport than any of the organizations which preceded it, it remained an "alternative" model of athletics in its commitment to the education and welfare of female student-athletes (Hult, 1989:282).

An Organization Takes Shape

Between 1966 and 1972 the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women established national championships in seven sports: golf (1966), Gymnastics and track and field (1969), badminton, swimming, diving, and volleyball (1970) and basketball (1972) (Grant, 1989). In light of the growing interest in intercollegiate sport and the need for a more secure financial base for creating tournament opportunities, in 1971 the DGWS and CIAW initiated the creation of a new organization, the AIAW (Lopiano in Grant, 1981). In 1971-72 the CIAW became the AIAW, an affiliate of the DGWS and a substructure of the AAHPER (Hult, 1989:283). In the beginning the AIAW was clear that its promotion of competitive sport opportunities for women would retain an educational focus and not succumb to the commercialization evident in men's athletics. Like the women who made up the CWA and the Women's Division of the NAAF fifty years ago,
before, the women who created the AIAW were disdainful of what they considered the "male model" and its emphasis on winning, money, and its disregard for the welfare of student athletes. As Joan Hult explains, "The new governance association, in keeping with the experimental dream of women physical educators, adopted a student-centered, education-oriented model with built-in safeguards designed to avoid the abuses observed in the male model" (1994:97).

The first proposal for the AIAW, then referred to as the National Organization for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (NOIAW) asserted,

The NOIAW is to be composed of member institutions which wish to uphold and promote the highest standards in women's collegiate athletic programs. As in the past, the focus is to remain on the individual participant in her primary role as a college student. (DGWS Minutes 1971, quoted in Hult, 1989:281)

The AIAW set eligibility standards for female collegiate athletes, and organized and conducted national championships. More importantly, it did so with a clear vision that collegiate sport for women should contribute to, not detract from their education, and that sport should be a vehicle for education. To insure the implementation of this approach they included in their aims, the development of qualified women leaders.

The purpose of the AIAW as stated in the AIAW Handbook of 1982 was:

1. To foster broad programs of women's intercollegiate athletics which are consistent with the educational aims and objectives of the member schools and in accordance with the philosophy and standards of the National Association of Girls and Women in Sport.
2. To assist member schools in extending and enriching their programs of intercollegiate athletics for women based upon the needs, interests, and capacities of the individual student.
3. To stimulate the development of quality leadership for women's intercollegiate athletic programs.
4. To foster programs which will encourage excellence in performance of participation in women's intercollegiate athletics.
5. To maintain the spirit of play within competitive sport events so that the concomitant educational values of such an experience are emphasized.
6. To increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and value of
sports and athletics as they contribute to the enrichment of the life of the women. (AIAW Handbook, 1982:13 in Grant, 1989).

Adaptations to the Original Model

Throughout its existence the AIAW would be faced with a series of compromises to its educational approach, the first and most important involved the granting of athletic scholarships. In a somewhat ironic twist of fate, Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 would prove to be a both a blessing and a thorn in the side of the AIAW. Title IX outlawed discrimination based on sex in any educational institution receiving federal funds. The effect of this legislation was a tremendous increase in sport opportunities for girls and women; it would also force the AIAW to compromise its educational approach.

When a female tennis player receiving an athletic scholarship filed suit for the right to compete in a tournament sponsored jointly by the AIAW and United States Lawn Tennis Association, the AIAW's delegate assembly voted to allow female athletes to both receive financial aid and compete in intercollegiate championships, lifting the ban on scholarships in 1973 (Hult, 1980:307; 1994:98). This decision was an important break with the AIAW's initial opposition to athletic scholarships, and "immediately placed in jeopardy the philosophical commitment of AIAW to an educational model" (Hult, 1980:307). When Title IX was signed the AIAW had little choice but to adapt its stance on financial aid to athletes because the standard for comparison for equality was men's athletics (Hult, 1989).

In 1980 Joan Hult, an expert on the history of women's collegiate athletics and the AIAW made this statement regarding the AIAW, "The short history of the association seems to suggest it has ushered in a period of transition in which the vision of an educational model and student-centered program is clear; but the legislative actions demonstrate some evidence of the erosion of philosophical commitments" (1980:308).
In addition to the pressures facilitated by the requirements of law, there emerged within the AIAW an internal conflict between "traditionalists" and "modernists" (Hult, 1994:98) over the direction of the organization, with the latter more willing to compromise the educational focus if it meant increased opportunities for female athletes. While Title IX served to weaken the AIAW's vision of an educationally focused collegiate sport world for women, the internal split between physical educators (and the more modern stance of young female physical educators) created impetus for further adaptations on issues of recruiting, financial aid, and divisional structure. These changes moved the AIAW closer to the "male/professional model" of sport and would eventually contribute to its demise. However, the most important factor in the decline of the AIAW was not the internal split or Title IX, but the NCAA.

The Struggle for Control of Women's Collegiate Athletics

Throughout the history of collegiate sport, women's and men's athletic programs have existed as separate entities. As such the educational model promoted by women physical educators never really came in conflict with, nor did it challenge, the more commercial male approach. When Title IX was passed, women's sports became a threat to the male dominated realm of collegiate athletics; at issue was the sharing of resources. Title IX required that resources be shared equally among men's and women's programs. Thus, the NCAA worked hard to block the passage of Title IX, and when this failed it lobbied Congress for an amendment to exclude first athletics and then revenue producing sports from its purview (Cahn 1994:254-255; Carpenter and Acosta, 1993: 389). When both attempts failed the NCAA took its case to court, and in NCAA vs. Califano argued that Title IX should not apply to athletics on constitutional grounds (Carpenter and Acosta,
When it became increasingly clear that despite its best efforts at opposition Title IX would prevail, the NCAA decided that compliance would be more palatable, and perhaps less costly, if it also controlled women's athletics (Cahn, 1994:256). In 1972 when Title IX was passed a similar logic led to the merging of men's and women's athletic departments, the consequence of which was the elimination or demotion of hundreds of female athletic directors. In four short years between 1972 and 1975 the percentage of women athletic decreased from 90% to 25% (Acosta and Carpenter, 1994). The tactic: feign inclusion, absorb, and render powerless.

Throughout the 1970's women's sports grew in popularity around the country, and the AIAW became more powerful and established as an athletic organization. The NCAA and AIAW met on several occasions on the topic of merging, but the NCAA would not agree to a merger which would give the AIAW equal voice and power (Hult, 1994:99). Eventually, the increased popularity of women's sport, the growing power of the AIAW, and the fear that women's sports would drain resources from men's athletics, led the NCAA to carefully consider what was at stake if the AIAW retained control of women's athletics (Hult, 1989:298). In 1980 the NCAA changed its stance regarding Title IX, where once it was a vehement opponent, now its leaders were equally emphatic that Title IX required the NCAA to sponsor women's championships. Given that the AIAW did not want to merge with the NCAA on its terms, a hostile takeover of the AIAW was initiated.

By 1979-80, the year the NCAA voted to sponsor women's championships, the AIAW had an institutional membership of 973, television revenues of $219,052.00 (Grant, 1989:44-45), corporate sponsorship worth $50,000.00, was able to reimburse institutions 40% for the cost of attending the National Basketball Tournament (Hult,
1989:296-297), and had representation on the United States Olympic Committee (Hult, 1994: 99). It was a strong and powerful organization in its own right, but ultimately no match for the NCAA. More importantly, the merger of athletic departments in 1972 had disarmed the AIAW by weakening women physical educator's ability to insure institutional support for the AIAW. When all was said and done, male athletic directors were ultimately in charge of both men's and women's programs, and would determine the future direction of women's athletics.

In 1981 when the NCAA voted by a narrow margin to sponsor women's championships, 95% of those voting were men; a week earlier the AIAW had voted to maintain the AIAW and governance of women's athletics, 75% of the voting delegates were women. As Hult explains, "Thus the NCAA, a male dominated organization, voted to impose a men's decision on women's athletic programs" (1994:99). Although the NCAA decision largely reflected the feelings of male athletic directors, there was strong support among some women physical educators, particularly women basketball coaches who saw the benefits of increased television coverage and more lenient recruiting rules. The NCAA also enticed women and their male counterparts who were doing the voting by promising to subsidize travel expenses to tournaments, and by not charging additional membership dues for women's programs. Male athletic directors were also motivated by their own desire to simplify their jobs: in taking over the administration of women's sports in their own athletic departments, they had acquired not only additional responsibilities, but the headaches of having to deal with two separate sets of rules, regulations, and the paper work it entailed; one governing body for both men's and women's athletics would simply streamline the work, reduce the complexity of the job, and make life easier. Finally, women leaders were also assured 16% representation on
the NCAA Council and from 18-24% membership on other committees (Hult, 1994:99).

These enticements proved to be too much for male athletic directors and some women coaches and administrators to resist. However, these forces alone did not prove to be the AIAW's undoing. In the end it would take one last financial blow. Acosta and Carpenter explain, "the NCAA made a deal with television networks to televise both men's and women's basketball finals on the same dates that the AIAW was holding its championship games, depriving the AIAW of its financial base" (1994:390).

Although changes in society mandated adaptation to its original vision, the AIAW remained committed to its core principles. In 1978 actions of the Delegate Assembly lead to this assessment, "The AIAW maintains as its cardinal principle the belief that the focus in intercollegiate athletics should remain on the individual participant in her primary role as a college student; the justification for such athletic programs is their educational value" (Hult in Hult, 1989). In another paper Hult asserts, "While growing from its 206 charter members to over 970 institutional members, the association has sustained its four original purposes. These purposes include the concept of fostering broad programs consistent with educational aims and objectives, assisting in extension and enrichment of programs, stimulating quality leadership, and encouraging excellence in performance" (1980:307).

In 1981-82 the AIAW held 41 different championships in 19 different sports (Lopiano in Grant, 1989:44) and in 1980-81 it had a four year million dollar contract with NBC (Hult, 1994:97). In 1980-81 ten women's national championships were televised by NBC and two by ESPN (Grant, 1989:45). The AIAW had created leadership opportunities for over 1,200 women at the state, regional, and national level of the
AIAW and on many national boards including the USOC (Grant, 1989:45).

In spite of all it accomplished for women's sports and in some ways because of it, in the end the AIAW was no match for the more powerful NCAA and the athletic directors whose mergers gave them the power to control the course of women's athletics within their institutions. In 1982 the AIAW filed an anti-trust suit against the NCAA and lost. In 1982 the AIAW closed its doors (Acosta and Carpenter, 1993:390; Cahn 1994:257).

The Female Model of Sport: Organizational Decline and the Survival of Culture

Several authors have documented the NCAA takeover of the AIAW (Acosta and Carpenter 1993; Cahn 1994; Grant, 1989; Hult 1989, 1994). The consensus among these authors is that the demise of the AIAW has, in effect, resulted in the loss of the "female model" of sport. And, some have concluded that women coaches and administrators have had no choice but to follow the "male/professional" model. The following is a sample of reactions by leading researchers to the AIAW's decline and their interpretation of the impending consequences.

The AIAW's legacy to the sports world is monumental. The association was successful for a decade at offering an alternative model of intercollegiate athletics for female athletes. The women created a highly effective governance structure and won the Title IX 'war.' But the AIAW's very success lead to its demise as, beyond the wildest dreams of its creators, it fulfilled its mission of providing opportunities for female athletes. (Hult, 1989:302)

The struggle for survival of a women's athletic model of intercollegiate athletics failed. The opportunity for female collegiate athletes, however, succeeded. (Hult, 1989:302)

Thus would the alternative model of women's athletics be silenced in the subsequent folding of the highly successful AIAW. (Hult, 1994:99)

The AIAW's failure to survive as a separate organization ended women physical educators dream of establishing a unique alternative model of women's athletics. (Hult, 1994:100)
Moreover, the takeover of women's sports by the NCAA has meant that the athlete-centered model supported by the AIAW has been replaced by a competitive and commercial model that is beset by problems. (Theberge, 1989:519)

Women have gained unprecedented admission to the world of sport but on terms very different from the ideals envisioned by women's sports leaders both earlier in the century and more recently. (Theberge, 1989:519)

Following the death of the AIAW (which many who witnessed it would describe as a "murder at the hands of the NCAA"), women who wished to be leaders in intercollegiate athletics, particularly in Divisions I and II, had only one viable choice: to adopt the male model for athletics. (Acosta and Carpenter, 1993:392)

For many women in intercollegiate athletics, the 1980's have been silent and isolated years. While not necessarily having lost the vision of an educationally sound and fiscally prudent model for intercollegiate athletic programs, those who had been representatives in the AIAW clearly recognized that the power to implement such a model had been virtually eliminated. Perhaps the will to work toward such a goal had been crushed in light of the increased magnitude of such a task. (Grant, 1989:45)

The mourning for the sound of a woman's voice in the design of women's athletics continued for some years. Some female leaders left the field telling themselves the game was over and they had lost. Some stayed and tried to maintain their principles and vision within whatever circle of influence they might have. Some stayed and told themselves that the future for an alternative to the male model existed only by 'working within the male system.' Thus they sought or accepted positions within the NCAA while convincing themselves they could be agents of change from within. A price was paid by all. (Acosta and Carpenter, 1993:392)

...Women's sport was assimilated into the existing dominant male model. The trunk of traditional women's sports culture was felled...In the process of assimilating women's sport into men's sport, the values, traditions, and organizational structures of the women's sport culture were discarded and replaced by those of the male sport culture. (Hill, 1993:51)

While it is clear that the governing structure for the "female model" of sport no longer exists, that the NCAA now governs both men's and women's athletics, and that the NCAA's model for athletics reflects a commitment (at some levels more than others) to the commercial aspects of intercollegiate athletics; it is not clear that women in athletics, including coaches, have actually adopted the male model. Nor is it clear that the female coaches' approach to coaching reflects a belief in a program centered and win-at-all costs philosophy. As Cahn explains, "Contemporary women leaders are grappling
with a problem that plagued earlier physical educators: how to press for full inclusion in athletics without being subsumed into a pre-existing model of sport viewed by many as fundamentally sexist, elitist, and exploitive"(1994:248). If in fact women coaches have "had no choice but to adopt the male model," then the male model would be reflected in their philosophy of coaching and their actual coaching practices. This has to be shown to be the case, and can not simply be assumed to have occurred based on changes in the structure of sport.

Even though the institutional carrier for the "female model" no longer exists, the model itself may continue to survive. Despite the NCAA's governance of women's athletics, the "female model" approach to sport may continue to survive, perhaps even thrive, in the philosophical ideals and everyday practices of women coaches. Despite the loss of an "institutional carrier," the educational approach to women's intercollegiate sport may in fact be carried by the culture of women's sports; created and sustained, in part, by the coaches who believe in and work to implement this philosophy.

In asserting that women have had to adopt the male model of sport, Acosta and Carpenter state,

If they sought significant institutional support they had to put athlete ahead of student. They had to redefine their own self worth in terms of win/loss records. They had to consider whether their value systems allowed them to become as adept as their male counterparts at circumventing NCAA regulations when those regulations interfered with their attainment of a winning season. They sometimes had to search for athletes who could help the team win even if the athletes themselves had no chance of winning as students. (1993:392)

While this may reflect the reality for some women coaches, perhaps the opposite is also true. It is suggested here that despite the fact that the governing structure in collegiate athletics reflects the "male/professional model," female coaches (and many male coaches too) may continue to coach from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport.
Despite the commercial priorities of the NCAA, women coaches may continue to emphasize the educational aspects of sport participation, putting the athlete's personal welfare above "winning-at-all costs." They may, in effect, find ways to resist the dominant sport culture.

To assume that the NCAA takeover has altered the way women coaches approach sport is to assert that women's athletics does not have a culture of its own; that over one hundred years of struggle has failed to leave an "imprint" in the philosophies and practices of women coaches. To assert that the NCAA takeover has left women "no choice but to follow the male model" is to assert that the social world of sport is void of human agency and that social structures impose and determine human action. From this point of view then, when faced with the realities imposed by the dominant, "male/professional" sport culture, women coaches, many who continue to be trained as physical educators, simply jettison their educational ideals; and do not adjust their style and approach to meet the needs of female athletes.

The extent to which this is true is explored in this study. In-depth interviews with forty six female collegiate coaches were gathered in an effort to determine the nature and meaning of coaching for women and the extent to which coaches accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture, the meaning they assign their actions, and their underlying motivations.

**Summary**

The purpose of this chapter has been to explore the roots of coaching as an occupation. Coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's has its historical roots in the field of physical education. As such it has been influenced by the ideals and philosophies of early
leaders in physical education who believed in the health benefits of exercise for girls and women and later in the educational benefits to women of sports and games. Despite opposition on many fronts, physical educators began carving out a niche for women in the realm of sport.

At the turn of the century the growth of and popular support for games and sport combined with public outrage at abuses in men's intercollegiate athletics to galvanize a small but influential group of female physical educators in opposition to varsity intercollegiate competition. As carriers of the educational ideals upon which the profession was founded, women physical educators sought to protect women's sport and women athletes from the abuses and exploitation associated with the commercialization of collegiate sport. They created organizations which made and interpreted rules, set standards for conduct for players and coaches, and endeavored to promote both women's sport and leadership for women in sport. The effect of these organizations was the creation, most effective in the realm of education, of a separate program for women's intercollegiate sport embodied in an approach referred to as the "female model."

Despite adaptations, especially regarding elite level competition, women physical educators have always espoused an educational and student-centered approach to intercollegiate sport. Beginning with the Women's Basketball Committee in 1899 until the fall of the AIAW in 1982, notions regarding the health benefits of exercise and sport, and the educational benefits of sports and games advocated by physical educators at the turn of the century, were carried by women physical educators in the emerging realm of women's sport. Here, in this newly emerging social space, with forethought and careful calculation they created organizations to sanction and legitimate a democratic and humanitarian approach to sport. Ever leery of the male approach to sport, they also
worked to insure that female athletes would have women organizing and leading their sport experiences.

In this chapter I have traced the occupation of coaching back to its professional roots: coaching, like sports for women, emerged from within the field of physical education. I have described the female model of sport and uncovered its most important underlying values: a commitment to the welfare of female athletes and an educational approach to sport. And, I have shown that the female approach to coaching has paralleled the "female model" of sport: it has always reflected the ideal that sport is a vehicle for education, and that coaches are educators.

These conclusions provide a point of reference for analysis of the empirical portion of this study, and give new meaning to the questions which frame it: To what extent does a "female model" of sport continue to exist in the philosophies, beliefs, and practices of women coaches? To what extent is there a "culture" among women coaches which reflects the "female model" of sport? Moreover, if a "female model" continues to exist in practice, is this in part a result of active resistance to the dominant sport culture by women coaches? Do women coaches recognize both a "male" and "female" model of sport, and do they consciously choose between one or the other? What factors influence the text and context of coaching, the practices and meaning coaches assign to their work?

Previous studies in the field of work and occupations show socialization into the profession to be crucial in shaping the ideals, expectations, and practices of group members. In an effort to better understand what coaching means to women coaches and the motivations behind their actions this chapter has made clear the ethos of the physical education profession and the connection between the profession, women leaders, and female coaches. In light of the findings in this chapter, and the recognition that 79%
percent of the women in this study were trained as physical educators, the following
questions are posed: To what extent should coaching as an occupation for women, and the
behavior of coaches, be understood in terms of their socialization as educators? If
professional socialization does not explain the behavior of coaches, what does? To what
extent does gender explain how coaches coach, and the meaning they assign their work?
How much is their behavior influenced by the demands created by the structure of
collegiate sport: the dominant sport culture? Finally, where do athletes fit in? Is the
meaning and practice of coaching constructed in interaction with female athletes? These
questions, and the ones raised above will be addressed in the empirical portion of this
study and in the following chapters of this dissertation.

In the next chapter I discuss the theories relevant to this study. The effort to
understand the nature of coaching as an occupation for women and the extent of
accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture requires the integration of
two distinct theoretical perspectives: at the macro level of analysis a theory which
explains the nature of sport as an aspect of culture; at the micro level of analysis a
theory which places women at the center and acknowledges the gendered nature of the
social world.
CHAPTER IV

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SPORT, WOMEN, AND WORK

The following discussion presents a theoretical schema from which to consider the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women and women coaches' accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture: the sport culture in modern industrialized society characterized by an emphasis on rationalization, productivity, and instrumentalism (Whitson, 1984:75). It is comprised of two parts and includes two levels of analysis, each of which serves as a partial explanatory device for this project. These two levels are points of reference from which to think about the female coach in the world of collegiate sport, taken together they foster a more comprehensive understanding of coaching as an occupation for women and the behavior of women coaches in the 1990's. More generally, taken together they help explain a specific instance of the relationship between agency, "the power of actors to operate independently of the determining social constraints of social structure" (Jary and Jary in McDermott, 1996:19) and structure, "social interaction and relations that endure over time" (Turner, 1991:489), in the realm of sport in modern capitalist society.

The first section sets the framework for this study and focuses on the nature of sport in modern society. Women collegiate coaches work in the realm of sport, thus it is necessary to have a general understanding of the nature of this realm. The nature and meaning of collegiate coaching and the behavior of women coaches is influenced by the nature of sport itself. While understanding the nature of modern sport is the starting point for understanding behavior within the realm of sport, the subjects under
...investigation are not simply actors, they are women coaches, they have specific statuses in the world of sport: an occupational status and a gender status. These statuses can also be thought of as objective locations in the social structure; these locations influence the meaning of coaching and how coaches interact with the larger sport culture.

Any effort to understand the nature and meaning of coaching and the behavior of women collegiate coaches must also acknowledge that gender conditions human experience. Thus, the attempt to understand women's coaching must recognize that men and women experience the world differently, and must attempt to understand coaching from the standpoint of women. The meaning women assign their work, and the behaviors they choose result from their interactions, as women, with the larger sports world and their more immediate work environment. The social actors under investigation here are women whose experiences reflect their status as women in a patriarchal society. The effort to theorize their actions must acknowledge the nature of this unique social location.

In addition to being women, the actors in this study are also workers. The meaning they assign their work and the motivation for their behavior is influenced not only by the larger social structure, the dominant sport culture, but by their occupational identity and their immediate work environment. The analysis of women's collegiate coaching must also recognize the influence of occupational identity and work environment on behavior and the construction of meaning. Moreover, it must recognize that work is a gendered institution.

These two objective locations: gender and occupation are discussed in the second part of this chapter. Here the nature of agency is addressed, in an effort to explain how gender and occupation may influence the behavior of women coaches and the meaning
they assign their practices. While it is acknowledged here that class status is an
objective location which influences behavior, and class status is addressed in this
chapter, the primary focus in this dissertation is on gender and occupation.

**The Nature of Sport: The Autonomy of Culture and the Hegemony of Dominant Groups**

Modern sport is rationalized, bureaucratized, and reflects the norms and values of
modern industrial society (Ingham, 1975), in capitalist societies it is subject to the
influence and interests of dominant classes. Sport, however, is an aspect of culture,
which, like all forms of culture has a degree of independence from other realms in
society (Althusser, 1971). While dominant classes use their resources to insure the
world of sport reflects their interests and values, subordinate groups garner their
forces to resist domination. As Hargreaves (1986:5) explains, "If ever there was an
"iron law" in human affairs it would seem to be that the exercise of power over people
engenders opposition and resistance." The propensity for actors to resist domination in
the realm of sport stems from the fact that sport is a constitutive process, a form of
cultural production continually created and recreated by human agents (Gruneau,
1983). In the end both dominant and subordinate groups will both lose and gain
something, but this mutual accommodation will result in the hegemony by one over the
other (Hargreaves 1986:7). The crucial point however is that hegemony is never final,
it is an active process which must continually be "renewed, limited, altered, and
changed" (Morgan 1994:71. As Hall explains,

Even though sport is dependent upon and reflective of the material conditions in the
society in which it exists, it also opposes those conditions. In other words, in a
cultural sense it is viewed as largely inconsequential and somewhat autonomous from
the dominant economic and political structures which govern social necessity.
Therein lies the fascinating paradox of sport. (1988:109-110)
The view that sport is separate from but reflective of the economic and political realm of society is central to neo-Marxist and cultural Marxist interpretations of sport, hegemony theory, critical theory, and the cultural studies approach to sport. This interpretation gained popularity among sport sociologists with the publication of works by Hargreaves (1982) and Gruneau (1983). Gruneau and Hargreaves concur that sport is a cultural practice that does not mirror society exactly, but neither does it transcend it. For Gruneau sport is a paradox of freedom and constraint where the dominant classes' attempt to establish cultural domination is never complete. For example, the emergence of the non-competitive "New Games" Movement in the United States in the late 1970's was a counter-cultural attempt to redefine the nature and meaning of sport against an increasingly rationalized, product oriented, and competitive sport culture (Donnelly, 1993). Hargreaves' analysis follows Gruneau's, he asserts: sport is a site of struggle which possesses a degree of autonomy within "more general hegemonic class relations" (Critcher, 1986:334-335).

Both Hargreaves and Gruneau eschew Marxist determinism for more dynamic interpretations of culture which acknowledge both agency and structure and the need to study sport in its historical context. Borrowing from Gramsci's analysis of hegemony and cultural studies school writers like E.P. Thompson, Raymond Williams, and Stuart Hall they argue, "Sport, as an element of culture is part of the contestation of meaning that arises in class societies" (Critcher, 1986:336).

The Centrality of Patriarchy

While the early works of Gruneau and Hargreaves set the stage for understanding the nature of sport in modern capitalist society, their depiction of sport is incomplete
because it fails to acknowledge the centrality of patriarchy in the development of modern sport. Hegemony theorists need to make gender relations central to their analysis (Critcher, 1986:337). This cannot be accomplished by simply inserting gender as a variable (Hargreaves, 1994). Rather, as Critcher asserts, "it involves recasting the theoretical framework. If that must involve encountering the unresolved antagonism between Marxism and feminism, then so be it" (1986:339).

While the cultural studies approach makes clear that sport is an aspect of culture which is created and recreated by human agents, and that dominant classes attempt to control sport are never final, it overemphasizes the role of capitalism and fails to acknowledge male domination in sport. A more accurate description of the nature of sport in modern society acknowledges the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy. As Hargreaves explains in a later work,

One of the most frequent mistakes made in the analysis of class formation and reproduction is to treat classes as preconstituted 'historical subjects' or as things-in-themselves, rather than as achieved effects of a continuous process, consisting of the interaction of many elements, both of a class and non-class nature. Accordingly, we treat class and non-class divisions in relation to sport and power, not by reducing the latter to class, or by opposing this or that factor to class as more or less important, but instead as affecting each other mutually, and as undergoing the process of construction together. Thus we argue that class and gender divisions are constructed together by examining how sport plays a part in the construction of both simultaneously. (1986:6)

This view of sport is reflected in socialist feminism and recognizes that capitalism and patriarchy are equal sources of exploitation and oppression for women and men. In recent years many sport sociologists and feminists have made gender central to their analysis of modern sport. From the perspective of socialist feminism (and some Marxist feminists) capitalism and patriarchy are equally privileged (Deem, 1988; Hall, 1985; Hargreaves 1990). The relationship between gender and class, capitalism
and patriarchy in sport is summarized here by Hall,

1. class cannot be understood accept in connection with gender and vice versa; 2. "class and gender categories have to be treated as emergent social practices by which groups are constituted and by which they constitute themselves' (Connell, 1983:37); 3. gender relations (like class relations) are in essence power relations whereby men as a social group, have more power over women, than women have over them; 4. the two sets of relations, whether they are called patriarchy and capitalism, relations of production and relations of reproduction, or class and gender, are somehow hinged together, but the problem of their articulation gets stuck in functionalism unless the structures themselves are reformulated in terms of the social practices (e.g. sport) that compose them (Connell, 1983:64-65); and, 5. in the final analysis, the way out of this jungle of abstraction towards and understanding of the capitalism/patriarchy relationship is through a focus on historical change (Connell, 1983), historical problems (Buechler, 1984), or the historical concrete (Beamish, 1984). (Hall 1985:113)

The radical feminist perspective sees patriarchy as even more central to the analysis of modern sport and asserts that patriarchy supersedes class domination. For radical feminists, hegemony in sport is best conceived as "male hegemony" (Birrell and Richter, 1987; Birrell and Theberge, 1994; Bryson, 1987; Dewar, 1991).

Although there are important differences between the various schools of thought regarding the make-up of power relations in modern sport, there are also important similarities. This project focuses on the assumption shared by a variety of theoretical schools of thought, "that sport and leisure are practices that are struggled over and that connect to the exercise of power" (Deem, 1988:352).

Sport then, is an aspect of culture which reflects the interests of dominant groups in a society characterized by capitalism and patriarchy. This "dominant sport culture" is characterized by the "male/professional" model of sport: it is rationalized and product oriented (see Chapter I). Despite the power of dominant groups to organize sport in their own interests and imbue sport with meanings and values which reflect these interests, individuals and groups struggle for the power to define and control their sport
experiences. The nature and meaning of sport then is dynamic and fluid rather than static, and it is influenced by the complex set of power relations which characterize a particular historical epoch. Women coaches do not necessarily accept the dominant sport culture, the emphasis on the sports product, sport as a commercial endeavor, or the increasingly rationalized and bureaucratic nature of sport. They may instead attempt to evade or subvert its control and struggle to construct meanings and experiences which reflect their view of sport.

Chapter III made clear that collegiate sport is controlled by men and that the governing organization for collegiate sport is a male dominated and controlled organization which, albeit rhetoric to the contrary, fosters a commercial and product oriented approach to collegiate sport (Hult, 1980). What is less clear is the extent to which women coaches accommodate to or resist this approach.

The cultural studies approach and hegemony theory assert that while actors may consent to their own domination, they may also resist it. From this perspective then, it is conceivable that despite the NCAA takeover, increased rationalization and bureaucracy, women coaches may resist the commercial, product oriented approach to sport. The point here is that sport is constructed by human agents; actors who struggle to make their sports in their own image and interests. Despite the influence of the dominant sport culture, individuals and groups work to control their sport experiences and imbue them with personal/group meaning.

The Nature of Agency: Resistance and Accommodation

Morgan (1994) describes five "levels and/or sense of agency" in the hegemonic literature including:
1. The privately accommodative.
2. The privately oppositional.
3. The collectively accommodative.
4. The collectively oppositional.
5. The radically transformative. (1994:99-100)

This study of female coaches focuses on the first two levels. According to Morgan the privately accommodative can be viewed as,

...comprising the personal goals and aims that inform the day to day actions of our lives...in the realm of leisure, what sports we play or observe as spectators. All of these are private projects, which, though momentous in their own right, are entirely inscribed within existing social relations and so typically reproduce them. (1994:99)

On the other hand the privately oppositional includes goals and aims that "run counter to existing social relations." Morgan explains,

This is accomplished through expressing discontent with dominant institutions and cultural forms by searching for alternatives within one's private life or one's family, or within some local group or other. The possibilities here are too numerous to cite in detail but may involve private acts of political dissent (individual acts of protest or defiance), or individual moral expression, or local ecological acts or nurturance and concern. In the case of sport, the possibilities are once again legion but center on the private and local pursuit of recreational sports, which run the gamut from "pure" play to the private appropriation of more highly organized sports to countercultural activities like the New Games movement. Though these acts take issue with existing social relations, their individual and local character ensures that they too fall within the bounds of prevailing social relations, and so are largely reproductive in their overall effect. (1994:99)

Morgan's point is that through their actions and the meanings they assign these, social agents can and do oppose the dominant sport culture; however, these acts of opposition are never transformative. Thus, the female coach may behave in ways which challenge the commercial and product oriented nature of collegiate sport, but her actions will not and cannot transform the nature of the dominant culture itself. This same point is made by Hargreaves,

When considering subordinate groups' involvement in sports, one of our major themes will be the ways in which they manage to evade and subvert controls, the respects in which the sport-power relation enables them to resist pressure from
dominant groups and to make tangible gains for themselves, as well as the ways they reproduce their subordination. (1986:6)

While there is some disagreement as to the transformative power of resistance within the realm of sport, the potential for freedom amidst structural constraint, it is argued here that while subordinate groups are ultimately incorporated into the dominant culture, their resistance effects the shape of the totality—it may not transform it, but it does have an effect on its overall nature (Coakley, 1994; Hargreaves, 1986). In other words, the dominant sport culture would be different without resistance to it. The hegemony of patriarchy and capitalism in collegiate sport may ultimately prevail, but so too will resistance to it; the dominant sport culture will be continuously challenged, as a result, it is subject to continuous change. The idea that privately oppositional actions may be "largely reproductive" is interpreted here to mean just that, largely, but not entirely.

Agency, the capacity to act independently against the constraints of social structure, is central to the analysis of modern sport. As Morgan explains

One can approach the agency question in this relational way by discussing the options and responses available to individual and collective agents in light of established institutional structures of sport. Thus one can point out that agents exert pressures against such structures, or that agents can modify such structures to accommodate their own peculiar interests, or finally that agents can find new options by acting through and within such structures. (1994:69)

The essential point for hegemony theorists is that the meanings and structures which make up the world of sport is the result of the relative capacity of groups to use resources to further their interests. This involves an ongoing process of interclass negotiations, the goal of which is control over sport structures and meanings. In adapting this idea to include the recognition of male dominance in collegiate sport, the process of negotiation would include not only class groups, but gender groups as well.

Most important for this study is the idea that "dominant classes cannot prevent the
underclasses from establishing their own social enclaves of meaning and their own renegade cultural forms" (1994:71). Alternative cultural forms are retained and constructed by individuals and groups who occupy subordinate social locations, groups who possess a world view different from the one put forth by the dominant group. As Williams has explained, these "structures of feeling" which emerge as a result of one's social location provide an "important source of resistance and opposition to the status quo" (Williams in Morgan, 1994:71). They are "symbolic statements of differential life chances and social locations" (Gruneau, 1983:96) representative of resistance to the dominant sport structures.

In the spirit of hegemony theory this project is in part, a search for the active construction and reproduction of oppositional sport meanings and behaviors, and the existence of subcultures of resistance. As Morgan states,

If the major structures of institutional sport are inscribed with the signature of the dominant class [and gender] and its prevailing systems of social relations, then a search for fractures within this framework must be directed to enclaves of meaning, value, and experience that reflect the desires and interests of the underclasses [and subordinate groups], and /or of those of the fractions of the ruling class that oppose the dominant moment of sport. These sorts of experiences and repositories of meaning, therefore, must be brought to light in order to register the forms of knowledge and cultural production they contain that challenge the dominant institutions and discourses of sport. (1994:76)

Moreover, it is an effort to describe the nature and extent of that resistance and its underlying motivation. While the opportunity for resistance may be limited in professional sport (Beamish, 1982; Gruneau, 1983) where the structure and values of sport most closely resemble those of work in a capitalist society, it is likely that there is more opportunity for resistance in women's collegiate sport where non-revenue producing sports are the rule not the exception (for men and women); and where alternative conceptions of sport may continue to exist in their residual form. However,
women's sport is in fact highly institutionalized and since the passage of Title IX in 1972 has experienced structural and philosophical changes characterized as emulation of the male sport model. Thus, the search for resistance should focus on private appropriations—small, seemingly insignificant efforts to control sport meanings and practices.

While alternative meanings and practices may exist in both "residual" and "emergent" forms, the focus in this study is on residual forms. This concept is used to refer to those sport meanings and practices which are older, but still active cultural forms. Hegemonists see these sport forms as an expression of class location; from a socialist feminist perspective residual sport forms are related to both gender and class.

Donnelly (1993) describes residual sport forms as those which have been left behind, or have failed to change with changes in the dominant sport culture; here the term is used more generally to imply sport forms which are representative of an earlier sport epoch and which resist incorporation into the dominant sport: the rationalized, commercial and product oriented world of modern sport.

There is according to Gruneau, a wide array of such elements in sport that act as surviving pressures against its modern technical and instrumental form. Some of the more salient of these include the ethos of fair play, the spontaneous enjoyment of sport, the qualitative appreciation of sport performances, the persistence of an ascriptively oriented, non-instrumental amateur code, and working class traditions of sport that trade on socialist notions of class solidarity. While any of these lingering class practices are capable of escalating, either individually or collectively, into self conscious political protests and/or oppositional practices, at the very least they count as forms of resistance to hegemonic assimilation and as buffers against assaults on the traditional integrity of sporting practices. (Morgan, 1994:77)

The struggle by women physical educators to develop women's sport organizations and control women's sport, is an example of resistance to hegemony. The fact that the NCAA finally prevailed over the AIAW to assume control of women's collegiate sport is an
example of the complex process of resistance, accommodation and incorporation to the
dominant sport culture (Dewar, 1991:161). However, hegemony is never complete, it
is subject to historical, political and social contexts which condition the individual and
collective agency of social actors. The empirical portion of this study illuminates this
historically conditioned dynamic struggle between women collegiate coaches and the
dominant sport culture.

Objective Structures and Human Agency

The previous section makes clear that sport is an aspect of culture which reflects the
political economy of society, and that it is a constitutive process. Social actors
continually create and recreate sport meanings and practices; at times accepting the
dominant sport culture, other times rejecting it. Sport as praxis is a continuous
process of negotiation between dominant and subordinate groups within historically
specific opportunity structures. While subordinate groups are eventually incorporated
into one hegemonic meaning system, their acts of resistance can force the dominant
culture to adapt; these adaptations may alter but can not transform the dominant
culture.

The cultural studies approach to sport illustrates the dynamic struggle between
agency and structure, freedom and constraint. But it fails to take account of the role of
objective structures for conditioning social agency. Women coaches actively construct
their own sport meanings, but they are not entirely free to do so; rather, they choose
among meanings and behaviors. They are not just 'social actors,' but individuals who
occupy specific social locations in the social order. The nature and meaning of their
work is influenced by the structural constraints imposed by their specific social
location as social actors. In order to fully understand the nature and meaning of work
for women coaches, it is necessary to recognize that gender, and occupation are social locations which condition human agency, and to illuminate the "perceptual and evaluative schemata that agents invest in their everyday life" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1991:12). Women coaches actively construct meaning in the world of sport, but they do so within the boundaries outlined by gender, occupational identity, and culture and structure of the occupational setting where they work.

Bourdieu's Structural Constructivism

Pierre Bourdieu's structural constructivism illuminates the extent to which agency is conditioned by structural constraints. According to Bourdieu, the objective aspects of social structure condition and constrain actions and meaning. This theory of human action is relevant to this study because it captures the reality of women coaches' experiences in the world of collegiate sport. While the coaches in this study are free to assign meaning to their work, to do so they both choose among existing cultural norms and values, and actively construct new ones. Turner explains,

Such structures constrain and circumscribe volition, but at the same time people use their capacities for thought, reflection, and action, to construct social and cultural phenomenon. They do so within the parameters of existing structures, but these structure are not rigid constraints but materials for a wide variety of social and cultural constructions. Acknowledging his structuralist roots, Bourdieu analogizes to the relation of grammar and language to make his point: the grammar of a language only loosely constrains the production of actual speech; in fact, it can be seen as defining the possibilities for new kinds of speech acts. And so it is with social and cultural structures: they exist independently of agents and guide their conduct, and yet they also create options, possibilities and paths for creative actions and for the construction of new and unique cultural and social phenomenon. (1991:508)

Bourdieu's structuralist constructivism parts from traditional structuralist theory in giving social actors more credit for their ability to adapt to and interact with social structures. At the same time Bourdieu asserts that there are objective structures
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which both condition and limit human action. This is relevant to this study because there are objective structures in women coaches' lives which influence and guide their actions and the meanings they assign these.

If it is good to recall, against certain mechanistic visions of action, that social agents construct social reality, individually and also collectively, we must be careful not to forget, as the interactionists and ethnomethodologists often do, that they have not constructed the categories they put to work in this work of construction (Bourdieu in Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:10)

Structural constructivism seeks to capture the reality of objective structural constraints and human subjectivity, hence, structuralism and constructivism.

First, we push aside mundane representations to construct the objective structures (spaces of positions), the distribution of socially efficient resources that define the external constraints bearing on interactions and representations. Second, we reintroduce the immediate, lived experience of agents in order to explicate the categories of perception and appreciation (dispositions) that structure their action from inside. It should be stressed that, although the two moments of analysis are equally necessary, they are not equal: epistemological priority is granted to objectivist structure over subjectivist understanding. Application of Durkheim's first principle of the "sociological method," the systematic rejection of preconceptions, must come before analysis of the practical apprehension of the world from the subjective standpoint. For the viewpoints of agents will vary systematically with the point they occupy in objective social space. (Bourdieu in Bourdieu and Wacquant 1991:11)

According to Bourdieu there is a correspondence between social structures and mental structures and the "cumulative exposure to certain social conditions instill in individuals an ensemble of durable and transposable dispositions that internalize the necessities of the extant social environment, inscribing inside the organism the patterned inertia and constraints of external reality" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1991:13). But symbolic systems are social products; they do not simply mirror social relations.

Using the concepts 'field' and 'habitus' Bourdieu attempts to break down the false dichotomy between agency and structure. Instead he emphasizes their relational
aspects, while also illuminating the importance of historical conditions and the
pervasiveness of power in social action. From this point of view agency and structure
are not polar opposites, but two sides of the same coin, ultimately and always related.

Bourdieu describes a field as: a structure of probabilities, a relational configuration
endowed with a specific gravity; a set of objective, historical relations between
positions anchored in certain forms of power (or capital); and a place of conflict and
competition. Habitus consists of: a set of historical relations "deposited" within
individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception,
appreciation and action; a structuring mechanism made up of dispositions and past
experiences (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1991:16-19). Bourdieu's actors are neither
blank slates nor cultural dupes; as a result they not only help to reproduce social
structure, but contribute to the ongoing process of social change.

There is action, and history, and conservation or transformation of structures only
because there are agents, but agents who are acting and efficacious only because they
are not reduced to what is ordinarily put under the notion of individual and who, as
socialized organisms, are endowed with an ensemble of dispositions which imply both
the propensity and the ability to get into and to play the game. (Bourdieu in Bourdieu
and Wacquant, 1991:19)

For Bourdieu the most important objective structure is social class. While actors in
a situation may actively construct meanings, the meanings they construct and the
behaviors they choose are influenced by their class location. In an adaptation of
interactionist theory and a critique of the "astructural" nature of interactionism,
Bourdieu emphasizes that interaction is "embedded in structure and the structure
constrains what is possible" (Turner, 1991:510). Following Marx, Bourdieu argues
that actors have important class interests; thus, class is the most important objective
structure for influencing perceptions, dispositions, and actions.

The women coaches in this study occupy similar class locations. They have similar
levels of education (most possess a Bachelors and Masters degree), are engaged in the same occupation (college coaching), and have roughly similar incomes (This varies most by years of work experience. Salaries range from $25,000-$35,000 for young coaches; $35,000-$65,000 for experienced and old coaches depending on the schools NCAA affiliation, Division I, II, or III and the sport coached). Following Bourdieu, the habitus of women coaches is influenced by their class status, but class is not the only objective structure which imprints perceptions, dispositions, and influences social action. In patriarchal societies human agency is also influenced and constrained by gender.

While structural constructivism theory makes clear that social actors are not completely free and that social action has context, it fails to acknowledge the centrality of gender as an objective location which constrains experience. Women have distinct experiences as a result of their unique social location as women in a patriarchal society. Thus, gender is an "objective fact" of the social structure, a relationship of power which, like social class, influences human agency; in this case the behavior of coaches and their attitudes, values, and beliefs.

Gender as an Objective Structure which Influences Agency

The effort to understand the behavior of women coaches and the meaning they assign their work must take into consideration that in patriarchal societies women and men experience the world differently. To fail to acknowledge gender as central to "structures of feeling" is to pretend that this is not the case. As Jaggar asserts,

Women share common experiences of oppression which, though they may be mediated by class, race and ethnicity, nevertheless cut across class lines. All women are liable to rape, to physical abuse from men in the home, and to sexual objectification and sexual harassment; all women are primarily responsible for housework, while all
women who have children are held primarily responsible for the care of those children; and virtually all women who work in the market work in sex-segregated jobs. In all classes women have less money, power and leisure than men. (1983:77-8 in Whelehan, 1995:62)

In her book *Lenses of Gender*, Sandra Lipsitz Bem argues that, "cultural categories construct and constrain social reality by providing the historically specific conceptual framework through which we perceive our social world" (1993:125). Using the concept "lenses of gender" Lipsitz Bem reveals the "hidden assumptions about sex and gender which are embedded in cultural discourses, social institutions, and individual psyches that invisibly and systematically reproduce male power in generation after generation, and shape how people perceive, conceive and discuss social reality" (1993:2). According to Lipsitz Bem we see the world through three lenses of gender: androcentrism or male centeredness; gender polarization; and biological essentialism.

The androcentric lens perpetuates the notion that the male experience is the norm, insures that men will be judged superior to women, and that women's experiences will be marginalized. The gender polarization lense insures that men and women are viewed as different and that sex will be a crucial determinant of social experience. The lense of biological essentialism lies at the base, or below the other two cultural lenses. It works to support androcentrism and gender polarization by explaining their existence as rooted in biology and arguing that they are therefore 'natural' and inevitable. These gender lenses help reproduce male power in society. Lipsitz Bem explains,

The lenses of androcentrism, gender polarization, and biological essentialism systematically reproduce male power in two ways. First, the discourses and social institutions, in which they are embedded automatically channel females and males into different and unequal life situations. Second, during enculturation, the individual gradually internalizes the cultural lenses and thereby becomes motivated to construct and identity that is consistent with them. (3)

Gender influences and constrains the actions and perceptions of women coaches
because they have internalized the cultural lenses which constitute patriarchal society.

How then, exactly, does this internalization occur? Lipsitz Bem acknowledges that socialization theories, psychodynamic theories, identity construction, and social-structural theories contribute to our understanding of the process which transforms male and female children into masculine and feminine adults and adds to these her own "enculturated-lens theory of individual gender formation" (137). In adding this perspective Lipsitz Bem locates the individual in a social and historical context which includes androcentrism and gender polarization and describes how society creates "gendered cultural natives" (138) who help to perpetuate androcentrism, gender polarization, and ultimately patriarchy.

The point should be clear. The kinds of human beings that children and adults become depend on their daily social experiences; and these social experiences are, in turn, pre-programmed by institutionalized social practices—which are themselves but one embodiment of the same cultural lenses that are also embodied in cultural discourse.

(140)

Androcentrism and gender polarization transfer the gendered lenses of the culture to the psyche of the individual via social practices which place men and women in different positions in the social structure. These social practices insure that men and women will have different experiences and a different view of reality. In addition, the emphasis on androcentrism insures that women and men will learn that the male perspective is what counts and the female experience is secondary or unimportant.

The focus of Lipsitz Bem's analysis is the construction and reproduction of gender inequality in society. It is used here to illustrate the role that gender plays in conditioning social experience. Women are cultural natives who, like all cultural natives have undergone a process of enculturation. As actors living in a culture embedded in androcentrism and gender polarization they learn to think, feel, and act in
terms of these cultural lenses; and thus help to reproduce them. The process of enculturation however is not equally effective, some individuals reject the androcentric and gender polarizing notions of patriarchal culture. These 'gender non-conformists,' "challenge the presumed naturalness of the link between the sex of the body and the gender of the psyche. And because they fail to follow the gender scripts of the culture, they must find a way to construct a viable identity in a society that insistently denies them their legitimacy" (167). Thus, the practices of women coaches and the meanings they assign their work may be related to the extent to which they consciously and unconsciously accept and/or reject these gender scripts. Gender influences action and feeling via enculturation in androcentric and gender polarized notions, but the extent of enculturation varies with individuals.

**Occupation, Gender, and Human Agency**

In a general description of the forces which influence the behavior of coaches Coakley (drawing on research by Edwards, 1973) includes: 1). What actors bring to the setting; 2). The organizational structures they confront; 3). Interactions with others in the work setting. These three dimensions: personality, organizational structure, and interactions are a good starting point for an analysis of the work world of women coaches and the objective constraints of occupation on human agency. But it is a gender neutral analysis which takes the male experience to be the norm.

Under the rubric of personality Coakley includes general cultural beliefs, asserting that these influence a coach's behavior. Since most Americans approve of autocratic leadership styles for coaches, the inference is that most coaches assume this style. Despite the influence of larger cultural beliefs on individuals, much sociological
research shows that social environment has more effect on behavior than does more distant and abstract cultural beliefs. This may explain why Eitzen and Pratt (in Coakley, 1994:191) find that female coaches have a leadership style that differs from their male counterparts: they are more likely to require their athletes to maintain good grades and display good sportsmanship; in short their approach is more educational, perhaps it is also more democratic. Their approach may reflect their socialization as women and as women physical educators; not abstract cultural beliefs about coaching.

As members of an occupational group women coaches share similar socialization experiences, both formal and informal. A fully socialized individual has acquired the knowledge and skills appropriate to his/her occupation, internalized occupational norms, and has developed an occupational identity (Moore in Sage, 1975:436). For women coaches this occupational identity includes the notion that coaching is an educational endeavor. Thus, Coackley's "personality," or what coaches "bring to the setting," would better fit women coaches if thought of in terms of occupational socialization and occupational identity.

Coaching behavior can also be influenced by "organizational settings and pressures". As Sage asserts, "Occupations are performed in a social context which is characterized by norms, values, and behaviors which are distinct to occupational categories (1975:435)." These pressures may include: 1). coaches are held totally responsible for the outcomes of competitive activities that are highly spontaneous; 2). these competitive activities are highly visible, 3). results are publicly reported; and 4). the success rates of coaches are objectively measured by wins and losses (Coackley, 1994:194). Thus, while coaches often experience a large measure of autonomy, the responsibility which accompanies it may make coaching difficult. More importantly,
these "pressures" influence coaching practices.

In addition, while organizational settings might appear to be gender neutral, in fact they are not. Most work settings are in fact segregated by sex, and even when they are not, sex specific criteria are used to evaluate workers (Martin, 1988). In other words, despite the objective measures of success, what matters is the value assigned to these measures; this varies with the sex of the worker. Coackley's description of the influence of organizational setting fails to recognize that women are evaluated not only in terms of their work role, but in terms of their gender role. Because women are expected to perform their work in ways consistent with their gender, objective evaluations are never entirely so; rather, expectations too are gendered.

Despite the dominant sport culture's emphasis on production and objective measures of success, women coaches continue to be evaluated in terms of their gender role; in terms of their effectiveness as caretakers. This is not to imply that they are not also evaluated in terms of wins/losses, only that the evaluation process is not gender neutral, and that female coaches are often held to two often contradictory standards. As Statham explains, "The cultural factors that shape the attitudes and behaviors of supervisors, colleagues, and clients, interact with and operate through structural features of the occupation and the specific working conditions within the organizational context" (1988:218).

Finally, unless one works in isolation, work involves social interaction with others. These interactions have an important impact on the nature of the work experience and the behavior of workers. Workers occupy a specific social status, but this status is influenced by others in the workers role set. Merton explains (1957)

I begin with the premise that each social status involves not a single associated role, but an array of roles. This basic feature of social structure can be registered by the
distinctive but not formidable term, role set. To repeat then, by role set I mean that
compliment of role relationships in which persons are involved by virtue of
occupying a particular social status. (1957:110).

Coackley uses Merton's concept of role set to illustrate role strain experienced by
coaches. Because coaches have to answer to different people with different expectations
their behavior is often motivated by efforts to reduce the strain including: generating
support for their programs, gaining control over their programs and people associated
with them, and being expedient in their interactions (carefully weighing the benefits
and costs of various interactions and actions) (Coakley, 1994:195-198). In this way
the coach gains a measure of control over his/her work.

The coach's role set, like other aspects of the work environment is not gender
neutral. Expectations by role set members may conflate occupational expectations with
gender expectations. And while women coaches interact with many of the same
constituents as their male counterparts, their roles sets are not mirror images.
Although women's sports receive more media attention and fan support than in years
past, especially those women's sports which are revenue producing, overall they
typically receive less media attention than male sports programs (even other non-
revenue producing male sports). In addition, administrators, mostly male, are
typically less concerned with non-revenue producing sports and sports with little
alumni support. Thus, while the female coaches' role set may include these members,
their expectations may be minimal and their influence on the coach's work life
inconsequential. This may create more space for women coaches to control their labor.
As Merton explains,

Thus, even in those potentially unstable structures in which the members of a role-
set hold contrasting expectations of what the occupant should do, the latter is not
wholly at the mercy of the most powerful among them. Moreover, the structural
variations of engagement in the role- structure, which I have mentioned, can serve to
reinforce the relative power of the status occupant. For to the extent that powerful
members of his role set are not centrally concerned with this particular relationship, they will be less motivated to exercise their potential power to the full. Within varying margins of his activity, the status-occupant will then be free to act as he would. (1957:114)

The woman coach's role set includes female athletes whose expectations and needs influence the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women. While the concept of the role set is important for illuminating the extent to which social interaction influences the nature and meaning of work, it can not be used as a gender neutral blueprint for all coaches, nor can the "role strain" experienced by male coaches be assumed to exist for women. Like alienation, role strain has to be shown not inferred.

While Coackley's analysis of the factors which influence the behavior of coaches help to describe the structural imperatives confronting all coaches; a more accurate analysis would begin with an understanding of work as a gendered institution. It is a social institution embedded with the gender relations characteristic of all social institutions in a patriarchal society. It both embodies gender relations and helps to reproduce them (Reskin and Padavic, 1994:5).

Objective Structures: The Social Context of Human Agency

This study focuses on the nature of human agency and the intersection of agency and structure in a particular realm of society at a specific period in history. It is a study about the way women coaches interact with a changed and changing sport culture and how they feel about what they do. The women in this study share similar experiences; as women, as workers, and as members of the middle class. The meanings they create and the actions they choose are influenced by these objective structures. Together, class, gender, and work form a context which influences and limits their ability to freely
choose action and assign meaning. Women college coaches are actively involved in the construction of meaning in their work worlds; but their creativity is limited by the objective structures of gender, class, and work. Their accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture, the way they act to inhibit or insure the hegemony of the dominant sport structure and the incorporation of women's collegiate sport into one singular 'sport logic,' is an act of agency conditioned and constrained by objective structures.

The Occupational Sub-Culture of Women Coaches

As actors who share experiences of class, gender, and work, women coaches are subject to similar objective constraints; it is in the context of these constraints that actions and meanings emerge. As a group they, "generate categories of thought, systems of speech, signs of distinction, forms of mythology, modes of appreciation, tastes, and lifestyle" (Turner, 1994:513).

It is possible that there exists among women coaches a sub-culture tied together by their unique experiences of gender, class, and work. An occupational sub-culture of women collegiate coaches.

Culture here refers to the way different threads of similarly placed individuals' lives work, leisure, family, religion, community, etc. are woven into a fabric of tradition, consisting of customs, ways of seeing, beliefs, attitudes, values, standards, styles, ritual practices, etc., giving them a definite character and identity. It is thus we speak here of working class culture, men's and women's culture, black culture, bourgeois culture and youth culture. (Hargreaves, 1986:9).

Shared experiences may produce shared interpretations. As Griswold explains,

Because cultural objects are interpreted not in isolation, but by interacting human beings, it seems likely that distinct interpretations, or reinterpretations, will continue to emerge from groups having distinct experiences. (1994:91)
Culture, described here more simply as "shared world view" of women collegiate coaches, can be both a reflection of, and act of resistance to the dominant culture. The aggregation of actions, attitudes, values, and beliefs among women coaches may produce an occupational sub-culture which is a source of power for resisting the dominant sport culture. It may also help to insure it is perpetuated, that women coaches are incorporated into the dominant sport culture. As Hargreaves explains,

Cultures in this sense are profound sources of power, reproducing divisions here, challenging and rebelling against them there, while in many ways accommodating subordinate groups to the social order. (1986:9)

Given the historical legacy of the female approach to sport and the relationship between women's physical education and coaching, the existence of an occupational sub-culture among women coaches which challenges the dominant sport culture would not be unlikely. If this is true, then the fear that the "woman's voice" no longer exists may prove to be unfounded. The question would then become, How resilient is a sub-culture without organizational forms to sustain it? Moreover, since coaching is an occupation which involves interaction between coaches and athletes, how might this process of interaction contribute to the maintenance of this sub-culture? As Bourdieu makes clear, "culture has a structure that is itself a reality, sui generis, and that can be analyzed like any other reality" (Bourdieu in Turner, 1991:518).

In the chapters which follow the agency of women coaches is explored, with special attention to the shared feeling, attitudes, and values which constitute a distinct occupational sub-culture. Following Geertz (1973), this analysis of culture is 'an interpretive search for meanings' whose understanding will help illuminate underlying motivations for actions and behavior.
Summary

Sport in modern capitalist society is an aspect of culture which both reflects the political economy of society and exhibits a degree of autonomy from it. It is a gendered institution which reinforces the notion of gender difference and perpetuates gender inequality. While sport reflects the power relationships in society, as an aspect of culture it is also a constitutive process constructed by individuals who struggle to control the meanings and practices of their sports; individuals who struggle to insure sports reflect their attitudes, values, and beliefs: their world view. While sport reflects the interests of those who control the resources in society, the dominant groups' ability to control sport is never final. Acts of resistance to hegemony insure that the dominant culture will have to adapt to the needs and demands of subordinate groups, but these adaptations also insure that subordinate groups will ultimately be incorporated.

Collegiate sport, like sport in general reflects the political economy of capitalism and patriarchy. Governed by the NCAA, a male controlled and dominated institution, collegiate sport is a commercial enterprise which reflects the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy in the realm of sport. Until the NCAA takeover of women's collegiate sport in 1982, women's sport had a separate governing structure which embodied the interests and values of women physical educators: broad participation and an educational approach to sport. The loss of that structure has lead some authors to assert that without a separate governing structure, women coaches have little choice but to "accept the male model."

Despite the loss of organizational carriers for the "female model of sport," the approach to sport reflected in this model may continue to exist in the practices, attitudes, beliefs, and values of women coaches. Women coaches may resist the dominant sport culture and its product oriented approach to sport and athletes; they may also
accommodate to it. The agency of women coaches may include both acts of resistance and accommodation. While women coaches may choose actions and assign meaning, their freedom to do so is constrained by the objective structures of gender and occupation. As actors they struggle to make their sports in their own image; however, the unintended result may be sport practices and values which ultimately work to perpetuate their subordinate status and relative powerlessness vis a vis the dominant sport culture.

The shared experience of gender, occupational socialization and work environment may contribute to the construction of an occupational subculture which, in the absence of organizational structures, may be a carrier for the "female model" of sport. The existence of such a sub-culture, like acts of resistance and accommodation, can not simply be inferred, it must be shown to exist.

The theoretical schema presented here is a framework for understanding the nature of coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's. It is used here to analyze the empirical portion of this study of women collegiate coaches and to answer the research questions which guide this investigation:

1. How do women coaches experience their work; what values and meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and what are the social sources of their approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?
5. To what extent does a woman's reason for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?
To understand the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women and the extent to which they accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture, 46 in-depth interviews were conducted with female coaches coaching in NCAA Division I, II, and III during 1995-96. In the following section the method, sample, and strategies for analysis of the empirical portion of this study are discussed. The data collected in this portion of the study were analyzed to answer the research questions posed earlier in Chapter I.

Method as Perspective: Qualitative vs. Quantitative

In recent years several researchers have noted the need for more qualitative approaches to studying women and sport (Binde, 1989; Boutilier and SanGiovanni, 1983; Dewar, 1993; Hargreaves, 1993b), and women's work (Fuchs Epstein, 1990). The collective call for more qualitative research stems from the recognition that certain questions can only be answered by becoming more closely involved in the life world of one's subjects. Qualitative techniques are "grounded" in real life experience, language and categories of subjects. They allow researchers to listen with their eyes and ears; and to probe more deeply into areas which subjects deem important. By allowing subjects to "speak for themselves" relevant themes and issues emerge which both reveal the subject's world view and disjunctions between researchers assumptions and the subject's reality. Qualitative techniques are most appropriate when the purpose of the
study is to uncover deep meaning and the complex details and motivations behind human action, when little is known about the topic under investigation, and when the research is exploratory in nature. It is also appropriate when the purpose of the study is to verify hypothesis and prove theory, and when the effort to do so necessarily implies the examination of the rich details of human experience. Qualitative methods were chosen here because the purpose of this study is to explore the deep meaning of coaching for women, and to uncover the complex details and motivations behind their actions. Moreover, little is known about the nature of women's coaching; concepts and themes, grounded in subjects real experiences, need to be developed.

This study involves both inductive and deductive reasoning. It includes both the attempt to understand the nature and meaning of coaching, to generate categories, themes and theory (an exploratory, inductive approach to research), and the effort to determine the extent and nature of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture (a test of existing theory and a deductive approach to data analysis).

The researchers choice of methodology, whether quantitative or qualitative, should ultimately be determined by the research questions (Judd et al., 1991). Thus, the fact that quantitative techniques yield little in the way of in-depth understanding is not a drawback, but a methodological fact, and one that researchers simply live with in order to answer the questions they have posed. So too with qualitative research. The inability to generalize to a larger population at some known level of statistical reliability is inherent in qualitative research and is not viewed here as a shortcoming, but a matter of choice. In qualitative research one simply chooses detailed knowledge and in-depth understanding over generalizability at some level of statistical certainty in an effort to answer the questions which have been formulated. Moreover, in field research when one
uses qualitative methods, one develops working hypotheses anchored in real situations, hypotheses based on first-hand knowledge, hypotheses that would inform subsequent research and, if necessary, be tested on a larger scale with larger samples.

While in-depth interviewing brings the researcher close to the life world of the subjects under investigation, the understanding which emerges has been filtered through the researcher. Subjectivity is inherent in all forms of social science. The participant-observer who experiences what his/her subjects do still interprets those experiences in light of his/her own world view. Although in-depth interviewing brings the researcher close to the subjects point of view, the actual process of interpretation always involves subjectivity.

Following Glaser and Strauss (1967) it is argued here that experience and personal insight are appropriate guides to understanding in social science research. As Reinharz (1979) suggests, the researcher must use his/her experiences and reflections to understand human behavior. In qualitative research the point is not to reduce subjectivity, for such a feat is virtually impossible, but to treat it as a matter of fact and use it as a guide to understanding. This is best accomplished if the researcher enters the field with some knowledge of the issue at hand, but is not constrained by preconceived notions, categories, or theories; at the same time using his/her own personal experience as a way of understanding what subjects mean and feel.

This approach to qualitative research is referred to by Reinharz (1979) as "experiential analysis," a methodology which rejects the subject/object dualism characteristic in social science research and argues that subjectivity should be exploited to the researchers advantage. While Reinharz uses this term to explain a particular approach to participant-observation research her ideas regarding experience and
subjectivity can also be applied to in-depth interviewing, especially when the researcher has "shared experiences" with the subjects.

In conducting the in-depth interviews in this study I immersed myself (as much as possible with this method) in the life world of coaches while making a conscious effort to suspend pre-conceived categories of understanding. This stance of detachment allowed me to think theoretically about (Glaser and Strauss, 1964:226) individual interviews and the data in aggregate. At the same time, I allowed myself to reflect on and integrate my own shared subjective experiences and insights; doing so helped me to understand the subtleties and complexities of coaching in the 1990's, and to make sense of the shades of meaning and contradictions which make-up the world of coaching. Moreover, this approach insured that the contradictions which emerged in the interviews would not be recorded simply as "contradictions," but would be researched further until their underlying meanings and contextual influences became more apparent.

Interviews, Observations, and a Questionnaire

Data for the empirical portion of this study were gathered using three methods: in-depth interviews, observation, and a short fixed response questionnaire administered to the subjects interviewed. In-depth interviewing was chosen as the technique most appropriate for uncovering both how women coaches do their work, and how they feel about it. Interviews constitute the bulk of data for analysis in this study. Field notes were used to record cultural artifacts of coaching, materials which are part of the culture of coaching and stand as symbols of the meaning that coaching has for women coaches, and as evidence of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture. Field notes focused on the physical environment of the female coaches work world.
The fixed response questionnaire was used to gather more data on coaches perceptions of collegiate sport, preferences regarding women's collegiate sport, and the extent to which their coaching practices reflect a "male/professional model" or "female model" approach. Each subject interviewed was asked to complete a brief fixed response questionnaire (see appendix A). This questionnaire was administered at the end of the interview when time provided, or was filled out by the subject and returned to the researcher after the interview. Forty three questionnaires were received (93%); three were not returned. The questionnaire is discussed in more detail in the following section.

The data obtained from in-depth interviews, field notes, and the fixed response questionnaire contribute to the "picture" of the nature of coaching as an occupation for women which emerges from this study. This data is used to understand both the nature and meaning of coaching in the 1990's, and the nature and extent of women coaches' accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study is a non-probability sample; therefore, relevant findings can not be generalized to the larger population at a known level of certainty. However, because this sample is also a purposive or judgement sample, some degree of generalizability may be acceptable. The conclusions reached here may also apply to other women coaches currently employed at the collegiate level whose environmental influences and experiences could be shown to be similar to the subjects studied here. In cases where researchers have carefully chosen subjects based on knowledge of the population and issue of concern, cautious generalizing is acceptable (Judd et al., 1991). Finally, this sample includes quota sampling techniques which further insures its
representation as a sub-sample of the larger population of women collegiate coaches.

Interviews for this study were obtained two different ways, through snowball sampling and cold calls, but most often by using a snowball technique. To insure that the final sample would not be biased towards individuals who, because of association and/or friendship, hold similar views and have similar values and attitudes, the snowballing included several different points of entry. The first interviews conducted were obtained by contacting individuals known to me based on previous experience in the field of collegiate athletics. In these early interviews, and in all other interviews conducted, subjects were asked for names of others who might consent to be interviewed. Those who were named were then contacted by phone. Using the original interviewee as a sponsor, I explained the research and asked if they might be interested in participating.

Using a variety of published sources I also obtained the names and phone numbers of college coaches employed within two and a half hours driving distance from my residence. I made cold calls to several coaches at their place of employment, introduced myself, explained the study, then asked if they might be interested in participating. The vast majority of coaches contacted in this study, whether through snowballing or cold calls, agreed to participate. A total of fifty three coaches were contacted resulting in forty six interviews, a participation rate of 86%. Three coaches declined from the outset (all because of time constraints) and three were willing to participate but a suitable interview time could not be arranged. One coach did not show up for a scheduled interview.

Although it is important to consider the bias of willingness and availability to participate in any non-probability sample, the high participation rate in this study implies that the sample is not over-represented by coaches who had more time or were
more willing to participate. Most of the coaches in the sample were very busy, but still made time to do the interview. The high participation rate can be explained by the fact that snowballing naturally creates sponsors and increases probability of participation. My own personal contacts were also instrumental in helping me gain access to potential interviewees, without their sponsorship several coaches would not have made time to talk to me. Finally, many coaches were genuinely interested in participating in a study focusing on their profession, and saw it as a way to contribute something to the field.

While this sample may not be biased by subject's willingness to participate, it does reflect the number and type of coaches available to interview. Only 47.7% of women coaches were coaching women's collegiate sports in the United States in 1996. While regional statistics are unavailable, there is no reason to believe that New England colleges and universities do not reflect the country as a whole, although regional biases in sport types may create some differences. In addition, if a school offers seven women's sports (in 1996 the national average was 7.5) it necessarily employs seven coaches, less than half of whom are likely to be women: approximately three coaches per institution. However, not all schools employ full-time coaches (a requirement for this study) for all sports. Therefore, the availability of subjects for this study is related first and foremost, to the number of women currently employed as full-time collegiate coaches in colleges and universities in New England.

Forty five of the forty six coaches who comprise this sample were employed as full-time coaches at the time of the interview, one had recently been appointed to an administrative position (in the same year as the interview.). Forty five of the Forty six coaches were employed at a college or university in New England, one was employed outside of New England at a university in the Mid West. There is a regional bias in the
sample which is reflected in the types of sports coached by individuals interviewed for
this study. Certain sports are more popular in the East than in other parts of the
country (i.e., field hockey, lacrosse), and others are less popular (gymnastics, golf).
These regional preferences determine the types of intercollegiate sports offered at
colleges and universities and influence the overall profile of the population of coaches in
New England. Consequently, the sample selected for this study reflects these same
biases. In short, the percentage of women coaching a sport plus regional preferences by
sport, combined to influence the number and profile of the pool of available subjects for
this study. There were, for example, ample numbers of field hockey, and lacrosse
coaches to interview: 97% of the coaches in field hockey are women, as are 93% of
coaches for lacrosse, and both are popular women's sports in New England. It was also
easy to find basketball, softball, and volleyball coaches to interview, but there were few
women's swimming, track, cross country, and soccer coaches (see Table 2) to contact.

The non-probability, purposive sample collected for this study is also a quota
sample. Coaches were selected according to NCAA Division in an effort to roughly
approximate the work environment of the larger population of female coaches. In
addition I made every attempt to include variety and avoid biases along dimensions which
influence the experience of coaching such as: type of sport coached; type of institution:
private vs. public and large vs. small; and conference affiliation. A combination of
judgement and quota sampling produced a sample which reflects the important categories
of variation in women's coaching. Those variations are briefly discussed in the following
section.

The experience of coaching is influenced by the NCAA divisional affiliation of the
institution the coach is employed by; women coaches are not simply coaches, but
individuals who coach in a particular NCAA Division. Coaches from all three NCAA divisions are included in the sample. In selecting coaches for inclusion in this sample I tried to approximate the proportion in each Division in the nation overall. The final sample includes eighteen coaches coaching in Division I, five coaches in Division II, and twenty four coaches in Division III (see Table 2). These numbers roughly approximate the proportion, by Division, of NCAA institutions in the country (Div. I 305 (34%), Div. II 246 (27%); Div. III 352 (39%)). They are also a reflection of the Divisional affiliation of New England colleges and Universities, and the availability of subjects. The final sample includes 18 coaches from Div. I (39%), 5 from Div. II (11%), and 23 from Div. III (50%).

Table 2: Interview Sample: Number of Coaches by NCAA Affiliation of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCAA Division</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Schools Sample</th>
<th>% Schools Nation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39% (18)</td>
<td>34% (302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11% (5)</td>
<td>27% (247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50% (23)</td>
<td>39% (357)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: NCAA Guide for College Bound Student Athlete, 1995-96

The experience of coaching also varies by sport, team sports differ to an extent from individual sports, and revenue producing sports are different from non-revenue producing sports. In an effort to capture to overall experience of coaching, to see the similarities as well as the differences, I made every effort to include a wide variety of women's intercollegiate sports in the sample (within the limitations discussed above). As a result thirteen sports are represented in the sample: field hockey, lacrosse,
basketball, softball, track and field, cross country, ice hockey, tennis, swimming, volleyball, crew, synchronized swimming, and squash (see Table 3). This list includes eight of the ten most popular intercollegiate sports for women (Acosta and Carpenter, 1994). Missing from this sample are golf, and soccer. Their absence is a result of a combination of factors including: availability (discussed above), and/or willingness of subjects to participate. In an effort to avoid bias by sport I set a limit of nine interviews per sport type, three per Division. As it became more difficult to find coaches to interview the Division guideline was adjusted slightly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% female coaches in country 1994</th>
<th>% schools w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>basketball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field hockey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ice hockey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacrosse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>softball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>squash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swim/diving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synch. swimming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tennis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>track</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volleyball</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coaches who coached more than one sport were categorized according to the sport they identified as their primary interest.

Work environment has an important influence on work experience. In an effort to avoid bias which might emerge from the influences of work environment I limited the number of interviews at each institution to three, but typically conducted only one or
two per institution. As a result thirty one colleges are represented in this sample. To protect the identity of subjects in this study, the names of those institutions are not included here.

Attitudes about work are also influenced by age, and by the number of years employed in a profession. In an effort to avoid conclusions biased by the age of the participants in this study and to be able to explore changes in women's coaching, I made an effort to obtain a sample which included variation in age and years employed in coaching. This was made possible because of my knowledge of the coaching profession and by asking respondents specifically for names of both new and more experienced coaches (This typically yielded variation in age as well, but when it did not I specifically asked for names of young and older coaches). The importance of obtaining variation by age and years of coaching experience for this study is discussed below in the section on analytic procedures.

The final sample obtained here is a purposive quota sample. The biases are regional and reflect those biases which might emerge from snowball sampling and the availability of subjects to participate. It is believed that the biases in this sample do not significantly influence the data collected here and that overall, the sample reflects the reality of collegiate coaching as it is experienced by women collegiate coaches in New England in the 1995-96

**Interview Guide and Questionaire**

The interview guide and questionnaire (see Appendix A and B) used in this study were designed to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How do women coaches experience their work; what values and meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and what are the social sources of their approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female"?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?
5. To what extent does a woman's reason for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?

The interview guide is semi-structured. The questions in the guide were designed to answer the research questions posed in this study, and to allow for open ended responses and additional probing. While most questions were asked of most subjects, the guide was designed both to address certain issues directly and to open up areas of conversation which would lead the researcher to a better understanding of the nature of women's coaching in the 1990's.

The following is a brief discussion of the interview guide describing the seven major topic areas and their relationship to research questions. While certain sections of the interview guide were designed to answer specific research questions, there is also considerable overlap, with several sections leading to responses which helped to answer a single question. As a whole the interview guide was designed so that a number of different items, some in different sections of the guide, would contribute to answering the research questions posed. It was also designed so that the interview would have a natural, conversational flow to it, and so that detours could be made to follow areas and issues that subjects deemed important. Thus in some cases, answers to specific research questions emerged from bits and pieces of the data, and not as the single answer to any one or two items in the interview guide.

Part I of the interview guide, the section titled "Profile," was designed to produce demographic variables on age, race/ethnicity, marital status, number of years in coaching, income, level of education, and major/minor areas of study in college; and variables related to work environment such as the school's NCAA Divisional affiliation,
department type, and the percentage of women coaches in the department. These variables were used to describe individual subjects and the sample overall. In addition, the variables NCAA affiliation, and college graduation date were used for analytical purposes (discussed below).

The data from this section of the interview guide were used in conjunction with data from other sections to help illuminate the extent to which the female voice in coaching is related to educational background and occupational socialization (research question two). It was also used to help establish why women coaches choose their profession (research question 5).

Part II of the guide, "Early Athletic Experiences," was used as a lead-in to the topic area, "Choosing an Occupation." Individuals do not simply pick a profession out of the air; rather, they choose (or do not choose) an occupation based on a variety of social factors. Often workers experience a form of "anticipatory socialization" (Merton, 1957) whereby they consider a certain occupation long before they begin training for it. Because coaching is a non-traditional occupation for a woman, it is important to understand the nature of coaches' "anticipatory socialization." In choosing an occupation individuals are also influenced by role models and early experiences related to the chosen field. These potential influences were investigated in this section (research questions two and five).

Part III of the guide, "Occupational Training and Socialization," addressed the influence of physical education training on the female coaches' approach to coaching. Whether or not she coaches with a "female voice" may be related to how she learned to coach, both formally and informally. The responses to these questions were also used to establish other social sources of the female approach to sport (research question two).
In attempting to determine the nature and extent of resistance to the dominant sport culture (research question four), the nature of that culture must be established (research question three) and the subjects of this study must perceive that such a culture exists. Moreover, the perception must exist that the dominant sport culture is encroaching on women's collegiate sport. Part IV of the interview guide focused on coaches' perceptions regarding the nature of "Sport in American Society". It was designed to allow coaches to reflect on the similarities and differences among various sport realms (professional, collegiate, women's collegiate) and the extent to which the dominant sport culture influences these.

Part V focused on "Coaching Philosophy." A philosophy of coaching is defined here as a system of values which guides an individual's conduct in the profession. It is "a system of motivating concepts or principles; a basic theory or viewpoint based on beliefs and values" (American Heritage Dictionary, 1975:985). The meaning and value of coaching is revealed in coaches' philosophies: the principles which guide their conduct (research question one). And, the extent to which women coaches approach their occupation from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport is made evident, in part, by coaching philosophy. By establishing the nature of coaching philosophies, questions regarding the nature and extent of accommodation and resistance could be posed: Are these attitudes, values and beliefs evidence of resistance to the dominant sport culture, or do they stand as examples of accommodation, or some combination of both (research question four)? Moreover, does this constitute a collective culture, an occupational subculture of accommodation and/or resistance?

In another part of this section titled "Philosophy" coaches were asked to define success in their jobs. The answer to this question was also used to illuminate the extent
to which coaches coach from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport (research question two), and their accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture (research question four).

Another series of questions was grouped under the sub-heading "Coaching Style." These questions were designed to illuminate actual coaching practices and to stand as points of comparison to philosophies of coaching. Here the female coach's attitude, values, and beliefs grew more apparent in her practices and in the image she had of herself as a coach (her occupational identity) (research question one). The coach's style of coaching may be consistent with or challenge the dominant sport culture. Thus, responses in this section also helped illuminate the extent to which coaching practices are evidence of accommodation and/or resistance (research question four).

Another group of questions in this section focuses on "Gender Differences" in coaching. Here subjects were asked about their perceptions regarding the relationship between gender, coaching philosophy, and coaching style. The purpose of this section was to investigate women coaches' perceptions about gendered approaches to coaching, "male" and "female" models in collegiate sport (research question three).

Part six of the interview guide focused on "Work Environment" including work tasks, role strain, social support, and occupational prestige. Here the nature and meaning of coaching for female coaches was established in light of the work tasks entailed and interactions with role set members (research question one). Responses to these questions were also used to further understand the nature of accommodation and resistance as evidenced in the amount of time coaches devote to certain work tasks and their attitudes and feelings towards those tasks (research question four).

Part seven of the interview guide, "Staying and Leaving Coaching," probed coaches'
plans for the future, perceptions regarding opportunities for advancement, and their feelings about the benefits and drawbacks of coaching. Coaches were also asked to reflect on past experiences—both good and bad. Responses in this section were used to further investigate the nature and meaning of coaching for women coaches, and resistance and accommodation to the dominant sport culture (research question one, two, and four): In this section coaches were asked about whether they had ever considered leaving coaching, the factors which influenced these thoughts, and why, in the end they chose to remain in the field (research questions five).

The fixed response questionnaire (see Appendix B) used in this study was designed to further explore coaches' perceptions of the nature of collegiate sport and the extent to which coaches accommodate and/or resist the dominant sport culture. Three specific issues were addressed: (1) the extent to which coaches perceive that collegiate sport reflects male/professional norms and values; (2) coaches' idealized vision of women's athletics, and; (3) the nature and focus of their own programs.

The questionnaire was self-administered and consisted of three fixed response items. Each item has twenty-two possible responses; subjects were asked to select and rank order five. Item responses were adapted from Blinde's (1989) list of "male/professional" sport model values and "alternative" sport model values. The eleven variables loading highest in each category were selected for inclusion as possible responses to items on the questionnaire. Answers to this questionnaire further reveal coaches' perceptions of collegiate sport, the nature and extent of hegemony of the dominant sport culture, and the extent to which women coaches participate to insure its dominance, and/or work to maintain a different set of values, beliefs, and practices.

The interview guide and the questionnaire were pre-tested before beginning the
process of collecting data for this study. Several changes were made in the interview
guide (mostly deletions and re-wording of questions for clarity and meaning), and a few
minor changes in the questionnaire. Before each interview the purpose of the research
was briefly described and a consent form administered (see Appendix C). The consent
form reminded subjects of the voluntary nature of their participation and assured them
that their responses were confidential and their anonymity would be protected. With the
consent of each of the subjects in this study, each of the interviews was tape recorded.

Most of the interviews took place in coaches' offices, a few were conducted in my
home. The interviews lasted from one to three hours, with most lasting one and a half
hours. The questionnaire took approximately five minutes to complete and was either
completed at the end of the interview, or left for the subject to complete and return to
me later. Field notes were recorded immediately after the interview in the privacy of
my car or home.

Sample Description

The interviews gathered for this study produced a sample of forty six female head
coaches coaching at an NCAA affiliated institution in 1996. The characteristics of the
sample are described here, both as a single group and by NCAA Division. For the
Divisional comparison Division I, II coaches were combined. The decision to combine
Division I and II coaches was made on the basis of the similarities in their work
environment as compared to Division III coaches. Although there are important
differences between Division I and II sport programs in some sports and at some
institutions, in women's athletics the differences are less pronounced than those between
Division II and III. (The rationale for combining Divisions I and II for analytical
purposes is discussed in the section on data analysis strategies.)

Race

Forty three of the forty six, 93%, of the individuals in the sample are white, 7% are black. The racial/ethnic make-up of subjects in this study is a reflection of coaching profession in general. In 1993-94, 91.4% of head coaches at NCAA affiliated institutions (Historically black colleges excluded.) were white, 3.9% were black, 1.8% other minorities and 2.9% unknown (NCAA Study of Race Demographics, 1993-94). In this sample, 22 (96%) of the coaches in Divisions I, II are white, and 1 (4%) are black; in Division III, 21 (91%) are white, 2, or 9% are black.

Age

The average age of subjects in this sample is 37 years old with a median age of 36 and range in age from 27 -57 years. In Divisions I and II the median age is 36 with a range of 27-57 years. In Division III the median age is 37 with a range of 27-51 years. The age of subjects in this sample is a reflection of the stepping stone process of occupational mobility typically associated with achieving a head coaching position. The majority of coaches in this study served as assistant coaches before obtaining a head coaching job. Coaches ages are also a reflection of a "cohort effect," coaching jobs which opened up in the late 1970's and 1980's and the women who obtained them.

Marital Status and Children

Nineteen coaches in the sample are single (41%), three are divorced (7%), and 12 (26%) coaches are married, and 12 (26%) are living with a partner (see Table 4). Twelve coaches (52%) in Division I and II are single, three (13%) are divorced; four
(17.5%) are married, and 4 (17.5%) are living with a partner. In Division III, 7 (30%) are single, eight (35%) are married, and 8 (35%) are living with a partner. No one in Division III is divorced. The marital status of coaches in this sample is a reflection of the demands of the job and the incompatibility of coaching with women's family roles (Knoppers, 1987). When the data were aggregated to create the categories "living single" and "co-habiting," the difference between Divisions became more apparent and pointed to the additional demands associated with Division I, II coaching and its impact on a coach's personal and family life.

The difficulty of combining coaching with a family life is further supported by the number of coaches who have children; only 6 (13%) of the coaches in the sample have children; three coach in Division I, II; and three in Division III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Marital Status of Coaches in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division I, II Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income

An informal analysis of employment advertisements for full-time coaches in the
NCAA News for 1996 revealed that starting salaries vary by sport coached, Division, institution, and responsibilities of the position. For Head coaches in Division I, II, and III a typical starting salary for coaches with 1-3 years prior experience ranged between $25,000-$35,000 and typically required a Masters degree. There was significant variation in salary by institution, sport coached, and in some sports by NCAA Division. Coaches of higher profile sports (i.e., basketball) in Divisions I and II, were offered higher starting salaries. However, many small Division III institutions also offered high starting salaries.

Subjects interviewed for this study were asked to indicate a salary range for their current coaching position. Incomes from coaching ranged from under $25,000.00 to $55,000.00-$64,999.00. The variation in income of the coaches in the sample is a reflection of institutional differences in wages and the number of years a coach has been employed. The median for the sample was $35,000.00-$44,999.00. There was no difference between Divisions on this measure.

In 1992 median real income for women twenty five or older with four years of college education was $30,394.00, for women with five or more years of college education it was $38,115.00 (Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, 1992). These statistics reveal that the women coaches in this sample have incomes similar to employed women with the same level of education.

**Education**

All forty six coaches (100%) have a Bachelors degree, twenty three (50%) a Masters degree, and one (2%) has a Ph.D. (see Table 5). The majority majored in physical education, 31 (67%) hold an undergraduate degree in physical education, and
21 (46%) hold a graduate degree in physical education (Three individuals who did not have an undergraduate degree in physical education obtained one at the graduate level.) Seventy nine percent (79%) of the coaches in this study have either a graduate or undergraduate degree in physical education (see Table 6).

There was an interesting difference between Divisions in level of education attained. In Divisions I, II only 6 (26%) coaches have a Masters degree compared to 17 (74%) in Division III. This may be related to time constraints on Division I and II coaches who typically have 12 month contracts, as compared to the 9 or 10 month contract which is the standard in Division III: Division III coaches have more time away from work to pursue a second degree. This difference may also be related to differences in the requirements of the position and the philosophical differences between Divisions.

A comparisons of major field of study for the undergraduate degree reveals little difference by Division: 15 of 23 coaches, 65%, in Divisions I and II have an undergraduate degree in physical education and five (22%) have a graduate degree in physical education; in Division III 16 of 23 coaches, 70%, have an undergraduate degree in physical education, and 16 of 23 (70%) hold a Masters degree in this field (Three of whom do not possess an undergraduate degree in physical education but pursued one at the graduate level.). Overall, Division III coaches are better educated than their Division I and II counterparts (although the one Ph.D. in the sample belongs to a Division I coach), and the vast majority of the graduate degrees in the sample are in the field of physical education (only one coach in the sample held a graduate degree in another discipline).
When educational background was analyzed according to the coach's college graduation date (An analytical category to be discussed in the next section), an interesting pattern emerged concerning major area of study. All of the individuals who graduated on or before 1971 have an undergraduate degree in physical education (six of six or 100%). Of the 23 individuals who graduated between 1972 and 1984, 18 (78%) have an undergraduate degree in physical education. Of the 17 individuals who graduated in 1985 or after, 7 (41%) have an undergraduate degree in physical education. (Three other coaches in this cohort who did not have an undergraduate degree in physical education, went on to obtain one after deciding they wanted to enter the field of coaching.) This declining trend is shown in Table 7 and will be discussed further in the analysis.
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portion of this study.

Table 7: Undergraduate Degrees in Physical Education by Date of College Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971 or before</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 and 1984</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 or after</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31 (67%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupational Role

All of the coaches in the sample are employed full-time at an NCAA affiliated college or university. Occupational titles varied substantially; however, job descriptions were fairly similar and can be broken down into two groups: the full-time coach who has no other assigned duties, and the coach-teacher, or coach-administrator who also has teaching and or administrative duties within the Athletic or Athletic/Physical Education Department. The majority of coaches in Divisions I, II (87%) were coaches only and had no other teaching or administrative duties within their department. On the other hand, all of the coaches in Division III (100%) had teaching duties and/or played an administrative role in their department. However, most were hired for their coaching ability, and the majority see coaching as their primary duty.

Social Class

Based on their level of education, their income, and the prestige associated with their
occupation, the coaches in this sample fit into the lower middle and upper middle classes (Gilbert and Kahl, 1987; Thio, 1994:145). If household income is considered (a better measure of class status) then coaches who are married or live with a partner most likely have combined household earnings which place them in the upper middle class.

**Head Coaching Experience**

The number of years an individual spends in a profession can have an important influence on their attitude towards work, and the values and beliefs they hold about their occupation. Individuals newly employed in a field may be both more idealistic, and/or experience a feeling of cognitive dissonance when the ideals they entered the profession with do not match the reality of their experiences. Older workers tend to be more pragmatic in their assessment of their work experiences; age, life stage, and work experience contribute to older workers' ability to keep work in perspective and to see it as a part of life, not its essence (Rosen, 1987).

Professions change over time and these changes are felt by the individuals employed in the field. In addition, work environments change, and this can affect the attitudes and perceptions of workers towards their jobs. For these reasons it is important to know the number of years the coaches in this sample have spent in their respective fields. While most spent some time as assistant coaches before obtaining their head coaching position, it is their head coaching experience which is of interest here.

The coaches in this sample have been employed as head coaches between one and twenty seven years with a median of eleven (11) years of head coaching experience. A comparison by Division reveals a range of 1-26 years of head coaching for Division I, II
coaches with a median of 11 year of experience; and for Division III coaches a range of 1-27 years with a median of 10 years of head coaching. This variable is also used for analytical purposes and is discussed below in the next section.

Summary

A summary of the descriptive data presented here produces a "profile" of the average female collegiate coach in this sample. While averages obscure important variations, it is often helpful to have an image of the "typical" subject in studies which make subjects the object of inquiry. The "typical" female coach in this sample has the following characteristics: she is Caucasian, in her mid thirties, is as likely to be single as she is to be married, and probably has no children. She graduated from college in the 1970's or 1980's and majored in physical education, although if she graduated after 1985 she is less likely to have majored in this field. She is as likely as not to also have a graduate degree in physical education. Employed in her occupation for a number of years, she earns a salary which places her in either the lower middle or upper middle class.

The descriptive characteristics of this sample are used as a point of reference for the analysis which follows. These background variables help construct an individual and social context from which begin to understand the female collegiate coach.

Data Analysis Strategy

The data for this study consist of the transcribed interviews, questionnaire responses, and field notes from observations of coaches' physical work space. Questionnaire responses were tallied and frequency distributions determined; comparisons were made between items and among coaches. Field notes were coded focusing on material indicators
of the occupational sub-culture of women coaches. Coding involved a process of labeling cultural artifacts in the data as indicators of male/professional sport values or alternative sport values. The patterns which emerged were noted and summarized.

The analysis of the interviews conducted in this study started shortly after the interviewing process began. Following Glaser and Strauss's (1967) inductive approach to theory construction, I identified emergent categories and themes while collecting the data. Using a modified version of "theoretical sampling," after each interview I made a decision about who to interview next in an effort to expand the category. By systematically choosing several comparison groups I was able to look for replication of conceptual categories and their properties, and to further develop the categories and themes. This method of inductive data collection and analysis also allowed me to develop hypotheses about the generalized relations among categories and their properties.

The inductive approach to data analysis assists the researcher in generating categories and themes grounded in the lived experiences of subjects. The grounded theory approach advocated by Glaser and Strauss is best utilized when the purpose of the research is to generate theory; its strength is the construction of broad concepts and themes; its weakness rich detail. In an effort to recapture the rich details of coaching the transcribed data was re-analyzed and coded after all of the interviews were completed. The themes which emerged in the research process were used as codes for the data.

Six important categories emerged from the transcribed data. The first category focused on socialization into the coaching profession. Several relevant themes were included in this broad category including: role models, formal and informal training, the intersection of gender and occupational socialization, and overcoming stigma. These
themes are discussed in Chapter VI where I explain how coaches choose and become socialized in their occupational role.

The second category centered around the increasingly product oriented and bureaucratic nature of coaching. Within this category themes included: changes in work tasks in recent years, recruiting, becoming a successful coach, employer expectations, parent expectations, and accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport model. These themes are discussed in Chapter VII. The third category was defined as controlling cultural space. The themes which fell within this category are discussed in Chapter VIII, "Coaching with a Female Voice," and include the following: philosophy, definition of success, style of coaching, and cultural artifacts (from field note data), and resistance to the dominant sport model.

The fourth category which emerged from the data dealt with the female athlete's affect on the experience and meaning of coaching. Here the relevant themes were changes in the female athlete, the benefits and costs of changes in women's sport, and the female athlete influence on the female voice in coaching. The content of these themes is addressed in Chapter IX, "The Female Athlete's Influence on Coaching." The fifth category which emerged from the data focused on the female coach's attempt to balance the increasingly product oriented and bureaucratic nature of her work with her occupational ideals and the needs and demands of the female athlete. This category is explored in Chapter IX in the section "Between Two Worlds." Here the themes discussed in the two previous chapters are presented in consideration of their combined influence on and consequences for women coaches. Accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture is a theme revisited here.

The sixth and last category which emerged was the future of coaching as an occupation.
for women. The themes organized under this category included coaching as gendered
work, and the limitations of agency amidst the persistence of patriarchy. The substance
of these themes is explored in Chapter X, the Summary and Conclusion of this
dissertation.

All of the data collected in this study, interview, questionnaire, and observational,
were analyzed by cohort and Division. Comparisons by Division are made throughout the
discussion which follows. As explained above, two categories were established for
analysis: coaches from Division I and II are analyzed together to form the first category,
and coaches from Division III form the second category. The decision to group Division II
coaches with Division I was made on the basis of the similarities in Divisional approach
to collegiate sport, especially the awarding of scholarship money. The existence of
scholarship money makes the Division II coach's job more similar to the Division I than
the Division III coach (who has no athletic scholarships to offer). Athletic scholarships
are a resource committed by the college or university to the athletic program; their
very existence puts pressure on coaches to produce winning programs. Although
Division II institutions do not typically place as much emphasis on winning as Division I
schools, resources committed by the institution to the program is a quid pro quo, and a
reminder to coaches that winning games is a tacit part of the job description. This same
message is sent via the Division II coach's job description which is similar to her
Division I counterparts: few if any additional teaching or administrative duties; more
time for recruiting and building winning programs. Because the NCAA affiliation of the
institution is an aspect of the coaches work environment which influences the make-up
of work tasks and influences the coach's approach and attitude towards her work it was
chosen as a major category of comparison for this analysis.
The data were also analyzed by cohort, determined by coaches' college graduation date (see Table 8). This method of establishing cohort groups was chosen because the coaches in each of the three groups are similar in age, have had similar experiences in sport as young girls and women, have had similar experiences related to their occupational training, and have been coaching for approximately the same number of years. For certain parts of this analysis cohorts were further divided by Division, adding Divisional affiliation to the list of similarities. Both analytic groupings, cohort and cohort by Division were used at various points in this analysis. However, the small number of observations for old coaches in Division I, II and III dictated that results obtained from cohort by Division analyses would be presented as tentative conclusions requiring further investigation.

The overall purpose of organizing and analyzing the data by cohorts was to illuminate change: change in socialization into coaching as an occupation, change in work tasks, and change in women's collegiate sport more generally. It was also used to gain insight into trends which may impact the future of coaching as an occupation for women. This cohort analysis also allowed me to control for age and years of work experience, two variables which may influence the female coach's attitudes, values, and beliefs about coaching and affect her actions and behavior (the cohort analysis also allowed for some control by occupational training).

Those who graduated from college on or before 1971 were categorized as "old" coaches. This is the group of coaches who faced limited opportunities for sport participation as young girls and women and who played collegiate sport before the days of organized intercollegiate competition or as it was just beginning. Despite their athletic prowess, their collegiate experiences did not include athletic scholarships. Their
collegiate experienced were influenced by the DGWS, both as collegiate athletes and as physical education majors.

These are the coaches who were hired primarily as physical education instructors and who have faculty status in their departments. They entered the profession of physical education to become teachers first and foremost and often acquired coaching duties as intercollegiate opportunities for women expanded; they tend to see coaching as an extension of their teaching. Their longevity in the field gives them a perspective unlike the other coaches in the sample. They were involved in athletics before it was acceptable for women to play sports, have coached through the battles over Title IX, the rise and decline of the AIAW, and the boom in women's collegiate sport participation; and they continue to coach under the auspices of the NCAA.

Coaches who graduated between 1972 and 1984 were categorized as "established" coaches. As young girls in high school this group of coaches had many more playing opportunities than their predecessors, in part because of Title IX (1972) which prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex at institutions receiving federal funds. As young girls and women their sports world was filled with female coaches, officials, and physical education instructors. They participated in intercollegiate sport when the AIAW governed women's athletics, were the first group of college women offered athletic scholarships, and the first to have fully developed intercollegiate sport experiences from varsity competition to regional and national championships. As college students and athletes they were influenced by the AIAW's approach to women's collegiate sport. Most of them possess undergraduate degrees in physical education, but unlike their predecessors many aspired to become college coaches; the increase in collegiate sports for women which took place throughout the 1970's enabled them to do so. The majority
entered coaching when the AIAW governed women's athletics and experienced the transition to NCAA control of women's intercollegiate sport.

Coaches who graduated in 1985 and after were categorized as "new" coaches. These are the women who have had organized sport opportunities at all levels of play, as young girls in community leagues, and in high school and intercollegiate sport. They grew up in a sports world full of opportunity, but which increasingly encouraged specialization and was void of female models. They participated in collegiate sport after the decline of the AIAW. Their collegiate sport experiences have included media attention, scholarships, tournaments, and equipment and travel experiences on par with the men's programs at their institutions. As collegiate players and coaches, they have known only one collegiate sport model, that provided by the NCAA. Less than half, 41%, majored in physical education in college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Coach Cohort Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Old&quot; Graduated 1971 or before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Established&quot; Graduated 1972-1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;New&quot; Graduated 1985 or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

To understand the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women in the
1990's, and to determine the nature and extent of their resistance and accommodation to the dominant sport culture, 46 in-depth interviews were conducted with full-time female coaches coaching at an NCAA affiliated institution in 1995-96. A fixed response questionnaire and observations were used to supplement the interview data. Although the findings presented here can not be generalized to the larger population of women coaches in the U.S. with a known degree of certainty, judgement and quota sampling were used to increase the representativeness of the sample along the following dimensions: NCAA affiliation of institution, sport coached, age, number of years in coaching, conference affiliation, and type of institution employed by (public/private; large/small). The addition of quota sampling increases the representative nature of the sample and strengthens the case for cautious generalization. In addition, in non-probability sampling where the researcher has extensive knowledge of population characteristics, and carefully selects subjects to reflect these, the sample can be used to represent subjects with similar profiles and experiences.

Interviews were obtained through snowball sampling and cold calls. A description of the data is presented in this chapter focusing on individual and occupational variables relevant to this study including: race, age, marital status, income, education, occupational role, social class, and number of years as head coach. The Divisional affiliation and sports coached have also been described. The transcribed data was analyzed qualitatively, first using a grounded theory approach to discover emergent themes and categories, then by coding the data and looking for relevant patterns and relationships between themes and categories. The transcribed data were then organized in cohorts and by Division within cohorts to control for the effects of age, and work experience on coaching values and practices and to discover patterns of change related to
the occupation of coaching and women's collegiate sport. Findings from the analysis of transcribed data, questionnaire responses, and field notes comprise the empirical portion of this study and are presented in the chapters which follow. The theoretical perspectives discussed in Chapter IV are applied to the empirical findings and integrated in this analysis in Chapter X.
CHAPTER VI

BECOMING A COACH

The biographical approach gives us an important advantage in understanding the human meaning of work, as the careers of individuals interact with the careers of occupational and professional groups at a given point in history. (Krause, 1971:57)

The discussion which follows is derived from the analysis of responses to Part II of the Interview Guide, "Early Athletic Experiences," and includes responses to questions in the section, "Choosing an Occupation." Responses to questions in Part III, "Occupational Training/Socialization" were also included in this part of the analysis. To analyze the data for this chapter the interview data were organized into cohort groups, "old," "established," and "new" coaches (see Table 8, page 186) then further subdivided into Division groups (see Table 2, page 164). This analysis strategy allowed the social and historical factors which influence occupational choice to be revealed.

This discussion focuses first on general patterns reflected in the whole sample (which transcend Division and cohort), and then primarily on the patterns which emerged within and between cohorts. The analysis by Division added little to the understanding of why women in this sample chose coaching as an occupation, however, those patterns which did emerge are discussed. In the latter part of this chapter coaches who were physical education majors are compared with those who did not major in physical education in an effort to understand the relationship between occupational socialization and occupational identity.

In this chapter, and throughout this dissertation, coaches responses are used to illustrate patterns in the data. As a general guideline, a relevant "pattern" was deemed
to exist when approximately half of the coaches in the group or sub-group expressed a similar sentiment. In addition, other responses deemed interesting or informative are also presented, even when they do not meet this guideline. The responses used in this chapter are, "typical responses," whose purpose is to reveal a generalized feeling or condition among coaches (or a sub-group of coaches) in the sample, in many cases several quotes are used to illustrate a single pattern. Counter opinions and feelings are presented where relevant, especially in cases where, in aggregation, they approximate another pattern.

In some cases responses are also chosen for the extent to which they point to an underlying meaning alluded to but less apparent in other responses. In addition, it is important to note that because of the semi-structured nature of the Interview Guide, and because some coaches had less time to share than others, every coach in this sample (46 in all) did not answer every question on the guide. Except where noted, only those questions with high response rates (40 of 46, or 87% or more of all coaches in the sample responding) were used in analyses for this study.

A central aim of this study is to explore the meaning of coaching for women. This interest necessarily implies a biographical approach: the analysis of work experience of individuals from the point of view of individuals. The individual constructs the meaning of work from "past experience, present aims, expectations for the future, and those factors in the social situation which support him in his [sic] lifetime search for meaningful work" (Krause, 1971:34). In this chapter the meaning of coaching is investigated through an analysis of the factors influencing occupational choice and the acquisition of occupational values and beliefs.

Taking on a work role and acquiring membership status in an occupation or
profession necessarily entails a process of socialization. This process is typically viewed as developmental, involving a sequence of stages and some degree of internalization of norms and values associated with the occupation. It involves the social psychological process whereby the character of the individual is shaped in accordance with the demands of the vocation (Berger, 1964:231); in other words it involves the acquisition of an occupational identity. While some individuals view work as a necessary evil; others see it as a "calling" and more readily embrace the norms and values of the group they seek to be a part of.

Choosing a profession also involves socialization at various points in the life cycle, and includes a variety of socializing agencies. In childhood the family is the primary socializing agency, later secondary socializing agencies i.e., the peer group and the school, take on more importance. Through positive and negative feedback, the family, the peer group, and teachers act as "reference groups" for occupational choice. These are the "significant others" whose expectations shape individual behavior.

Occupational choice and the development of an occupational identity are developmental processes which may begin in childhood through the influences of family, peers, and teachers. Early contact with occupational group members can lead to "anticipatory socialization," where individuals imagine themselves as members of the occupational group. The socialization process is most likely to lead to the development of an occupational identity where group norms have been internalized; a process most likely to occur when individuals identify with those doing the socializing i.e., role models (Glaser, 1956). As Moore has argued, "normative internalization takes place only in situations marked by strong affectivity in relationships, and some part of the affect must be positive; fear of disapproval must not be discounted, however" (Moore,

Given the research described above, it is likely that the women in this sample were socialized into their profession and that their experience of choosing coaching as an occupation involved a series of developmental stages culminating in the acquisition of an occupational identity. It is also likely that, for most of the women in this sample, family members and significant others played a role in encouraging, or at least not discouraging, their occupational choice. The discussion which follows illuminates how and why the women in this sample became coaches; the stories they tell about the choices they made along the way to becoming coaches reveals, in part, the meaning of coaching.

Theoretical Models of Occupational Choice

The choice of an occupation is one of the most important decisions made by a person during his or her lifetime. Most of our waking hours are related to our occupational activities. Our jobs provide the economic base for our survival, they become entwined with our self image and self respect, they consume a large percentage of our time and psychological and physical energy, and they shape major aspects of our social existence such as status, life style, friendships, place of residence and attitudes and opinions (Caplow, 1954; Super, 1957; in Mitchell and Beach, 1976:231)

Three theories of occupational choice dominate the early literature in the sociology of occupations and professions: the rational-decision making approach; the fortuitous approach; and the sociocultural influences approach (Pavalko, 1971). In the first approach occupational choice is viewed as an irreversible process involving compromise between individual interests, capacities, and opportunities (Caplow,1954). The individual passes through a series of stages and a progressive narrowing of choices or leveling of aspirations; from the fantasy period (ages 6-11), to the period of tentative choice, (ages 12-17); to the period of realistic choice (ages 18 and over) (Ginzberg in Pavalko, 1971). The individual's self concept may also play a role in the decision
making process; from this point of view occupational choice is an effort to match self concept with work roles (Super in Pavalko, 1971). Despite variations, the rational-decision perspective consistently asserts that entering an occupation or profession involves a process of rational choice; decisions made at various stages in the maturation process.

In contrast to the rational-decision approach, the fortuitous approach sees occupational choice as a process of eliminating alternatives. From this perspective individuals enter an occupation not because they have made a series of carefully considered decisions, but because they have, for somewhat trivial reasons, eliminated alternatives (Caplow, 1954). The timing of this "non-decision making" coincides with transitions in formal education when individuals are forced to declare their intentions regarding future plans. This approach may be better applied to occupations than professions because entry to the professions necessarily entails a longer period of schooling (and the investment of time and money this entails) for which individuals must plan.

The socio-cultural approach to occupational choice emphasizes the external influences which constrain occupational choice. While the first two approaches focus on agency and individual choice, the socio-cultural approach illuminates the role of social structural determinants which limit, inhibit, and ultimately shape occupational preferences. Those factors which shape aspirations, and ultimately occupational choice include: social class, rural-urban residence, race, and sex (Pavalko, 1971: see also Gerson, 1985; Jacobs, 1991; and Romero, 1990 for empirical support for this perspective.).

Occupational psychologists have developed similar theoretical models to explain
occupational choice: expectancy theory and decision theory. Both of these theories employ mathematical models and focus explicitly on the process of choice, on "individual perceptions of the outcomes of a particular choice and the importance of these outcomes to him/her" (Mitchell and Beach, 1976:233). Expectancy theory asserts that the choice of an occupation depends upon the degree to which a given alternative is seen as more likely to lead to valued outcomes than any other alternative (1976:233 ).

Decision theory is similar to expectancy theory and is based on the principle of maximization of expectation. From this perspective, "expectation for any action is the algebraic sum, across potential outcomes, of the values of each of the possible outcomes of that action and their respective possibilities of occurrence should the action be performed. The maximization principle prescribes that the action that has the maximum expectation should be the one chosen" (237). In reviewing the empirical research on occupational choice which employs one or the other theoretical models, Mitchell and Beach state,

An overview of both the expectancy and decision theory results suggests overwhelmingly that some sort of expected value model provides a good representation of the occupational preferences and choice processes. While important distinctions exist between and among these different models, the similarities are more striking. At the heart of all these models is a rational, maximization principle: people will prefer and choose those occupations they believe are most likely to lead to the highest personal benefit...It is our contention that these theories present a generally good prediction of the result of people's occupational choice processes. (243)

Analysis of the data collected for this study reveals patterns of occupational choice consistent with aspects of all of these perspectives, it also reveals patterns which do not fit existing theoretical models and therefore, need more explanation. The following discussion focuses on the patterns which both fit and pose a contrast to existing theories and research. Most importantly, occupational choice is treated here as a developmental
process which includes socialization; a long term process which for most women coaches began in childhood. Relevant cohort (old, established, and new coaches) differences are discussed throughout this section.

Early Socialization

For the women in this study the process of choosing as an occupation began very early with their childhood play experiences. As young girls they participated in any and every sport available. The following "established" coach explains,

The earliest [I remember] is just playing in the backyard with my dad. There are eight in my family, I am the oldest sister and all the boys came after me. I remember as a toddler playing in the backyard with my dad. I lived in the best neighborhood in Massachusetts. There were easily 40 kids on that street. All large families, all Irish. We all knew each other, went to school together. Everybody played outside. No Nintendo, everything was playing outside, and we stayed outside after school until we had to come in. We played everything, tag football, capture the flag, baseball, football, hours on hours. I was tall so I got picked a lot. Wonderful, wonderful childhood memories of just playing day after day, all year long.

In response to questions about their early playing experience coaches explained that they "loved sports" and played "all sports" usually with brothers and other boys in the neighborhood. While all of the coaches in the sample described "loving sports," and playing a variety of sport while growing up, the "new" coaches played more organized sports in town sponsored youth leagues or through some other organizational structure. In addition, unlike the other coaches in the sample, more "new" coaches described specializing in one sport at a younger age (three before high school, and four more by the time they reached college; seven out of 17 or 41%). Only two "old" coaches and one "established" coach specialized in one sport before college, and in the case of the "old" coaches it was more out of lack of opportunity than choice. The following response illustrates the cultural values and underlying rationale surrounding sport specialization
among "new" coaches, "I tried everything and concentrated once I got to a certain level. I started playing softball at age six, I had good natural ability."

The follow-up question, "What was that like (sports growing up)?," revealed a variety of responses but one consistent pattern: as young girls, the coaches in this sample received positive feedback for their involvement in sport. Their athletic skills were valued by their peers and several described themselves as being faster, stronger, and/or more skillful than the other kids; the "the best" or one of the best athletes in the neighborhood. Several of the women interviewed also described sibling and parental support for their early sport involvement. The following coach explained,

I grew up with five brothers so sports was just part of what we all did.

Another stated,

My parents were like, "Well if the boys can do it than you can too." So, I got a lot of support.

In some cases, sport participation was simply a "family norm."

My father was an Athletic Director and football coach at a public school and he also worked at a health club running the tennis and pro shop. Because he was so heavily involved in sport we all just grew up with it—always at the high school or playing indoor tennis. We had a blast, always doing stuff, we were all naturally good athletes. In junior high we played the school sports and played indoor tennis in the winter.

On the other hand, one coach was discouraged from sport participation by her mother although her father encouraged her, another (an only child with a single parent) said her mother didn't care one way or the other. However, overall, the pattern of familial support was much stronger than the pattern of ambiguity or non-support: of the twenty three coaches who discussed family feelings regarding their early sport involvement, twenty one, or 91%, described sibling or parental support and encouragement.

The analysis of coaches' early childhood playing experiences reveals that sport was the driving force in their lives, their real passion and joy. Their love for sport
established in childhood continued into high school resulting in extensive participation during their adolescent years. In high school they played "whatever was available." They described their experiences as "great" "positive" and "fun." Although four had no high school sport experience (three because the schools they attended did not offer organized sports for girls, one because the sport she enjoyed was not offered), the majority (33 of 41 who answered the question, or 80%) played more than one high school sport, and many played three (27 of 41 or 66%). A comparison of high school experiences among cohort groups revealed a pattern similar to coaches' early childhood playing experiences: "new" coaches had a greater tendency to specialize in one sport as high school athletes (3 of the 15 "new" coaches who responded, or 20%). The only other coach who played one sport in high school was an "old" coach who played tennis only, because it was the single sport offered to girls.

A comparison of cohort groups revealed that in terms of the number of sports participated in, "established" coaches had the most uniform high school experiences, most participated in three sports: of the 20 coaches who responded, 17 or 85%, played three sports. Looking at the results another way: "established" coaches participated in an average of 2.65 high school sports, "new" coaches in 2.26, and "old" coaches 1.6.

Despite the differences in number of sports played, the high school sport experience was important to all of the coaches in this sample. This sentiment was conveyed by the following coach,

Q: What were high school sports like for you?
A: I wasn't a great student and I just went to school mostly for sports. I was never pushed academically. I was in leaders club and took leadership roles in all the sports and physical education classes. I love games, games are fun to me and they always have been.

Another explained,
Q: What were high school sports like for you?
A: Great. All the things you think about. Making friends. It was the highlight of each stage for me. It was the focus, it was everything you did. That's what you lived for. I played three sports in high school. I played three sports in college. It was the same, my whole focus.

Motivated by their love for sport, the encouragement and positive feedback first from family members and peers, and later from coaches, these young women engaged in sport wherever and whenever possible. They learned to value sport and their involvement in it at a very early age. This extensive involvement and the positive feedback they received from others set the stage for the establishment of an athletic identity; as young girls and adolescents-sport and athleticism stood at the core of their identities. One coach illustrates this point while discussing her early experiences in track and field,

The first time I started jumping I felt like a different person; it was such a high; such a pique experience-I remember the first time I did the long jump, I did it and I said, "I can do better", and there was never a question I couldn't do it; and I was like, I was like, this is my life.

Another coach explains,

The feeling that comes from play achievement, and creativity. Like when you wouldn't have a football because John had to go to his grandfathers-well O.K. get your jacket and role it up-this will be our football-or oh no we don't have a bat...well get some electrical tape and fix something and make it work, the whole bit. To be nine, I can't imagine a year in my life being any more empowering then when I was nine [laughter].

The importance of early playing experiences for choosing coaching as an occupation becomes more evident when coaches discuss why they chose to go into coaching.

Choosing an Occupation

For most of the history of women's athletics, and for most of the women in this study, coaching and teaching physical education have gone hand in hand; if you were a physical education teacher you were also a coach, and vice versa. In addition, for women,
coaching positions which did not also include teaching responsibilities did not emerge until the late 1970's and early 1980's, and are still only the norm in Division I and II; in Division III a coaching position typically includes teaching physical education. Because sports for women emerged from within physical education and teaching jobs often included coaching and vice versa, until recently the educational credential typically pursued by aspiring teachers/coaches was a bachelors degree in physical education. From the standpoint of women's athletics, until recently, possession of a physical education degree has been the most important qualification for obtaining a college position in coaching (whether or not the position also includes teaching physical education).

Responses to the question: What made you decide to go into coaching?, revealed an interesting pattern distinguishing coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts from those in the "new" cohort. All of the coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts stated that they decided to go into coaching because either: (a) they loved a sport or sports, or (b) they wanted to teach, or to make a difference in young people's lives. And, most said their decision was motivated both by their love for sport and desire to teach (all of the "old" coaches, 100%, and 16 of 23 "established" coaches, 70%).

As the preceding section made clear, for many, love for sport was the driving force in their lives, and choosing an occupation was simple. For many becoming a teacher and coach was a way to "stay involved in sport " and a "natural choice" for others it was teaching which inspired them first and then the idea that they could combine teaching with their love for sport. Whichever occurred first, all of the coaches in the "old" cohort, and 21 of 23 coaches (91%) in the "established" cohort described the decision to become a teacher and coach as a "natural progression," an extension of their love for and
involvement in sport, and their athletic identity. The following "old" and "established" coaches explain,

Old

A: I just chased after sport, I absolutely loved it, and then to think you could teach and coach sports was to me phenomenal.

A: I just had this base feeling of being an athlete and loving sport and wanting to stay involved in it and wanting to be a teacher, coaching and teaching are similar. As I went along I realized I wanted to teach physical education, and that went along with coaching after school, and because I loved it.

Established

A: It's all totally connected, it's who I am. My identity as a person has been as an athlete since my youngest days. That part of me is just a connection with what I am doing right now. You go to practices everyday, you compare for competition. Preparing for competition, I'm not physically out on the field, but I'm on that field in every other sense of the word. The elation of victory, the disappointment of losing, it's all there.

A: It was one of those things where it seemed like the obvious thing to do. I wanted to be a physical education teacher. From the time I was in third grade I remember being in physical education class and thinking, this is what I want to do.

A: It was so much a part of everything I was doing. An education was important to me growing up, but I knew I always wanted to teach and physical education was most important to me because I loved sports. So I never had any questions about what I was going to do or anything, I never thought of anything else.

These responses echo Sage's assertion that "undoubtedly the inclination to become a coach is related to sports experiences in childhood and adolescence" (1975:430).

For the majority of the women in these two cohorts, becoming a collegiate coach was something they decided to do after making the decision to become a teacher. They described it as an "evolutionary" process whereby they discovered through experience with both teaching and coaching that they enjoyed coaching more. This "discovery" was typically made as a result of a positive coaching experience and or a negative teaching
experience, or a combination of both. In addition, four of the six (66%) "old" coaches never really planned to coach, but were hired as physical education instructors and were asked to coach as sport opportunities for women opened up. One "old" coach explains,

I never planned to go into coaching. I was actually hired as a tennis instructor, a physical education instructor. When I got here I was asked to coach. It was a gradual thing like, we went from an informal schedule to a more formal schedule, and my job went from being more about teaching to more about coaching. A lot of the change happened when we hired a new athletic director and his goal was to build the athletic department.

In contrast to women in the "old" and "established" cohorts who planned to become teachers/coaches early in life, those in the "new" cohort made their decision much later, and for many the path to coaching was "pure chance," or a "fluke," and "not something they ever really thought about" as young girls. Seven of the 17, 41%, decided to go into coaching after college.

The difference between cohorts on this measure reflects three important factors which influenced how women in this sample entered the occupation of coaching:

(1). changes in attitudes towards women and female appropriate work roles and the corresponding increase in opportunities for women in non-traditional occupations/professions; (2). the decline of women in coaching and the consequent decline in female role models. The interaction of increased opportunity and declining female role models contributed to a third factor; (3). a magnifying effect on the stigmas associated with women who pursue careers in sport.

Those in the "old" and "established" cohorts grew up at a time when there were few professions open to women besides teaching, nursing, and secretarial work. In addition, they had female teachers and coaches in high school and college who were positive role models. For those growing up in the 1970's and 1980's, the "new" cohort, the situation was just the reverse: they had many more occupational opportunities and few female
role models. These different social structural contexts led to two very different "paths" to coaching. One involved early planning and rational-decision making in the context of limited choices; the other was more fortuitous. The latter also involved a process of "getting beyond negative stigmas," a reconciliation to the love for sport and the desire to teach and coach.

The Stigmas Associated with Sport and Women in Sport

From the standpoint of American society, women who coach carry three negative stigmas: one is associated with intellect, the second sexuality, the third with the contribution coaching makes to society. Sport is a male domain and is associated with masculinity (Messner, 1992; Messner and Sabo, 1992). Those traits most valued in sport: power, strength, and aggression, are typically viewed as male attributes and are associated with masculinity. As Coakley explains, "dominant sport forms in most societies have been constructed in ways that not only ritualize aggression but tie the expression of aggression to certain forms of masculinity" (1994:176). Because sport is associated with maleness and society values male defined attributes, women who participate in sport beyond puberty are often viewed as masculine. Female athletes who engage in serious sport activity beyond puberty may even have their status as "real" women called into question. As Scraton explains,

Clearly the stereotype of the lesbian female physical education teacher is linked to the 'masculine' definition of physical activity or sport (Lenskyj, 1986). Women who undertake physical activity, develop strength and muscle, and have chosen a career in this area are stereotyped as having 'questionable sexuality. This implies lesbianism and its assumed non-feminine attributes. (1992:102)

Because sport focuses on the body, the study of human movement or physical education is also perceived as a non-intellectual pursuit, something entailing a
minimum of intellect. The legacy of Zoroastrian dualism and Protestant asceticism have combined to foster an underlying attitude of disdain and disrespect for the human body in American culture. As the father of one woman in this study asserted when she explained her intention to study physical education, "You know what they say...Those who can do, those who can't, teach; those who can't teach, teach physical education." Women who coach are not only perceived as masculine, they carry the stigma of the "dumb jock" (this stereotype is associated with male coaches too).

Finally, because sport is the realm of leisure and involves play, those who organize and direct games and play are believed to be playing too (both men and women). From this perspective, teaching sport is not really teaching, it is playing; and coaching is not really work, but play. Thus, teaching and coaching sport is stereotyped as a "trivial pursuit," an occupation that doesn't really make an important contribution to society because nothing is "produced."

While all of the women in this study received positive reinforcement for their early sport participation, the decision to enter the field of physical education brought more mixed response and far less support. As one coach explains,

I went to Catholic school. I remember telling the guidance counselor I wanted to be a physical education teacher, she said, no, no, no you are much to bright for that. Why do you want to go into physical education, there are all kinds of weird people in physical education. Why do you want to do that?...Well the nuns were like, you will come around, you will change your mind, and my mom was like you don't really want to do that.

Several of the women in this study learned that the relationship between women and sport changes when a girl enters adolescence. In childhood the boundaries of one's gender role are somewhat less salient, cultural mores regarding gender appropriate behavior somewhat more forgiving. Thus, young girls can be "tomboys" and "jocks"... but only for a while. This coach explains,
Being nine was special time in my life, the number nine has special significance for me. It was before social roles of male and female. You could be nine and it was O.K., you could just play. You were cute at nine, it was O.K. at nine.

Another coach explained,

Growing up, about age 10, I decided I wanted to be a gym teacher, and people were like. "Why a gym teacher?", it did have those connotations back then in the 1960's.

Three coaches from the "old ' and "established" cohorts transferred into physical education programs after first majoring in other fields. All three received negative feedback from family members. One coach describes,

Q: What made you decide to go into coaching?
A: I did camps and loved being with the kids and everything, so at the end of the year I decided to transfer into physical education. I told my dad and he was not happy at all. Luckily I was paying my own way.

Another explained,

Q: What made you decide to go into coaching?
A: Actually I started as a history major and really thought I wanted to do that and my mom did not want me to be a physical education major.

Q: Why?
A: I think she was afraid of the stereotypes on women in physical education, and also I would end up an old maid. So I went into history for a year then switched into physical education, then I finally just said to myself and my mom...look physical education and coaching is what I want to do, so I did that my last two years and also got a degree in biological sciences so I could get in a Masters program in exercise physiology.

Six "established" coaches described family resistance to their occupational decision and others explained they simply were not encouraged to pursue physical education/coaching. Thus, while not all of the women in the study encountered resistance to their decision to enter physical education, several did. On the other hand many were encouraged, some by family members and even more by non-family members, typically a high school physical education instructor or coach. More
importantly, a comparison or cohorts reveals the stigma associated with physical education and coaching appears to have increased at the same time sport opportunities for women were also increasing. No "old" coaches described resistance to their occupational choice, six "established" coaches described objections by family members or guidance counselors, and seven "new" coaches who anticipated objections and/or negative reactions, simply ruled out the choice. Stated differently, the increase in sport opportunities for girls and women has done little to reduce the stigmas associated with physical education and coaching.

While there is little reason to expect that increased sport participation by women would raise the status of coaching in terms of it being "real work," or that more opportunities for girls and women might somehow change the perception that to coach or teach physical education does not require intelligence. One might expect that increases in sport opportunity of the magnitude seen in recent years might diffuse the notion that sport is a "masculine" pursuit, and that women in sport are more masculine than their non-athletic counterparts. One might expect that as sport participation for women grows more normative, the stigma associated with it might become less prevalent or grow more diffuse.

In her analysis of girls and boys play groups Barrie Thorne (1993) explains that the term "tomboy" was rarely used among young children in her study, despite its use by adults to describe past experiences. Thorne attributes this change to greater acceptance of sport for girls and women and to the fact that the gender boundaries proscribed by popular culture do not match the real world experiences of boys and girls. According to Thorne's research, gender boundaries are more blurred and less defined. While the proscriptions regarding physical activity for girls may have changed, it is unclear that
this is the case for young women. Moreover, it is argued here that much of the change is quantitative not qualitative and that the 'masculine' stigma associated with participation in women's sport is as strong and as pernicious as ever. Women and girls have gained, "conditional acceptance" (Goffman, 1963) in the realm of sport. Participation is acceptable if women continue to prove their femininity, what West and Zimmerman (1991) call, "doing gender."

The more women continue to enter the realm of sport, the more they seem to have to prove their femininity. By displaying gender appropriate adornments, "femininity signifiers" (Bolin, 1992) such as make-up, nail polish, jewelry, and feminine hairstyles, female athletes attempt to diffuse the masculine connotations of sport and accusations of lesbianism. When asked if female athletes are accepted on campus one established Division I coach stated,

No not really, and it is getting worse. It's acceptable for women to exercise, but not to compete, to have muscles. This is a real problem. It's O.K to go into the weight room and lift light weights, you know, low weights and light repetitions, buy really lifting is not O.K. Every one of my players wears a ponytail. The stigma of athletics is very strong, and the players have to fight it. It wasn't that way when I played.

The various stigmas associated with physical education and coaching appeared to be even stronger for the women in the "new" cohort, those who graduated from college long after the "revolution" in women's sport participation, and who had extensive opportunities to play organized sport. The majority of women in the "new" cohort did not even consider a career in teaching and coaching until after college; in-depth probing revealed that it was the stigmas associated with teaching/coaching that kept these women from considering it as an occupational endeavor. Despite their acknowledged love for sport, for many, teaching and coaching were never considered viable choices, and yet these same women explain that they eventually entered coaching because they love
working with young people and see themselves as "natural" teachers.

These women appear to have been avoiding the inevitable; and their love for sport led them to coaching only after they found a way to reconcile their image of themselves as "real" women who are competent and intelligent; with the stigmas associated with teaching physical education and coaching.

**Mediating Factors: Role Models and Limited Occupational Choice**

While all of the women in this sample were confronted with cultural stereotypes associated with women's physical education and coaching, for the "old" and "established" women in this sample the stigma of physical education as an occupation for women was mediated by limited occupational opportunities and excellent role models. For these women, deciding about what career to enter simply didn't entail a whole lot of choice. One "old" coach who grew up in the 1950's and graduated from college in 1965 explained, "Back then there were two things you could be, a teacher or a nurse."

Another explained,

"Back then I knew I wasn't going to be a secretary, and teaching was a logical role, and that role I was comfortable in, that lead me to the field of education. I think we had that vision. If I was 17 today I have no idea what I would do. I think I would find it mind boggling. For me I could only go into health or physical education. Now I would have so many choices even within the field."

Two additional responses from "established" coaches, most of whom grew up in the 1960's and 1970's illustrate this point,

**A:** I come from a line of teachers, so you are what your mother is sometimes, or that is a strong role model for you. My sister is a teacher, and my cousins are teachers so I think you get in that track.

**A:** I was tomboy growing up, I loved athletics and I like the teaching idea. My mother was a teacher. Just part of me loving athletics and stuff.
Teaching has always been a female dominated profession, particularly at the elementary and secondary levels. It was among the top ten occupations for women in 1870, in 1940, and remains a female dominated profession into the 1990's. For women who grew up in the 1950's and 60's before the impact of the Women's Movement opened up traditionally male occupations to women, and even for those who grew up in the 1970's, there were few occupational choices; among them: teacher, nurse, office worker, servant, seamstress, sales clerk, cashier or waitress (Hooks in Reskin and Padavic, 1994:50). Teaching was and still is perceived as a gender appropriate occupation for women, an occupation consistent with their roles as caretakers, and nurturers (Spencer, 1988). For women who came from middle class families and who loved sport, the logical choice was to become a teacher; a physical education teacher.

In addition to having few occupational choices, the women in the "old" and "established" cohorts had positive female role models: individuals who were excellent teachers and coaches. These role models combined perceived feminine and masculine attributes; they were strong and assertive, yet nurturing and caring, and they were competent. Their existence helped diffuse the stigmas associated with teaching and coaching. As role models they raised the status of their profession such that those they came in contact with viewed it as a worthy endeavor, an endeavor appropriate for intelligent, "real" women. Despite the negative stigmas associated with their chosen field the women in the "old" and "established" cohorts viewed it as a valuable vocation, and they did not worry excessively about its masculine or anti-intellectual connotations.

The importance of role models in choosing a career in coaching has been documented by Pooley and Snyder (in Sage, 1975: 437) both of whom found that the coaches in their studies had coaches who were strong role models. While few of the coaches in this...
sample received actual verbal encouragement to go into teaching and coaching, the coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts had female role models they admired and respected. The existence of positive role models who modeled positive, socially acceptable female attributes may have made it easier for them to see teaching physical education and coaching as a socially acceptable occupation for women.

Although the world of sport is defined as a male domain, the fact that teaching is defined as a female occupation, and the existence of positive female role models whose actions and behaviors combined an emphasis on nurturance and caring as well as physical competence and strength, appears to have helped coaches to reconcile the stigma of masculinity associated with women in coaching and physical education. The fact that these role models were excellent teachers helped reconcile the notion that teaching sport was something anyone could do. Finally, the impact these role models had on the lives of individuals in this study, and on others around them, revealed to the women in this sample that teaching and coaching were anything but trivial. The following quotes (each from a different individual) illustrate the impact that positive female role models had on the "old" and "established" coaches in this study. The first group of quotes illustrates the impact of high school teachers and coaches, the second of college teachers and coaches (While most women in the "old" and "established" cohorts decided to go into physical education before entering college, college teachers and coaches often strengthened their decision or influenced their decision to pursue collegiate coaching over high school teaching and coaching.)

**High School Teachers and Coaches Who Were Role Models**

A: My high school coach was a role model. I really respected her, her person, her drive, and how she motivated me. She was a very good teacher, but she never said, be
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A: As I look back now I always new I would be doing this. End of 8th grade 9th grade I got hooked, the whole world was my physical education teacher and sports, and it was a pull away from music, I remember that... My physical education teachers and coaches, I looked to them as role models and tried to emulate them.

A: My high school physical education teacher was great and I could see how she influenced my classmates and teammates and I thought I would like to do that. I like to make a difference in somebody's life, I thought she made a difference in my life and in many people's lives around me and I thought I would like to do that. I wanted a job that made a difference.

A: Maybe my junior high physical education teacher. She was very organized, very competitive and a good teacher.

A: I loved sport and I had very good and supportive physical education teachers in high school that guided me.

**College Teachers and Coaches Who Were Role Models**

A: My two college instructors were role models, they had strength and enthusiasm. One had such a strong persona, she was strong and personable, and she always did what she said. I started talking to other people in the physical education department and I really liked the people who were in it, and it was very attractive to me.

A: Mary my coach and the woman I worked under. She is very much a role model for me. She was a great coach. I had a lot of respect for her and what she did, she was an administrator too. I think if she concentrated on one or the other she could go anywhere in the country. She is very well read, she has a dual degree in political science and physical education. That is partly why I got the physical education degree. I also have a lot of respect for her. I think she taught me a lot.

A: My college coach, Sheila, She was very pro-active in the AIAW and wanted women to take leadership positions in athletics, she was very involved in the USFHA. And I just thought it was really cool that someone like that could be so involved with an international sport like field hockey.

The existence of positive role models allowed coaches to engage in "anticipatory socialization," a form of role playing that individuals engage in which fosters socialization into occupational norms and values. By imagining themselves in roles as teachers and coaches individuals begin to accept the values, standards, and rules of the group (Krause, 1971:47). Through contact with occupational group members individuals learn the culture of an occupation, and develop and image of appropriate
occupational behavior. In most professions occupational socialization and the
development of an occupational identity occurs in formal training situations and in
actual work settings. However, the socialization which occurs as a result of early
contact with occupational group members is also important, and played an important
role in "old" and "established" coaches' decisions to enter teaching/coaching. As Pavalko
(1971) explains,

Both the amount and kind of anticipatory socialization individuals are likely to have
undergone prior to entry into formal training for an occupation is likely to vary in
terms of previous "exposure" to the occupation. Exposure may occur in various
ways. For example, the availability of role models such as parents, relatives, and
close friends in an occupation is likely to be an important source of useful
information that an individual might use in imagining what it would be like to be a
member of the occupation. The length of time that a person has considered the
occupation as a viable possibility is also important here. In general the longer a
person has been considering an occupation, the greater the opportunity he has had to
imagine what work in the occupation would be like, explore nuances of role
etc....Much of the socialization to occupational norms, values, and role expectations is
largely informal, unconscious, and unintentional from the perspective of the agents of
socialization.

The role models described by women in "old" and "established" cohorts were like a
"reference group," a group whose perspective "constitutes the frame of reference for
the individual, and a group to which the individual aspires to gain or maintain
acceptance" (Pavalko, 1971:89). If an individual has been socialized in the norms and
values of the group, then he/she takes those norms and values to be his own; i.e. adopts
the groups perspective. For the majority of the women in these two groups the process
of occupational socialization began early in high school; for some it influenced their
decision to enter the field of teaching and coaching; for others it strengthened their
conviction; for all of them, the existence of positive role models appears to have helped
to mediate and/or diffuse the negative stigmas associated with the profession.

The following coach chose to major in physical education despite her parents
lukewarm support. Her response illustrates that positive role models are a buffer against the negative stereotypes associated with teaching and coaching. They help raise the status of the occupation, thereby allowing those who might aspire to the occupation to be more attracted to and more readily identify with it (Caplow, 1954).

Q: What made you decide to go into coaching?
A: Love of sport and loving working with student-athletes.

Q: What made you think about it in the first place?
A: It was a combination of physical education/coaching.

Q: Was anyone a role model for you?
A: Yes, a woman who was my coach for all three sports, and then my softball coach, she didn't teach at our school. And a couple of my physical education teachers.

Q: What did they model for you?
A: What they gave to the game and their players, just the giving and the interaction. It just seemed like a nice profession, I wanted to be the one in the group, and part of the competition.

Q: How would you describe the coaching style of the woman who was your most important role model?
A: Demanding, very assertive at times, personable-a balance, being assertive but personable too, and knowledgeable.

Q: Did anyone encourage you to go into coaching?
A: Education was hurting then when I entered college, that was one thing they thought would hold me back. My parents didn't quite understand why I would want to be a gym teacher for the rest of my life, and they were worried I wouldn't get a job offer.

In contrast to the "old" and "established" coaches, the stigmas associated with physical education and coaching as an occupation for women deterred most of the "new" coaches from entering the field of physical education and it deterred them from making the decision to enter coaching until after college. For these women, the stigmas were simply too powerful. The following coaches explain,

Q: Was anyone a role model for you?
A: In high school I liked my basketball coach a lot. She was as close to being a role model to me...but I looked at her more as a mentor, I looked up to her a lot. She was my favorite coach. But I never thought, I want to be like her.
Q: How come?
A: I don't know, I don't know. I was scared maybe, scared thinking like physical education was an area that was not pushed in my family when I was growing up. Nobody was like, go into physical education. I was probably scared of that, I wanted to be more on a faster track, maybe a more intellectual kind of thing. I think environment played a big factor in terms of what I was being pushed to do. Like it was something that I just don't think was an option for me, physical education.

Q: Why?
A: Not prestigious enough, not intellectual enough, that kind of thing, like it had a stereotype. It wasn't anything that was talked about, it was just those were the facts going through my head, so I never though about it. It was like it just didn't seem like an option. I don't remember going home and saying gee I really want to go into physical education or I really want to go into coaching. I think partly it was largely due to my family was really pushing education on us, we went to private schools and my father wanted us to go to really good colleges, and get a great education and have great careers.

Another coach explains,

I think I had my own misperceptions of the gym teacher. I just didn't want to be a gym teacher.

A comparison of physical educators (7) with non-physical educators (10) in the "new" cohort (see Table 7, page 178) reveals that those who decided to pursue an undergraduate degree in physical education had more female role models in high school and/or college whom they respected and valued. Of the seven "new" coaches who chose to major in physical education, six described having female teachers and coaches in high school or college who were positive role models. Of the ten women who did not major in physical education, six explained they had no female teachers or coaches who were positive role models, the other four said they did not encounter a positive female role model until college.

Without positive role models to diffuse the negative stigmas associated with physical education and coaching, and social expectations surrounding new career opportunities, many "new" coaches simply never thought about majoring in physical education, or...
about coaching as a career (It is important to note that cut backs in education in the late 1980's made physical education a dubious choice at the time; however, this was not an important deterrent or determinant of occupational choice for the women in this study, only one coach mentioned this as an issue, and still she decided to major in physical education.) The non-physical education majors in the sample were more likely to have pursued another occupation before deciding to go into coaching, to have explained their entry into coaching as "luck," to have had few female role models in sport in high school or college and/or to have had what they described as "poor" female role models. One coach explained,

Q: What made you decide to go into coaching?
A: Actually I had planned to be a financial planner and after school I had a job offer with a firm and one with the university at the same time so I had to decide. I really loved athletics so I decided to go into coaching and be poor for the rest of my life.

Q: So you really didn't think about coaching until after college?
A: Yes, it was after. A lot of colleges...well I didn't even have a female coach until I went to college. Every coach I had was male so coaching wasn't anything you really thought about doing.

Another coach explained,

A: First of all I didn't really think a lot about it because I had all male coaches, so I never really thought about it as an option for me. I think when I really got my first good female coach it was a great influence, but it didn't make me think about it. Then in high school I had a coach I really respected and that made me think about it, here was someone I really respected in coaching. I also did some clinics in high school and really loved it. I helped out at camps in the summer but even then I never really still put it down as something I wanted to do. I was still thinking about being a lawyer, a lot of different things.

Three of the ten "new" coaches who did not major in physical education, and did not decide to go into coaching until after college, made it a point to explain that the few female coaches they did have were not "good" coaches. This response reveals what
coaches have in mind when they talk about "good" role models,

Q: What made you decide to go into coaching?
A: It was a fluke. I was running in a road race and ran into the man who was coaching softball at my former high school. I was working in accounting and was really unhappy with it. I told him I had wanted to call him to see if he wanted a volunteer coach a couple of days a week, and so he called later that February and offered me the junior varsity job. My dad had been wanting me to work with him, and I went to him and told him something was missing in my life and about the coaching opportunity. I said, something is missing in my life maybe this is it. So I worked for my dad part-time in the mornings and coached softball in the afternoon.

Q: Did anyone encourage you to go into coaching?
A: My assistant coach my senior year in college. I was interviewing for jobs and we were on a team trip in Florida riding in the van, and my roommate and I were talking about what we were going to do after school and she said you should really think about coaching, I think you would be really good. I said, oh no. I didn't have any good role models in high school, so I just really felt that a lot of the people I had been in touch with, that I had seen coaching, I didn't have a lot of respect for. I didn't think they modeled a good coach, I didn't think they were good teachers. It was more there was this culture that if you are a player and you don't really know what else to do then you can always coach, and that was the mentality.

A: In high school I had all male coaches and at the club level too in college I had my first female coach. I hadn't seen any real good female coaches to be quite honest with you; maybe there were some good coaches but they were not something I wanted to model. I didn't wake up and say, "Hey, I want to be like you." I kind of looked at my assistant coach and the head coach and I said, I am sorry, I just don't want to grow up and be like you.

A: A lot of it was like they were very good players... they don't coach because they want to be a good role model... they don't coach because they want to teach. I didn't feel I had any great coaches who really taught, I didn't see a lot of coaches teaching, they just recruited good players. If you think about this profession there are no real standards for it, there is nothing. If you are an accountant you have to go to school for it, if you are a lawyer you go to law school. There is no formal training for coaches. I guess that was part of it, and I said, I am sorry I feel I am too bright for this. That was the attitude I had, and it's a shitty attitude, and I had to deal with that when I got into coaching and I thought great, I am in this profession that I don't think has a lot of credibility. To my own standards.

This "new" coach was unaware that most women in coaching have been formally trained as physical education instructors or more recently in some other related sub-discipline in a physical education or a sport and leisure studies program. Her
description of the lack of good female role models is a reflection both of the decline in women working in athletics, the decline in women entering physical education, and a shift in professional standards for women coaches. Interestingly, despite the lack of positive female role models, for this woman, to be a good coach means to be a teacher. This woman simply could not identify with and did not want to model coaches who were not teachers and educators.

While the decline in positive female role models diminished opportunities for anticipatory socialization for these women the desegregation of occupations which occurred in the 1970's opened the door to the more prestigious and traditionally male occupations like law and medicine. Cottier et al. (1995) explain,

The 1970's were a breakthrough for occupational desegregation. From 1910 to 1970, occupational gender segregation had been quite stable, increasing slightly from 63.0 to 67.6 on the index of dissimilarity (D); then, between 1970 and 1980, it declined to 59.8 (Jacobs, 1989a). (1995:3)

While occupational desegregation opened doors for women, it also created new expectations. New opportunities combined with declining female role models in teaching and coaching to create a social context which influenced the early career decisions of women in the "new" cohort. Over half (59%) of the women in the "new" cohort had no intention of becoming coaches and most majored in fields like political science, psychology, and business. Eight coaches (47%) (all non-physical education majors) started, or had planned to start careers in different fields before finding their way back to athletics, or as one coach described, "falling into coaching."

While the lack of positive female role models who modeled culturally acceptable female attributes was important, new opportunities for women in the world of work were equally as important. On coach who had positive female role models in her family, in high school and in college explained that she had always viewed herself as an educator
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but she planned to major in business, and work in business for a few years, then go into coaching. She explained, "To make a long story short I always knew I wanted to coach or at least be in education coaching and teaching. In my senior year I said well I know I will be in education eventually so let me go the business route for a while then I will do what I really know I will love." As if to appease changing cultural expectations and to gain acceptance as a "working woman," this coach planned to put off doing what she knew she would love for something more acceptable and more in line with cultural expectations.

The comparison of "old" and "established" coaches with "new" coaches illustrates that individuals make their career choices in a cultural and historical context. As Kraus explains, "A final major determinant of individual careers is the way in which the individual's life cycle intersects with history, the opportunities or oppositions presented by the current state of society as related to the state of his occupational or professional art" (1971:43).

**Occupational Identity: Coaching as a "Natural" Choice**

In recent years socialization theory has moved from a functionalist to a dialectical approach. Qualitative studies have revealed that socialization is a complex multidimensional process that is on-going, and that individuals are not passive agents in the socialization process; rather they actively construct, select, and negotiate meaning (Staton-Spicer and Darling, 1986; Staton and Hunt, 1992).

Research on the socialization of teachers typically defines several stages of occupational socialization. One view describes four phases: pre-training; pre-service; pre-service; in-service; and continuance; another model defines three stages: anticipatory (the choice phase); encounter or entry (the actual work in the occupation
and organizational setting); and continuance/adaptation/metamorphosis (when an individual adapts so as to remain in the profession) (Staton-Spicer and Darling, 1986).

Research on the pre-training/anticipatory phase consistently asserts that individual biography has an important influence on the internalization of occupational norms and values and the kind of teacher one becomes. An early study by Lortie found that "through years of close contact with teachers, education students internalize a model of teaching before they enter a professional training program; research by Eddy (1969) found that teaching technique and management style were influenced by teachers own experiences as students (Staton and Hunt, 1992:113). Hollingsworth (1989) and Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1986, 1989) assert that prior experiences and beliefs serve as a filter through which to interpret more formal training (in Staton and Hunt, 1992:113).

Despite the fact that there were important differences between cohorts in the paths taken into coaching, all of the coaches in this study appear to have adopted the norms, values and beliefs typically associated with their profession. All appear to have developed an identity consistent with the norms and values of their field...an occupational identity as women coaches. Despite the fact that the women in the "new" cohort had few positive female role models, and many did not major in physical education, they too see themselves as teachers and emphasized the educational aspects of their role as coaches. In discussing why they chose coaching as an occupation their responses reflect an approach to teaching and coaching consistent with the "female model" of sport: a focus on the educational value of sport, and a concern for the athlete's overall well-being. For example, the following Division I coach describes what coaching means to her,

My colleague and friend who was a teacher and coach thought I would do well as a teacher. I certainly had to have been a born teacher, and coaching is teaching at its finest so they so, so I was drawn to the teaching part of it first, how to teach somebody, and the satisfaction you get and realizing they learned because of what you
did, and the feeling you get when someone has learned, the nice goose bumpy feeling
when someone has learned and you had a hand in that; probably of all the things, still
today, that thrill me in teaching and coaching is when someone masters a jump shot,
or got better as a player. I know that is still true, I still get that feeling. So you
know you love it no matter what. So it was teaching really and then coaching, I
probably could be as excited in teaching really, but the reality is that the motivation
for kids to learn is higher in athletics, so that is probably the difference, but I love
both really.

The coaches in this sample entered coaching for altruistic reasons, to "give something
back," and to "help others." They want to "have an impact on young peoples lives," and
to "help other young women grow." For most, coaching is a "calling," and it is central to
their sense of who they are. One coach explained that when she started to coach, "my life
lit up," and other explained it as something "spiritual" and related, "This is really it
for me. It's everything. It's emotional, it's spiritual, it involves your whole being."

A comparison of coaches in all three cohorts revealed that regardless of age, years of
experience, or college major, there was little difference in occupational identity; the
coaches in this sample see themselves as teachers and educators. For these women
coaching and teaching means caring about your athletes. The following quotes illustrate
this pattern.

Physical Education Major

I think only that philosophically from the start I wanted to be an educator. I wanted
to be in a profession where I was helping people, working with people, having an
impact on somebody's life, and knowing from the moment I walked into college that
was what I wanted to do.

Non-Physical Education Major

So part of it is that you have to be a teacher, love it and give the information in a
positive way. I think you can learn it but I also think a lot of it is something you can
either do or not do. Maybe I learned that growing up, how to impart knowledge.
Because basically that is what I am I think of myself as a teacher. I do coach, but I am
a teacher. I think probably I was a teacher from the beginning.

Not only do all of these coaches see themselves as educators and teachers, they
described what they valued about coaching in terms which are consistent with expectations for their gender role: caring, giving, and nurturing. Their responses revealed that all of the women in this sample have developed an occupational identity consistent with the female model of sport even though only 74% were formally trained in the field of physical education. Despite the differences in occupational socialization among "new" coaches, they appear to possess an occupational identity similar to their "old" and "established" counterparts.

Past research in work and occupations shows that for professionals the formal training period is crucial for the development of occupational identity (Becker et al., 1961; Becker, 1971; Khleif, 1975; Merton, 1957). However, while in-service socialization through contact with peers and significant others might explain, in part why "old", "established" and "new" coaches share similar values, norms, and beliefs; and why they appear to share an occupational identity consistent with the female model of sport; another explanation needs to be considered. The consistency in occupational ideals expressed by the coaches in this study may be related to gender.

The values and attitudes which constitute the coaches' occupational identity may have been developed through a combination of childhood play experiences, anticipatory socialization, or through formal socialization in college; it may also have developed through interaction with peers and colleagues in work settings. However, the most important determinant of the shared values and attitudes described by coaches in this study may be related to the female coaches gender role. From this point of view, occupational identity is constructed, interpreted and experienced, in part, through the lenses of gender (Lipsitz Bem, 1993).
“Doing Gender”

In her discussion of the lenses of gender, Sandra Lipsitz Bem (1993) explains that men and women are perceived to be fundamentally different kinds of people, something she refers to as gender polarization, and that this notion of fundamental difference has become an organizing principle in social life. She also explains that biological essentialism rationalizes and legitimates this polarization and insures that these differences will be understood as inevitable and intrinsic. Moreover, Lipsitz Bem argues that individuals internalize these "cultural lenses" and are motivated to construct an identity consistent with them. According to Lipsitz Bem these lenses of gender are the hidden assumptions about sex and gender embedded in cultural discourses, social institutions, and individual psyches.

While Lipsitz Bem outlines the hidden nature of gender imperatives, West and Zimmerman explain the intricacies of “doing gender,” how individuals “organize their various manifold activities to reflect or express gender” (1991:14). According to West and Zimmerman, gender is the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category, gender activities emerge from and bolster claims to membership in a sex category” (14). Gender, they argue, “is not a set of traits, nor a variable, nor a role, but the product of social doings of some sort “... gender itself is constituted through social interaction,” (16). Borrowing from Goffman’s idea of “gender display” West and Zimmerman take their conceptualization one step further to argue that “doing gender” is an ongoing activity embedded in everyday interaction. According to West and Zimmerman men and women are held accountable for their gender behavior, and to fail to live up to normative conceptions of gender is to risk having ones sex category called
into question; in other words, gender is something one is accountable for. As they note,

A woman physician (notice the qualifier in her case) may be accorded respect for her skill and even addressed by an appropriate title. Nonetheless she is subject to evaluation in terms of normative conceptions of appropriate attitudes and activities for her sex category and under pressure to prove that she is an "essentially" feminine being, despite appearance to the contrary. (West in West and Zimmerman, 1991:26).

The "old" and "established" coaches in this study have been socialized in the norms and values associated with women's coaching through their participation in organized school sports and their contact with members of the occupational group. Research by Scraton (1992) supports the findings presented here: that women physical educators and coaches espouse traditionally female approaches to sport and physical activity, an approach which affirms traits associated with women and femininity. She states,

In considering attitudes and ideas the research confirms that women teachers have clear expectations about girls and young women which are constructed around a notion of 'femininity.' This femininity encompasses ideas about physical ability/capacity, sexuality, domesticity and motherhood. Crucially the research demonstrates that it is a construction which does not remain simply in the minds of individual teachers but one which is generalized, both informing and influencing physical education practice. This is reflected in the choice of suitable activities for girls, class organization and teacher-pupil interaction. Clearly then in their professional practice, women physical education teachers are agents of socialization, transmitting gendered messages to pupils through their interaction, language and teaching. It is a process derived from expectations around femininity. (Scraton, 1992:114)

In attempting to diffuse the masculine connotations of sport and the consequent stereotypes, and reconcile the conflict between physical activity and femininity, female physical educators reinforce culturally acceptable definitions of femininity (Scraton, 1992:107).

However, even those coaches who had little or no high school physical education and few sport experiences; and those who had few or no female role models, appear to have
adopted and occupational identity consistent with the norms and values of the "female model" of sport. Analysis of the data presented here points to the tentative conclusion that this identity is made up, in part, of the socializing influences of the occupational realm, and the socializing influences of gender. In essence the desire to "give back" and "help others" appears to be a reflection of the fact that coaches have been properly socialized in their occupation; it is also a reflection of gender socialization and coaches "doing gender." This coach explains,

I wanted to be in a profession where I was helping other people, working with people, having an impact on somebody's life, and knowing that from the moment I walked into college that was what I wanted to do. So that's definitely at my core, wanting to be an educator.

In sum, for women coaches in this sample coaching is an educational endeavor and coaches see themselves as teachers. However, the meaning of coaching for women coaches can not be explained only in terms of their occupational socialization, it must also be thought of in terms of their effort to construct an identity consistent with their gender. Gender is something the coaches in this sample feel accountable for; perhaps more so because sport is a male domain and carries connotations of masculinity

Occupational identity then is constructed through early childhood play experiences, anticipatory socialization and role models, and through informal and formal occupational training. It is also constructed through gender socialization. There is no way to be sure, from this study, if the examples of "doing gender" found here are verbal accounts only and do not correspond with reality. However, this is not a problem when the intent is to establish occupational identity and the meaning of an occupation for workers; properties which reside in the minds of individuals in any case. In addition, there is also no way of knowing, from this study, whether coaches fulfill gender role expectations because they choose to or feel forced to (the relative power of agency vs. structural constraints), this
Choosing an occupation is a decision making process framed by socio-cultural limitations. It involves actively selecting and passively eliminating alternatives. But choosing and occupation may also be fortuitous, more the product of luck and/or trivial choices than any rational decision making process. In many cases choosing an occupation involves an effort to match self concept with valued occupational roles (Super, 1957) and is a compromise between interests, capacities, and opportunities (Caplow, 1954).

For coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts excellent female role models and limited occupational choices fostered anticipatory socialization and the early decision to enter the field of physical education to become a teacher/coach. Without positive female role models, "new" coaches could not even imagine themselves as coaches. Occupational desegregation led these women who loved sport to have aspirations in other more respected fields. Lack of positive female role models combined with more occupational opportunities to heighten the perception of the stigmas attached to coaching; as a result "new" coaches perceived coaching as an occupation with little status: unchallenging and possessing negative stereotypes. Most "new" coaches entered coaching only after finding their chosen field unrewarding; in some cases their love for sport led them to seek part-time or graduate school opportunities and an eventual coaching position, in other cases they had the good fortune to have been at the right place at the right time, often their past playing experiences led to coaching opportunities.

Despite the different "paths" to coaching the women in this sample all entered coaching for similar reasons, because they love sport and wanted to teach and work with
young people. For most of them coaching is a "calling," an expression of who they are and the core of their identity. The coaches interviewed in this study share similar norms and values; they share an occupational identity. For them, coaching is teaching, and to be a "good" coach means to be caring and nurturing, it also means being well-organized, knowledgeable, and assertive. For these women coaches, to be a "coach" is to be an educator, to try and make a positive impact on young people's lives. The analysis of the data collected here reveals that coaches in this sample espouse an approach to coaching consistent with the "female model" of sport: they view coaching in terms of its educational value. Their motivation to coach reflects the ideals and values of early leaders in women's physical education and sport. They are, in this respect, much like their predecessors.

Despite the fact that all of the coaches interviewed in this study see coaching as a form of teaching and value it for its humanistic ideals, they do not share the same formal socialization experiences. Thus, occupational socialization models may explain, in part, the development of the coaches occupational identity, but they do not explain all of it. The majority of women in the "old" and "established cohorts had positive female role models in high school and college and were formally trained as physical education instructors. These socialization experiences might explain, in part, acquisition of attitudes and values. However, if pre-training, and pre-service socialization explain the development of the occupational identity of "old" and "established" coaches, how do we explain the fact that "new" coaches share the same values?

The data from this study show that all coaches in this sample had relatively similar early childhood play experiences: extensive involvement in sport and positive feedback. They may also share similar work setting experiences. These shared experiences may
account for the fact that all of the coaches in this sample project an occupational identity consistent with the "female model" of sport. An alternative explanation is that these women share an occupational identity because they share a gender location. They are all women and thus experience their work from the standpoint of women; the meaning of work is filtered through the lenses of gender. It is suggested here women coaches' approach to coaching is consistent with the female model of sport, in part, because they are "cultural natives" (Lipsitz Bern, 1993). In addition, female coaches "do gender," because they are accountable for it, more so because they work in what has been defined as the last exclusively male domain in modern industrial society (Messner, 1992).

Two research questions are addressed in the analysis presented in this chapter:

1. How do coaches experience their work; what values and meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and what are the social sources of that approach?

The data presented here show that for the women in this sample coaching means being an educator; to coach is to teach and to teach is to care about young people and their growth as human beings. Coaching is valuable to these women because they love sport and because it is a helpful and humanistic endeavor. This however is only a partial analysis of the meaning of coaching and reflects meaning as it exists at the level of occupational ideals; the meaning of coaching for the women in this sample must also be examined on a more practical level, at the level of day-to-day tasks. Organizational settings have their own realities; they may foster or inhibit the implementation of occupational ideals. Thus, the meaning of coaching is further explored in the next chapter: "The Increasingly Bureaucratic and Product Oriented Nature of Coaching."

The data presented here also show that women approach their work, at least initially, from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport. Their occupational identity as teachers
is consistent with the educational approach espoused by women physical educators.

These findings imply that the women coaches in this sample have been socialized in the "female model," most likely through formal or informal occupational socialization. More specifically, the source of this approach is derived from a mixture of contact with role models and anticipatory socialization, and from formal training as physical educators. It also appears that the way coaches think about, and what they value about coaching, is related to their socialization as women in a society which views men and women as polar opposites and legitimates the notion of difference by claiming its genesis is biological, and asserting the authority of "scientific facts" (Lipsitz Bem, 1993).

An additional source of the female model approach to coaching not addressed in this chapter is social class. However, it is clear that for the women in this sample, class status is an objective location which influences occupational choice and the experience of occupational socialization. Moreover, it is clear that class and gender intersect. Coaches' reasons for entering coaching fit middle class notions of gender appropriate behavior, and gender appropriate work.

Finally, although it is clear that the reasons women choose coaching as an occupation appear to fit the female model of sport, these occupational ideals do not necessarily determine practice. Workers may choose a profession because they believe in the occupational ideals of the group, and they may adopt the occupational identity of group members; yet the realities of their work situation may lead them to fail to live up to those ideals in practice. The extent to which coaches approach their work (coaching practices) from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport is further explored in Chapter VIII.
CHAPTER VII
THE INCREASINGLY PRODUCT ORIENTED
AND BUREAUCRATIC NATURE OF COACHING

Sport in the last 110 years has not escaped the thrust of rationality, both technological and bureaucratic. Sport has increasingly mirrored the 'formalized, hierarchical, rule-laden and efficiency seeking type of social organization the principal prototypes of which are big government, modern business enterprise, and the military establishment' (Page, 1973:32). It has emerged as yet another product-oriented activity in social life and this coupled with the application of scientific and technological rationality has led us to debate whether such trends engender the suppression of individual autonomy. (Ingham, 1975:338)

This chapter addresses the work tasks involved in coaching and adds to our understanding of how coaches experience their work, and the meaning they assign their practices. The focus here is on changes in job tasks: how coaches have responded to and feel about those changes. The data for this analysis are derived from "old" and "established" coaches responses to the question: "How has your job changed over the years?", and from their more general perceptions of the nature of and changes in collegiate sport. These women have been involved in coaching between ten and twenty seven years. Their responses illuminate the extent to which coaching as a profession has changed, and how coaches feel about and have adapted to those changes. They also reveal the underlying forces in the evolution of coaching as a profession for women. Data in this section are also derived from "new" coaches' responses about work tasks, their likes and dislikes.

In this chapter I deal first with changes in women's collegiate sport including the shift in focus from the process of sport to the sports product and the increasing rationalization of women's collegiate sport manifested in administrative tasks. The
second part of this chapter is an investigation of changes in work tasks involved in
coeaching with specific attention to the task of recruiting. In the third part I illustrate
change in the coaching profession by showing that "new" coaches' feelings about and
reactions to work tasks differ from their "old" and "established" colleagues. In the last
section I use the data presented in this chapter to draw tentative conclusions regarding
the nature and extent of women coaches' accommodation and resistance to the dominant
sport culture.

All of the data for this chapter were analyzed by cohort groups, and by Divisions
within cohorts. To review, coaches were placed in cohort groups according to the year in
which they graduated from college: "Old" coaches graduated from college in 1971 or
before, they range in age from 45 to 57 years old and had been coaching between 19 and
27 years; "established" coaches graduated from college between 1972 and 1984, they
range in age between 32 and 43 years old and had been coaching for 10 to 18 years;
"new" coaches graduated in 1985 or after, they range in age from 27 to 35 and had been
coaching between 2 and 10 years.

Coaches were assigned to Division groups according to the NCAA Division affiliation of
the college where the coach worked; coaches in Division I and II were grouped together
for analysis. This created two Divisional groupings which were used throughout this
study: coaches in Division I, II; and those in Division III.

In the first section on changes in women's collegiate sport responses by "old" and
"established" coaches are reported together because there were no apparent differences
between Divisions. "New" coaches responses were not used in this part of the analysis
because it was determined their perception of change would be too short sighted given
their brief tenure in the profession. In the second section, "Changes in Coaching," "old"
and "established" coaches responses are reported by Division to illuminate the
differences which were revealed by their responses. In the third section "new" coaches
responses are reported alone. Because there was little difference by Division within the
"new" cohort, the data is reported together and are not separated by Division.
Throughout this chapter "typical" responses are used to illustrate patterns in the data.

Rationalization and the Influences of Capitalism in Women's Coaching

The concept of rationalization used here follows Max Weber's interpretation.
Weber's notion of rationalization refers to changes in human action associated (at first)
with the emergence of modern capitalism in the West. It refers to a set of processes by
which all of human existence is subject to calculation, measurement, and control. For
Weber, rationalization involved specific changes in modern life including: (1). Changes
in economic organization including the bureaucratic organization of factories and
systematic accounting to increase profit. (2). Changes in ad hoc law and a move to
universal rational-legal interpretations. (3). In politics, a move away from
charismatic and traditional leadership to party systems and government characterized
by procedural rules, administrative roles achieved by merit, and hierarchical
organization. (4). And in society, the general spread of bureaucracy to all
organizational forms and social institutions. A modern life characterized by a focus on
efficiency, quantification, calculation, and control (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner,
1988:202). The consequences for man of this process of rationalization is, according to
Weber,

...while the Puritan wanted to work in a calling, we are forced to do so. For when
asceticism was carried out of monastic cells into everyday life, and began to dominate
worldly morality, it did its part in building the tremendous cosmos of the modern
economic order. This order is now bound to the technical and economic conditions of
machine production which today determine the lives of all the individuals who are born into this mechanism, not only those directly concerned with economic acquisition, with irresistible force. (1958:18)

For Weber, the rationalization of modern capitalist society has produced an "iron cage" which imprisons all mankind and reduces man to an existence void of meaning.

The women coaches in this sample have been influenced by the rationalization of modern society. They became coaches because they love sport and wanted to work with young people; they see themselves as teachers who can have a positive influence on young women. They have been socialized in the values and attitudes of their occupation and have adopted an occupational identity consistent with the female model of sport. However, the work world of the female coach makes it hard to live up to these occupational ideals. Her job, like all work in modern industrial society, has been influenced by differentiation and specialization; a universal trend toward bureaucracy: hierarchy, procedural rules and regulations; and rationalization (Caplow, 1954).

The female coach is confronted by the process of rationalization from another direction: the realm of sport. Like all social realms modern sport has grown more rationalized. It is characterized by, among other things, specialization, bureaucratization, quantification, and an emphasis on records (Guttmann, 1978). Rules are standardized and rule enforcement is controlled by regulatory agencies. The focus is on the organizational and technical aspects of the activity; and learning sport skills is formalized (Coakley, 1994). In addition, in capitalist societies sport also reflects the norms and values of capitalism: an emphasis on competition, achievement, and success; and in some sport forms, the pursuit of profit. Despite its alignment with education, collegiate sport has been influenced by the values and logic of capitalism.

The logic of capitalism and the process of rationalization combine to form the overarching context of the female coach's work world. However, while the
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characteristics of modern sport and the nature of work in modern capitalist society combine to shape the work world for American female coaches, the nature of coaching in the 1990's has also been shaped more directly by its peculiar relationship with higher education. Moreover, much of the change in women's coaching is related to the implementation of Title IX and the NCAA takeover of women's collegiate athletics.

The Parameters of the Job and Ensuing Change

The realities of work settings do not necessarily fit occupational ideals, nor allow for their implementation; and professional ideals are often antithetical to the organization of work (Pavalko, 1971). Faced with a mismatch between occupational ideals and organizational realities coaches, like most workers, find ways to adapt and/or reconcile cognitive dissonance, at times accommodating to the exigencies of job demands, at times resisting. The analysis of subjects' perceptions of women's collegiate sport and their work behavior, are evidence of the female coach's search for meaning in and control over her work; of her effort to both accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture.

Collegiate coaching is a labor of love, it has to be because women coaches spend enormous amounts of time at their jobs. For most, coaching is an avocation. As one coach explained, "you know what they say...when it stops being fun and starts feeling like work, then you know it's time to get out." Overall the coaches in this sample love their jobs, especially the part which entails contact with student-athletes: the actual teaching, coaching, and what they call, "counseling." But coaching in the 1990's entails much more than working with athletes. An analysis of work tasks reveals that the occupation of coaching includes five major tasks: recruiting; administration; fundraising; practice preparation, practice and game coaching; and informal contact
with student-athletes.

Women coaches spend between 60 and 80 hours a week at these tasks when they are "in-season," although the time devoted to each task varies depending on the time of year. The Division I coaches in this sample typically work ten to twelve hours a day, six to seven days a week, and many work this much all year. As one coach explained, "because of recruiting, 'in-season' is all the time." Many coaches do have a "down time" for a month or so after their competitive season ends where they work 40 hour weeks, but in Division I and II the standard is six days a week year round and seven days a week during the competitive season (including travel). Coaches in Division III described working 60 hour weeks "in-season" with one day off. Because most coach two sports, "in-season" is usually five to six months out of the year. In the off-season they work 40 hour weeks (Most Division III coaches have nine or ten month contracts as opposed to the twelve month Division I and II contract.).

Despite the long hours and relatively low pay, the majority of coaches in this sample said they love what they do. As one "new" coach explained, "I feel like the luckiest person in the world." To say that most of their waking hours are occupied by work is an understatement. Unlike their friends in the "real world," these women look forward to going to work, even if people continue to ask, "What do you do all day?" For most of the women in this sample however, especially those in the "old" and "established" cohorts, the occupation of coaching has changed significantly since they first entered the field. These changes have influenced how coaches feel about their work. As one coach explained, "I loved the game before all that came, and I like it now, I don't love it, I like it."

Since the passage of Title IX in 1972, there have been numerous changes in the
structure and philosophy of women's intercollegiate athletics. These changes have included athletic scholarships, increase in number of scholarships, increase in recruiting, increase in number of games/matches per season, decrease in broad participation, i.e. j.v. programs, increase in number of coaches, increase in hours spent in sport per week throughout the year, availability of academic tutors for athletes, increased publicity and press coverage, and increased emphasis on records and winning (Blinde, 1989:40).

These changes in women's athletics have been described as a process of emulation, women adapting to and emulating men's athletics. As Blinde explains,

> It has been argued that men have been in power throughout the time period in which rational bureaucratic organizations evolved and thus such structures may reflect something that is peculiarly male. Viewed from this perspective, big-time college sports is a product of the male character and resonates best with maleness as defined in the U.S. (1989:37)

Male dominance in sport insured that when opportunities in collegiate sport opened for women after the passage of Title IX, men's collegiate sport would become the standard against which to determine equality. As a result, women's collegiate sport has grown more like men's collegiate sport. When the NCAA wrested control of women's collegiate athletics in 1982 many argued that the process of emulation accelerated, and that women coaches would have no choice but to adopt the male model. They argued: not only would female coaches take on new tasks, they would also change how they think about and approach their work. Many believed that the encroaching dominant sport culture would force women coaches to shift their philosophical stance on sport and coaching from an educational to a product oriented focus.

The following section explores the extent to which women coaches have in fact adopted a "male" approach to collegiate sport by looking at the changes in work tasks and coaches
reactions to those changes. However, in keeping with earlier explanations regarding the nature of intercollegiate sport (see Chapters I and IV), the term "male/professional model" is used rather than "male model". This section addresses the question: How have changes in the structure and philosophy of women's collegiate sport affected the job of coaching and how have coaches responded to those changes? Moreover, do coaches emulate the "male/professional model" of sport, both philosophically and in practice? These questions are explored first in an analysis of "old" and "established" coaches' descriptions of changes in women's collegiate sport, and second in an analysis of their reactions to change experienced in their own jobs.

Changes in Women's Collegiate Sport

At various points throughout the interviewing process coaches described that collegiate sport in general is growing more "business-like." Subjects in this sample concur that Division I sport is a business, that women's athletics is growing more like men's athletics, and that some female coaches emulate the "male model" of sport (their language). While most Division III coaches felt relatively protected from this evolutionary process, many also described the businesslike "male model" approach encroaching on women's Division III sport.

The following responses illustrate the perception among coaches that women's collegiate sport is growing more "business-like." For the women coaches in this sample, "more business-like" refers to two distinct phenomena: (1). A shift in focus from process to product. (2). More time spent on administrative tasks.
From Process to Product

When asked to describe collegiate sport, all of the coaches in this sample started by drawing a distinction between Division I and Division III collegiate athletics (In the minds of coaches, Division II is a grey area, more like Division I than III; although Division II coaches also separate themselves from Division I.).

Q: How would you describe collegiate sport?
A: I think there is more...I think Division I is a business, the part we watch on TV, the other part we don't watch, what most of us do is an avocation-more like a hobby, or a separate part. It is still the academic athletic mix, but not so much at the upper levels. I am not saying that is bad, but it is a business for better or worse.

Another coach explained,

Q: How would you describe women's collegiate sport?
A: Well, it's not a business, I mean it's getting there, but I don't think it is there. Well, I take that back, women's Division I basketball is a business now. Division I women's is maybe a smaller business than the men's, but it is a business. I guess the only thing I can think of for the other levels is that they are more like an avocation.

Although this coach clearly separated Division III sport from Division I, she also described how Division III sport is being influenced by the increasing emphasis on winning.

I get concerned about the fair play-you don't really see blatant cheating-but there are the rules of the game and then there is the spirit around the rules, the ethos around the game. At camps you see people doing stuff and they are teaching players the wrong spirit of the game, and that is gone in a lot of ways, I just don't see that being taught. To me it's not fun if you can't win the right way, but doing things the right way seems to be less and less important. Some people say, "My job is to win and it means not breaking the rules but taking advantage of the rules." They say this is what they should be doing and I say that is coaching with blinders.

As the stakes have gotten higher, as we have gotten better and gotten better opportunities things have changed. Like we used to go to the play days and have the spirit around the game, that camaraderie-I'm not saying that...that was not huge [the most important] for me but there were those nice feelings about when competition was over, when you see the coach the next time and it would be nice and you could talk to each other. There are so many hard feelings now in sports. It's like the men coaches...they won't talk to each other. The women in our conference share a lot more, but I can see things have changed some. They get mad, think you screwed them, so the whole spirit around the game I think is lost.
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I go to a lot of camps and I see a lot of coaching and I just hope those people realize how much players can self actualize through sports. Like I said, I had great female role models, great coaches, I just wonder if other coaches are doing that now. I think it is very important and often it doesn't happen because people are focusing on end results, product not process.

The perception that the "stakes are higher" reflects reality, especially in Division I. This coach explains,

I think that collegiate sport is getting closer and closer to professional sport, in terms of it getting more business-like. With the monies that are being spent on coaches nowadays they are being more demanding about wins and losses I think it has become, men's sport was like this before, but I think women's sport are becoming more cutthroat in terms of recruiting, more business-like. I don't like that aspect of what is happening, I think it has increasingly gotten bad.

The following coach states more explicitly exactly what is at stake for coaches in Division I,

In Division I people have written into their contracts how many games they have to win. They say, "What do you need to be successful? Three cars, 3 assistants, scholarships, equipment recruiting budget, this and that? Here it is...three years. This is what I want to see in three years, if not, you are gone."

The increased emphasis on winning has had a profound impact on women's collegiate sport. The following Division I coach described this change,

Q: How would you describe collegiate sport?
A: Oh God I could get into trouble here. In theory an avenue to enhance education, in reality college sports has become a business. Smaller sports are less so, but they are getting more and more like the bigger sports. Like in softball a West coast university brought in a European woman in March, she pitched all season and they won the national title, then she left after the tournament. I'm sure she did not attend classes at the university. It's these kinds of violations, recruiting violations. It doesn't make any sense, women don't have any place to go after college, they can't be professionals, so it's really important they get an education.

Division III coaches expressed similar views, illustrated here by this coach who stated, "There is more emphasis on winning now, doing well, and less on what the athlete gets out of it."
The consensus among coaches in this sample was that Division I women's sport has grown more business-like, "especially in recruiting" and "especially in women's basketball." Although expectations vary by sport and institution, the coaches in this sample described that in Division I women's athletics winning is an expectation which accompanies the job, whether spelled out literally in their contracts, or communicated to them verbally by their athletic director. In general, colleges that commit resources to athletic programs in the form of scholarship money, recruiting budgets, travel and equipment want something in return... something tangible. One coach describes,

Q: How would you describe collegiate sport in American society?
A: It depends on which Division. Division I has scholarships, I put a lot of pressure on myself. I also feel there is a lot of pressure from the administration to succeed. I want to succeed and take the team to a higher level and get recognition for our sport. We are trying to make it as positive an experience as possible, also trying to get the best people as possible into my program, who want to work, who enjoy it, but also want to work. At our level it is different, it's not win at all cost but it is definitely a little more business-like approach. We are trying to do things at a higher level...it is a big commitment for the athletes.

While all of the women coaches in this sample explained an internal pressure to win, they also described external pressure, especially the Division I coaches. The expectation to produce winning teams can make the process of coaching more business-like, leading coaches to become more focused on those things that can help them win games and less concerned with those things which don't contribute to that goal.

Although Division III coaches described feeling relatively protected from this "shift in focus," in talking about the nature of their work tasks they revealed that even in Division III, women's collegiate sport has changed and there has been a shift in focus. It has become more product oriented. This Division III coach explains,

Q: How would you describe collegiate sport?
A: I would say Division I is a business, which is different from here, here the
emphasis is on sport being a part of education. Division I is definitely separate.

Another Division III coach explained,

Q: How would you describe women's collegiate sport?
A: I would say there is a big difference between men's and women's but at the Division I level the differences are dwindling fast. More so, women are the essence of collegiate sport, especially Division III. Division I is a whole different thing, it is becoming so much like the men because it is a business. With Title IX you got rid of all the women administrators, and since it's become a big business you have the women emulating the men. When I think of Division I women I think of basketball. Unfortunately so many women coaches and administrators are making the same mistake the men do. Like the cheating and the ridiculous recruiting, just all baloney. I have a friend who is a Division I assistant and they are out their looking at ninth graders...well, the only reason they do that is because the men's program does. It's the women following the men. I think it is the women wanting to prove women sports are as serious as men's instead of recognizing that men's sports are ridiculous in some ways. Because we are trying to emulate them and following the same pattern, thinking it is the golden rule, and I don't think it is.

Although this coach talks about Division III athletics as if it is immune from the "trickle down" of the "male/professional model," she goes on to explain that in practice the male coach at her school is the standard by which she feels she is being judged, and this affects her behavior.

I don't want to be a hypocrite. When the men's coach is out there recruiting five days and I haven't been out yet, I feel that. I think, maybe I should be out there, and usually I am. So there is this internal pressure, but I just think that at the Division I level it's totally excessive.

The Rationalization of Women's Collegiate Sport: Administrative Tasks

The shift in focus from process to product is not the only change women described. Women's collegiate sport has also grown more rationalized and bureaucratic, much of this is related to NCAA rules and regulations. Below, a Division I coach who had been away from coaching for eight years discusses the changes she felt upon re-entering the world of women's collegiate sport. Her comments illustrate the trend toward rationalization.
Q: What was it like coming back to coaching?
A: A lot had changed. It was more of a business. But there was more for the women, and we get respect. It was much more business-like. The novelty of coaching had changed. There is so much administration now, so much more publicity. I was so visible now.

Q: How is women's collegiate sport more business-like now?
A: There is so much paper work to be done. So much of what you do is defined by NCAA guidelines. There is not a lot of room for creativity. They stifle any creativity in terms of marketing you might want to do, it is almost silly. We [coaches] are all sitting here doing the exact same thing, it is comical, the recruiting. We all go to the same camps, and watch the exact same things and same kids. Over and over again. Out recruiting, back on campus, your whole life is defined by the NCAA calendar, your whole train of thought, everything you do is defined by the NCAA, the color of your paper...give me a break. You get bogged down in it, it is like being stuck in mud. If they can make more restrictions they will, if they can make more work they will... It used to be you could come up with new ideas and implement them. Now any new idea is a problem. And you really need secretaries to do all this paperwork, fortunately I have one.

Coaches described a tremendous increase in paperwork. This Division I coach explains,

Q: How has coaching changed?
A: The NCAA rules and regulations, that has just gotten unbelievably microscopic. Paperwork in, paperwork out, paperwork in, paperwork out. I just think the NCAA is mandating these things for all sports that really should only affect men's football and basketball, and maybe women's basketball. I think there ought to be a separate book for the big revenue producers

Another Division I coach explains the trend towards specialization, organizational differentiation, and an increase in procedural rules and regulations in women's collegiate sport.

There is more specificity now, less diversity. I went from teaching and coaching three sports to no teaching and coaching one sport. It seems like you do so much less now, because it seems like you did more when you did different tasks, but I think I work way more now than I ever did. Attaching ourselves to the NCAA triples paperwork and things you have to follow. Now I am responsible for academic performance, it is ludicrous and I mock it every chance I get, because the professors should be responsible not me if the kids are not in class, we inherited that from the men because they brought in kids that couldn't possible make it, it is absurd. So now it is our responsibility, you have to do drug education things, now we have film exchange so you have to have an organizational dept for film exchange, and a recruiting part, you need someone to do just recruiting. I don't think there is any one
aspect that has changed most, it has all changed. Probably on the court has changed least, it is the most the same, the actual teaching.

And Division III coaches are not immune to the increasing rationalization of women's collegiate athletics. This Division III coach explains,

There are more rules and regulations and such. I find the administrative side of coaching has gone up over the years. And that is with a very strong support staff. We have to monitor eligibility, academic standing, participate in health work shops with the students. And there is a larger group of people you have to coordinate your program with now.

All of the "old" and "established" coaches in this sample in all divisions described women's collegiate sport as having changed, as becoming more "business-like" and more like men's collegiate sport. In general coaches described the changes in women's collegiate sport as most pronounced in Division I women's basketball and softball, and they described women's Division III collegiate sport as more "pure," more "amateur," more "like what collegiate sport is supposed to be about." Although some coaches described Division III athletics as relatively immune, and "different," their responses in other segments of the interview revealed their perception that women's Division III collegiate sport has grown more rationalized, especially women's Division III basketball.

Overall, while many Division III coaches are quick to sing the praises of Division III sport and its "purity," when asked about how their own jobs have changed, their responses mirror those of Division I coaches: more recruiting and more administration.

Changes in Coaching as an Occupation

When asked, "How has your job changed over the years?," all of the coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts, women who have been coaching for ten or more years, described they do more recruiting than ever before. Many also described doing a lot more administrative work. While much of the change in women's athletics has been
attributed to Title IX, the NCAA takeover of women's sport and women's emulation of the 
"male model," recent changes in the job of women's coaching, especially the emphasis on 
recruiting is also a product of the relationship between sport and higher education.

American higher education has always been concerned with institutional survival and 
the procurement of resources, and it has never had a clear mandate regarding it's role in 
American society. As a result, over time university presidents have come to rely on 
those aspects of the university which might symbolically legitimize the institutions 
educational existence (Chu, 1989). In recent years more college presidents have 
embraced collegiate sport because they recognize it as one of the few objective measures 
of higher education, a measure the American public can identify with. When collegiate 
sport programs are successful, athletic excellence is generalized to include academic 
excellence, and the college or university may gain prestige and notoriety. The alignment 
between sport and higher education makes it hard to see that winning sports programs 
have little or nothing to do with the transmission of knowledge taking place at a 
university.

Winning teams may not increase alumni and booster support, but they can lead to 
tournament appearances and revenue sharing (Sperber, 1990) and make some athletic 
programs self supporting. In addition, while the vast majority of collegiate sport 
programs are not profitable (most run at a deficit), successful programs can increase 
media exposure and help increase applications for admissions. In sum, since the turn of 
the century more and more college presidents have come to recognize the importance of 
collegiate sport for institutional survival.

In recent years the relationship between sport and higher education has grown even 
more symbiotic. Increased competition for students (a result of the declining pool of
college age applicants, the rising cost of education, and stagnant wages among middle
class families) has led many colleges to allocate more resources to their athletic
programs, even at the Division III level. As the following coaches explain, in the 1990's
most college presidents are very aware that winning teams are both good for the school's
image and can increase applicants. This Division II coach stated,

You get a lot of publicity and a lot more kids apply to the school, and then alumni and
people start giving to your program. But in a lot of ways everything is want, want,
want. I think we lose the focus on what we are all about. The school is the same way,
it's not so much they care about my sport, it is how can we benefit from my team
going to the final four. That's all the administration talked about when we went. The
president said, "Can't we get more TV time? When we got home from the final four
the president wanted me to call the sportscaster from the local station and ask him to
do a story on us. First of all I said I don't have time, second, I am not going to call and
beg for attention. We had the press wanting to come to our practices, and so much
having to do with the press, we were in the papers for 22 straight days.

At Division III institutions the story is the same. Media exposure for athletics is good
for the school, and most college presidents recognize this.

Any college president who doesn't realize that athletic teams are automatic publicity
for the college on a daily basis isn't in touch. The media coverage of athletics has
increased over the years and schools are taking advantage of it—athletics is seen in a
slightly different light now—it is more positive. We are nationally ranked in many of
our sports. We have become known for our sports because several of our teams have
gone to the NCAA tournament.

Throughout the 1980's colleges and universities throughout the New England area
committed resources to their athletic programs, building new sports complexes and
adding sports teams. Despite dwindling funds, the logic was, especially among small
liberal arts colleges: in order to survive as an institution, and to compete with other
institutions for the dwindling applicant pool of students, you had to have excellent sports
facilities and good sports programs. The following Division III coach describes the
increased importance of athletics at her college in recent years, and how it has changed
The piece that has changed the most is recruiting. Before there was no recruiting really. We didn't have that kind of program, it was more let's all play if we don't win no big deal. So that was not something that was pushed on us. Then the whole thing changed. We grew, we got a new building, all of a sudden all this money started pumping in. Well they want to see some results. So now we are expected to recruit, to be here hosting games, the whole recruiting thing. That is one portion of my job that has really changed. Winning is more important, we are more highly visible now. We have the president showing up at games. When basketball went to the final four you better believe everyone was on the band wagon.

It is clear from these coaches' responses that women's collegiate sport has become more business-like and more rationalized, more administrative and bureaucratic, and more focused on the sports product. As the structure of women's athletics has changed, so to has the occupation of coaching. These changes are reflected in the increased amount of time women coaches devote to recruiting, the aspect of their job they describe as having changed the most over the years. Coaches' feelings about and reactions to this relatively new task in women's coaching are presented below. The meaning they assign to the task of recruiting reveals that the structural changes in women's collegiate sport and resulting changes in work tasks have not necessarily been accompanied by changes in philosophy, approach to work, or occupational identity. By looking at women's collegiate sport from the bottom up, from the standpoint of women coaches, their practices and the meaning they attach to what they do, we get a more realistic, albeit complex, picture of the impact of structural changes in women's collegiate sport on women coaches. We see more clearly at the everyday level of individual behavior and meaning the extent to which the dominant sport culture has actually influenced the occupation of coaching for women, and the extent to which they accommodate to and resist this new sport culture.
Recruiting: Division I and II Coaches

When asked how their jobs have changed over the years the coaches interviewed for this study explained that they spend far more time recruiting student-athletes than ever before, and that much of it involves administrative tasks. The following Division I coach explains,

The hardest thing for me is that this job is becoming more and more an administrative job and less and less a coaching job. The recruiting (sigh)...one of the things I love about rowing is that recruiting has not been a big part of it. One of the things I love in this sport, one of the most rewarding things is to see a young woman who has never rowed before, never been an athlete before, and over four years win a national championship. To see the evolution in that person, not only as an athlete but as a woman, I love it. I just love it! So to have to go out and recruit experienced freshman sort of goes against what I love about this sport, but I have to, and I have to more and more and more. Otherwise they will go to one of the other schools and then you have to row against them.

I didn't used to travel, now I spend three weeks on the road in the fall, which if you talk to anyone else around here that is nothing. Our A.D., all he wants me to be is a recruiter. I coach every day and then I am on the road, it is very hard. But him telling me to do it isn't the only thing, I have to do it, I have to more and more. I don't like to but I have to. I do maybe 90% more now than I used to and I have been coaching at this level for ten years. In the beginning I didn't do much at all.

The Division I, II coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts spend a tremendous amount of their time recruiting student-athletes for their programs. Coaches described allocating between 30% to 80% of the time they spend at their jobs to recruiting, with the majority spending over 50% of on it. Those who spend less have full or part-time assistants who assume all or most of the recruiting duties. The following coaches describe the importance of recruiting:

I spend 75% of my time on recruiting. When you have Stanford University who won the NCAA nationals last year with two freshman on the court, both M.V.P.'s, it has nothing to do with knowledge or technique of coaching, it has to do with recruiting. That is the name of the game.

Another stated,
I spend the bulk of my time on recruiting. Most of my time is spent recruiting. And most of my administrative duties are all wrapped up in recruiting. All those files you see there, those are recruiting files. Then there is the day to day administration. Unfortunately the least amount of time is spent with the kids. But you have to recruit. I spend 70% of my time on recruiting, 20% other administration, and 10% with my athletes.

For coaches in Divisions I and II, especially those with contracts which state expectations for producing successful teams, recruiting is essential; and for many coaches successful recruiting is a criteria of their job evaluation. Even for those who are evaluated on more subjective measures, recruiting is essential. This Division I coach explains,

The bottom line is when you are winning the kids are having fun, so you've got to get the kids and you've got to be successful, and if you are not then they are not going to have fun...I think we put more emphasis on winning and being successful nowadays. I think it comes from society, from parents. I mean my parents when I was in college never thought about how many games we were going to win or what's wrong with the team, you know. Nowadays parents are just more involved, too involved.

The Logic of Recruiting. Although recruiting is an enormously important part of their jobs, and consumes the bulk of their time, the majority of coaches in Division I and II hate recruiting. They hate it because it is "never ending" and because it entails long "road trips" and extensive amounts of phone calling which means late nights in the office or bringing work home, and because it consumes their weekends and summers. Several coaches described that the physical and emotional fatigue associated with recruiting often led them to consider leaving the profession. However, what they really like least isn't the time or energy recruiting entails, but the underlying logic of it all. This coach explains,

I don't really like it. I look at it as marketing. As I expect our athletes to run to get in shape for the games, I have to recruit to get the team in shape. I don't mind the home visits, but I do mind the travel. It bothers me to have to sell my program. I tell them what we have, I don't like to have to beg. It is so silly...it is more the parents.
In the recruiting process parents can be truly ridiculous. They act like their kid is some kind of commodity, like you have to recruit them to get their daughter.

Coaches are like salespeople selling their schools and their programs, and they compete for the few gifted athletes who are available. This competition gives the consumer, students and their parents, a good deal of leverage. While coaches feel they have something to offer students and parents, parents and students feel it is they who have something to offer the coach. In the end it becomes a bargaining "game" where coaches shop for the "best deal on athletes" at the same time athletes and their parents shop for the "best deal from coaches." With the increase in programs offering scholarships, and the move to contracts which stipulate objective measures of success, competition for student-athletes among Division I coaches has grown frenzied.

In the game of recruiting each party attempts to secure their desired goal. For coaches the goal is excellent athletes who fit-in with their programs, who fill a program need. For students and their parents it is a free education, and sometimes involves considerations of an academic or social nature. Each party feels they are offering the other a good deal, and each wants the other to feel they are giving more than they are getting. Overall, recruiting is a game which requires a great deal of time and energy, and it is filled with highs and lows because "getting an athlete" can make a program; it can also mean the difference between keeping or losing a job.

Additional in-depth probing into coaches' feelings about recruiting revealed that what they hate most about it isn't the time and energy involved, or even the travel and time away from home, but the fact that they have to convince student-athletes and their parents to choose their school.

The following Division I coach explains,

That is my least favorite part of the job. Not all people are truly honest in their dealings, I guess we all do it differently. What I don't like about it is , this is how I
look at it and what I tell my assistants. We've done very well here because the kids have worked hard, we have worked hard, there are nice people here. It is a great academic school, it is beautiful we really have everything in the world to sell. I am not going to get down in my knees and tell some kid how wonderful they are; if someone came into my living room and said, here is $20,000.00 for school and my kid said what else are you going to do for me...that attitude...I don't care if the kid is AAU for ten years and the parents have been getting up at 4:00 in the morning. I don't care. We worked here to have a great reputation, everyone has at this campus, and if I offer you a full scholarship and say we would really love to have you come here-I don't know what else you want me to do.

In recent years the rising cost of higher education has made athletic scholarships even more appealing to middle class parents who are trying to put their children through school. Coaches feel that the driving force behind the athlete's pursuit of an athletic scholarship is their parents. As one coach explained, "most female athletes are not hardship cases, they come from middle and upper middle class families." For parents, securing a scholarship can be the difference between keeping the vacation home, or having to sell, it can mean the difference between early retirement or a prolonged career repaying student loans. An athletic scholarship is also a source of social status. The following coaches explain,

This one kid we went to their home, and it is the most beautiful home you have ever seen. A Mercedes in the driveway and a Jaguar. I am so bored and this guy is chewing my ear. They come for a visit and I tell him we don't give scholarships. They say well we can't get financial aid so she is not going to go here, so she ends up taking a scholarship instead. It's like they could just sell one car and finance her education but instead the kid goes to a state school on a full ride instead of an Ivy League school. It happens all the time. It's a class thing. They don't want to have to pay for school if they don't have to, they are worrying about their own living standard, not the kids education.

Another coach explains,

And the parents are much more savvy, some are more greedy. I am absolutely floored by the attitude of some of them, what they expect...they have made an investment in their daughter by sending her to camps and clinics, and spending all this money over the summer and they expect to get a return on their investment in terms of a scholarship. And the amount of the scholarship is very important to them.

When asked, "How do you feel about recruiting?," another coach responded,
A: I hate it. Because it is so much of a business. A lot of it is, "What can you give me?" rather than what do you have to offer the school? Sometimes I see kids go to the wrong school, they end up in the wrong major because they went to the school for the wrong reason. Maybe they were offered $10,000.00 instead of $8,000.00 I have seen that, they go where they can get the most money.

Further analysis of coaches' feelings about recruiting reveal the underlying issues behind their distaste for this time consuming work task: (1) When parents and students assert their power as consumers of the collegiate sport experience coaches feel powerless and out of control of the situation. Without the power to "pick" their teams, coaches have less control over team success. In short, parents and students make the coaches job more uncertain when they "shop around" for the best deal. (2) Coaches are uncomfortable with the idea that players participate for extrinsic rather than instrinsic reasons, to get something rather than give something. Several coaches explained that through the recruiting process they learned that athletes don't really play for the love of the game-they play to get a scholarship. This coach explains,

It has really become more competitive recruiting wise. You really have to go out there and sell your school, you have to buy student athletes, you get kids nowadays playing for more money, they don't necessarily play because they love the game. They play to get scholarships, they play to be able to get into a certain school. I'm not quite sure that they all play because they just purely love the game now.

More importantly, when parents and students "bargain" with coaches and assert their power as consumers, and express their motivation for extrinsic rewards, they force coaches to acknowledge the utilitarian side of coaching as a profession, and their own utilitarian goals. This aspect of coaching is in conflict with the female model of collegiate athletics; an unspoken reality, or "secret" in the profession among women schooled in the female model and a reality most coaches are reluctant to acknowledge, except among other coaches. Students and their parents force coaches to acknowledge a reality that flies in the face of their ideological commitments to the profession: coaches have
utilitarian goals. When parents and athletes "bargain" with coaches, when they feign interest, or ask, "What else can you do for me?," when parents and student athletes treat athleticism like a commodity to be "sold" to the highest bidder, coaches are forced to acknowledge something they have known deep down all along, that collegiate coaching is, in part, a utilitarian endeavor. Despite altruistic concerns for the welfare of student athletes, coaches do have utilitarian concerns. The more a coach feels pressure to win games, the more her work is shaped by utilitarian concerns, and the more she must reconcile the ideals of her profession with the reality of her work setting: altruistic concerns with utilitarian goals. This coach's comments reveal how the "recruiting game" creates problems for coaches.

Q: How do you feel about recruiting?
A: If I wanted to go into sales I would have gone into sales, and recruiting, a huge part of it is talking to them, calling them, writing them...I mean you have to de-recruit them once you get them here if you want to know the truth.

Q: What does that mean?
A: Well you are telling them how good they are and how important they can be to your program and when they get in here a lot of times they need to understand they are just part of this team, and there are twelve other players just as good. Every kid I recruit is probably the best kid on her team. I think a lot of it is sales. And I don't like to have to bring them down afterwards...I mean I want to build them up, obviously I make it sound like a big deal...it's not a big deal...but it is there.

To what extent do Division I, and II coaches accept recruiting as part of their occupation? There was strong consensus among coaches in this sample that recruiting is sales and that you must sell your program. One coach explained, "You are a sales person in the business world. Your school is the product you have... and how are you going to sell it?" While some accept it as a necessary evil, others expressed anger that the task and logic of recruiting has encroached on their professional space. They see it as antithetical to coaching, something alien and out of place, not at all what coaching is
about. Several coaches echoed the coach who stated, "If I wanted to go into sales I would have."

Coaches describe recruiting as "a pain in the neck," "ridiculous," and "stupid." To them, much of it is "bulshitting," but they do it because they feel they have to, there is no other choice. To coach in Division I, or II they must accommodate to the imperatives of recruiting, and in many ways they play right along. Recruiting is such a big part of the Division I and II coaches job that they must find ways to cope with it. The irony is this: coaches say they love what they do; on the other hand they hate to recruit, and recruiting takes up over 50% of their time. One coach described the bind this puts coaches in. When asked, How do you feel about recruiting?, she stated, "I guess I don't want to say I hate it. I know I hate to do it, and it's a challenge. It takes up a lot of time and it's not easy, so it can be sort of a pain. I'm hesitant to say that I hate it, I'm trying not to say I hate it, I don't hate it...but ...I hate it." In short, female coaches must reconcile their love for coaching as an occupation with the fact that they hate a work task which consumes more and more of their time. For this coach, like most others, the solution is to continue to focus on those aspects of coaching they do enjoy, the part they find most meaningful: the teaching and working with her athletes.

Although many coaches hate recruiting, as long as they are evaluated by the objective measure of wins and losses, and as long as their own internal measure of success includes winning games, then they must devote substantial amounts of time to an activity they dislike. Most Division I coaches cope with recruiting by distancing themselves from it, a technique referred to as "role distance." In distancing themselves from recruiting coaches assert their commitment to the ideal of "the teacher," and reject the realities of the business aspects of collegiate sport. Distancing helps coaches to cope
with the self interest inherent in coaching, the grey area between philosophy and ideology, and it helps them cope with feelings of powerlessness. The following comments illustrate how coaches use humor and cynicism to distance themselves from the "recruiting game."

I've learned to dislike it more and more. Kids nowadays want to be pampered more and more. They want you to call them every week. Truthfully, I find a lot of coaches don't like recruiting. You get into a bargaining thing with them. Their fathers are like their agents, that's what my husband calls them. When their fathers call me at home my husband says, "It's an agent on the phone." Kids and parents play coaches off each other. I get burned off by that. It's a waiting game on both sides. I get tired of that. I need to know who wants to come to my school so I can offer my scholarships, the player is waiting out the best offer. And they will ask you...can you do better than that...so and so has offered me such and such. I just don't like it.

Here the term "agent" is used to mock the whole recruiting process. By using a term typically associated with professional sport, this coach both acknowledges the reality of the situation while asserting her disdain for it. In most cases, coaches simply distanced themselves from recruiting by naming it. By referring to recruiting as "sales" and "marketing" coaches asserted that recruiting student-athletes is a part of their occupation set apart from "coaching." In the minds of the "old" and "established" Division I and II coaches in this sample recruiting is still a foreigner, a stranger to be named and pushed to the margins of the profession; something they "have to do," not something they want to or enjoy doing. While they accommodate to the imperatives of recruiting, they refuse to acquiesce their philosophical/ideological stance that coaching is "really" about teaching and helping others.

**Recruiting: Division III Coaches**

The "old" and "established" coaches in Division III also explained that the biggest change in their jobs was the increase in the amount of time they devote to recruiting.
These women described devoting between 10-50% of their time to this task. Several coaches in Division III also explained feeling "pressure to recruit," others said that recruiting was "expected," and one coach explained she is formally evaluated on her ability to recruit. Most Division III coaches said their jobs didn't depend on winning. However, the majority of Division III coaches explained there was an underlying expectation that they should have reasonably successful teams. The following response illustrates this point,

There is some pressure to win, but it is not the kind of pressure where you are going to lose your job if you don't win. We do have a lot of talk around here about winning though. There are a lot of things we are expected to do now that I really don't like or agree with and a lot comes from our administration. There is a lot of pressure to recruit good athletes, how you look to the public. What kind of image you present of the school.

Moreover, while Division III coaches were reasonably sure they would not lose their jobs if they didn't win games, many expressed that they would not want to find out the hard way. In other words, for many coaches there was a degree of uncertainty regarding just how important winning is. Overall, Division III coaches explained that what is expected of them is that they provide students with a positive experience, and that they are reasonably competitive in their league. Whether motivated by the internal desire for success, by external expectations of success, or by the expectation they will provide student athletes with a "good experience," many coaches in Division III feel that recruiting is something they "need to do."

Like their Division I and II counterparts, Division III coaches don't like to recruit. Unlike Division I and II, the philosophy in Division III, and the absence of athletic scholarships, allows most Division III coaches to set limits on the amount of time they devote to recruiting. As a result, the majority of Division III coaches explained that they
"do not devote as much time to recruiting as they should." Moreover, most described
this was a conscious decision on their part. Despite a nagging feeling that they should be
doing more, they resist. The following coach explains,

We are expected to recruit. I probably still don't do enough of it, and that is a
personal decision on my part. I consciously choose not to be on the phone every night
for four hours.

Another coach explained,

Recruiting, I spend much less time than I should, maybe 10%, a fair amount of people
come to see me so I don't have to seek them out. You have to recruit. You have to at
least follow up on kids. Because if you don't recruit then you don't have them here to
work with. But here I am not going to lose my job. So I don't spend as much time on
it. Once the kids are here I work very hard with them. I should probably change that
and spend more time getting them here. My job hasn't changed much over the years
except maybe recruiting. I used to spend 5% of my time on it, now it's more like
10%, but I know I should be spending 20%.

Many Division III coaches would rather just work with whoever shows up on their
campus, they believe, "that is the way it is supposed to be." They see Division III sport
as the last bastion of amateur athletics and an educational endeavor, and they justify the
fact that they recruit "less than they think they should," by pointing to the educational
ideals espoused in Division III athletics. As one coach explained, "I guess I see it as what
sports was meant to be. An integral part of the educational process." While all of the
Division III coaches in this sample said they do recruit, and all said they do more now
than in the past, many believe that recruiting shouldn't be part of their jobs. As this
coach stated, "I don't like it I don't see that as part of my job."

Like their Division I, and II counterparts, most Division III coaches feel recruiting is
a game; a game increasingly defined as an integral part of their job, but a game they
don't want to play.

They say they are going to apply, then they don't, things like that. It is becoming a
game, and I don't want to play the game. That is the single greatest thing that I think
transcends everything else. That the person to person level of honesty and commitment is deteriorating, and it makes the whole thing feel kind of shallow. And that is just not within my values to do it that way.

In many ways Division III coaches are "holding out." They recognize the changing expectations regarding their work tasks, and the extent to which a more product oriented approach to collegiate sport is encroaching on their work world. And they recognize recruiting is necessary to produce successful teams, but they refuse to recruit as much as they think they should. As long as they feel relatively secure that they will not be fired for losing games, and most coaches asserted that this was the case, then they will choose to do only as much recruiting as is necessary to field competitive teams and satisfy their employers.

While many factors influence the amount of time the coach spends on recruiting it is clear that one of the most important determinants is the athletic director's expectations. Coaches who worked for athletic directors who expect them to recruit and/or express that winning is important, appeared to do more recruiting than those coaches whose directors do not. Throughout the 1980's and into the 1990's the focus on recruiting and retention at colleges and universities appears to have led athletic directors to encourage and expect their coaches to recruit, both to justify the resources allocated to their departments and to foster winning programs which increase media exposure and raise the status of the college. In short, in an age of diminishing college applicants, athletic directors justify their programs, in part, by supplying positive media exposure for the college and helping the admissions department secure applicants.

"New" Coaches: Integrating the Altruistic and Utilitarian Aspects of Coaching

A comparison of the "old" and "established" cohort of coaches with "new" coaches revealed what may be the beginning of a fundamental shift in coaching as an occupation.
While "old" and "new" coaches described "hating" recruiting, several "new" coaches explained they "like" and even "love" to recruit. Analysis of the interview data reveals that "old" coaches never expected to have to recruit student-athletes, and most did not do any recruiting in the early years of their career. While most "established" coaches entered coaching with the idea that recruiting would be part of their jobs, especially at Division I and II, many did not expect to have to devote so much time to it. Moreover, most of the women in the "old" and "established" cohorts were trained as physical educators, and most were not recruited athletes themselves. Even though they explained that recruiting is the most important determinant of success, their responses revealed they are ideologically opposed to it and talk about it as if it does not fit their image of coaching as an occupation. They practice the task, but they have not integrated it into their occupational identity.

Several, "new" coaches differed from their "old" and "established" counterparts in the degree to which they accept recruiting as a constituent component of coaching. While this may be explained in part by the fact that these coaches have simply been coaching for fewer years and have yet to feel the emotional and physical fatigue of years upon years of weekends and evenings devoted to recruiting, the difference between cohorts may also be related to occupational socialization. These women were recruited athletes themselves, so they see recruiting as a constituent feature of coaching. Moreover, as one coach explained, nowadays young coaches enter the field as recruiters not teachers, especially in Divisions I and II. The following coach explains,

The young coaches are different, they don't get it. They have never taught. New coaches are not physical educators any more, they can't teach. I picked my assistant because she was a teacher, she understood there is a nurturing element to coaching and teaching progressions. You don't see that any more. It is because the way to become a coach nowadays is you go and become a graduate assistant in a program and
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you go to school for whatever they have there, you don't really care, to get your Masters degree. G.A.'s do all the dirty work. Then you become a second assistant, they do the recruiting and some of the dirty work. Division I first assistant is a recruiting coordinator, she is doing all the phone calls, she is talking to kids. Then by the time you get to be a head coach you haven't really done anything. The GA and second assistant run the camps for you, but that's nothing.

Full-time assistant coaching positions for women are a result of Title IX and gender equity. However, the emergence of these "training" positions developed hand in hand with the decline in junior varsity programs. In years past a young coach would gain experience by being the junior varsity coach, a position which would entail teaching and coaching. Nowadays not only are many young coaches not formally trained physical educators, their early years in the profession are less likely to involve the actual teaching of sport skills, strategies, and game coaching. Unlike their old and established counterparts, several young coaches in this sample see recruiting as simply another part of the job, not a necessary evil, and it is a task some say they enjoy. In their minds, the altruistic and utilitarian aspects of coaching are less differentiated.

Recruiting: Accommodation and Resistance to the Dominant Sport Culture

An analysis of coaching tasks reveals that women coaches spend a great deal of time on the task they like least, recruiting. For the most part, Division I,II coaches see recruiting as a necessary evil. Many are philosophically opposed to it, others don't like the game it has become and the time and energy it takes, but overall they accommodate to the imperativeness to recruit. They do so because as they described: the key to success, at least in terms of winning is recruiting. One coach explained,

Women who make the decision to coach in Division I are making a decision about what they believe in. Our goals are to be competitive. To be in the top 15 in the country. I think this is where you make your decision about coaching in Division I or III. I think most of the coaches in Division I are assimilated to the male sport model or they wouldn't be here, they wouldn't survive.
But analysis of coaches' responses reveals that while coaches accommodate to the imperatives to recruit, in fact, most have not entirely assimilated to the "male/professional model." This coaches' comment was an aberration. Coaches talked about recruiting as if it were not actually part of coaching and used a variety of techniques to distance themselves from it. Their responses illustrate that recruiting creates a conflict for them; between the ideals and reality of the profession: the altruistic concerns of the teacher and the utilitarian interests of the coach. They coped with recruiting in a variety of ways: they mocked it by calling it "silly" and "ridiculous" and by using humor and cynicism. And some coaches justified it by focusing on the product they sell: "a good education." While Division I, II coaches may be "structurally assimilated" they are not culturally so. Their responses make clear that, for the most part, they remain committed to the ideals of their occupation and the "female model" of sport.

Division III coaches are even more philosophically opposed to recruiting and the business-like approach to sport it represents; they do recruit, but only as much as is necessary. In general their behavior can be characterized as active resistance to the dominant sport model. They too mock it and "name it" something "other, " an "outsider" among occupational tasks. And they go even further, they avoid it. Despite their acknowledgement that recruiting is expected, Division III coaches explained they choose not to devote more of their time to recruiting.

In coaches' reactions to changes in work tasks we see the influence of the history of women's collegiate athletics on the occupation of coaching. The way coaches cope with and attempt to resist these business-like aspects of their work reveals, in part, the power of the past for shaping how individuals think about the present. Coaches resist
these aspects of their work because they stand in stark opposition to past coaching
practices and to the longstanding ideal handed down through time that coaching is an
educational endeavor.

The data gathered for this analysis reveals that despite their adaptations, "old"
coaches had a strong sense of nostalgia for the past..."the way things used to be."
Established coaches also nostalgic for the past, but somewhat less so. They entered
coaching with less memory of a "different way," aspired to develop programs on par
with their male counterparts, and thus accepted and even encouraged, at least initially,
many of the changes in women's sport and coaching. However, most did not anticipate the
magnitude of change they have experienced.

Summary

The women coaches in this study entered coaching because they love sport and want to
work with young people. They see themselves as teachers who can make a contribution
to young people's lives; they want to give something back to the sport they love and help
others learn and grow. Through a variety of means they have been socialized in the
ideals associated with the "female model" of sport and they have taken on the occupational
identity of the female coach. But the reality of the female coaches work setting (defined
by the NCAA and the male model of sport and the relationship between sport and higher
education, as well as the more general trend towards bureaucracy and rationalization in
work and sport) is that coaches must spend a substantial portion of their time on tasks
they like least: recruiting and administration.

Wilensky (in Pavalko, 1971:191) has argued that professionals can adapt to
bureaucratic organizations in one of two ways: they can modify their work role to make
it more consistent with the ideals of the profession, or they can shift their orientation from the professional group to the organization. While all of the "old" and "established" coaches in this study retained their professional orientation, in adapting to the imperatives of recruiting they showed signs of a shift in orientation. While they refuse to jettison their professional ideals, they do, at least in practice, accommodate the realities of organizational demands. Without changing their philosophical stance on coaching as a profession, or altering their occupational identity, they have taken on many of the tasks associated with the "male/professional model" of sport.

Analysis of "old" and "established" coaches' responses reveal that coaching has changed in recent years. It has grown more bureaucratic and product oriented. Coaching like many professions, involves a blend of altruism and self interest, and the very nature of coaching insures that some of what coaches do is utilitarian. However, increased emphasis on winning has made women's coaching even more product oriented. Moreover, it has forced coaches to acknowledge, at least tacitly, that this is the case; and to cope with ensuing conflicts between their commitment to occupational ideals and the realities of work settings.

"Old" and "established" coaches in Division I and II accommodate to the "male/professional" sport model in practice by spending substantial portions of their time on recruiting. But this change in work tasks does not necessarily imply acceptance of the "male/professional model" of collegiate athletics. Despite adapting to recruiting in practice, women coaches believe that recruiting is "ridiculous" and "silly." Their comments illustrate that they are philosophically opposed to it. Those in Division III have also adapted to recruiting, they do more now than ever before, but they also resist doing as much as they think they should. Division III coaches responses illustrate their
more active resistance to the encroaching dominant sport culture. They accept it as part of their jobs, but only to a point. Most choose not to spend excessive amounts of time on recruiting because at this point in time they can, their jobs don't depend on winning. They do what they have to to insure they meet the criteria by which they are evaluated: their teams will be fairly competitive and their students will have a good experience. In sum, coaches reactions and feelings about recruiting illustrate that the dominant sport culture in general, and work settings in particular, may shape work practices, but they do not necessarily alter ideological commitments. Faced with a conflict between occupational ideals and the realities of work settings coaches use a variety of coping mechanisms: humor, cynicism, avoidance, and adopting an organizational orientation. They adapt to organizational demands and the realities of coaching in the 1990's without changing their philosophical stance on coaching as a profession for women.

A comparison of "old" and "established" coaches with "new" coaches illuminates what may be the beginning of a fundamental shift in the occupational identity of women coaches, and the meaning of coaching as an occupation. Several "new" coaches were far more amenable to the idea of recruiting; it is something they have grown up with. Their willingness to recruit and their acceptance of the business-like nature of collegiate sport reveals that although they see themselves as teachers and have adopted aspects of an occupational identity consistent with the "female model" of sport, their notion of what a coach is reflects an integration of some aspects of the "male/professional model" of sport.

The analysis of coaches responses reveals that all women coaches in this sample have had to adapt to the demands of an increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented approach to women's collegiate sport; they have had to increase the amount of time they
devote to recruiting female student-athletes and to administrative tasks. However, it is clear that women coaches are unhappy with the situation as it now exists, especially recruiting. If they could many would simply do away with scholarships and with recruiting and coach "whoever shows up." Other coaches, especially those with scholarships to offer, like the benefits of hand picking their teams. These women offer a different solution to the problem of recruiting: hire a full-time assistant and assign her the task.

Several research questions have been addressed in this chapter including:

1. How do coaches experience their work; what meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and what are the social sources of this approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female"?
4. Do women accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?

The analysis in this chapter leads to the conclusion that for the women in this sample coaching is an educational endeavor; they see themselves as teachers who contribute to the growth and development of young women. In this regard they continue to approach their work from the standpoint of the "female model" of sport: they maintain a philosophical stance consistent with the the occupational identity of the female coach.

While "old" and "established" coaches are disdainful of recruiting and the increasingly bureaucratic nature of their work, in practice they have accommodated to these changes, Division III coaches are more able to resist than those in Division I and II. In contrast several "new" coaches were more accepting of the bureaucratic nature of their work, and of recruiting. While "old" and "established" coaches philosophically reject changes imposed by the dominant sport culture, in practice they accommodate to it in varying degrees. Several "new" coaches exhibited this same pattern; however, several
others seem to have integrated aspects of the dominant sport culture into their occupational identity. They continue to see themselves as teachers, but they accept recruiting as part what "coaches" do—not something antithetical to the occupation. Concomitently "new" coaches both accept and are amending the occupational identity of women coaches. They accept the "female model," but for many their conception of coaching includes aspects of the "male/professional" approach. In sum, the "new" coaches' occupational identity is somewhat different from her "old" and "established" counterparts; this difference may be the beginning of a shift in the occupational identity of female coaches for years to come.

The analysis in this chapter also reveals that "old," "established," and many "new" coaches recognize two distinct approaches to sport, a "female model" and a "male model," and that the "male model" is influencing women's athletics and women coaches. On the other hand, several "new" coaches were less aware of this influence. Most of these women have known only one sport model, the "male/professional" one.

Despite the fact that "old" and "established" coaches in this sample have, to varying degrees, acquiesced to the increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented nature of women's collegiate sport, in other ways, and through other tasks they continue to assert their occupational ideals and put into practice the values and philosophies which lead them to the profession in the first place. In Chapter VIII the notion of the female approach to sport is further explored, as is the extent to which coaches accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture.
CHAPTER VIII

COACHING WITH A FEMALE VOICE

In this chapter accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture is further explored. The term dominant sport culture has been used interchangeably in this dissertation with the term the "male/professional model." Both refer to a model and culture of sport which focuses on winning (the sports product), sport as a commercial endeavor, and the instrumental and rationalized aspects of sport. In coaching, the "male/professional" approach also emphasizes the authority and control of coaches over their athletes (Coakley, 1994). The extent to which women coaches accommodate to and/or resist the dominant sport culture is further investigated here by analyzing coaches' responses along three dimensions: (1). Coaching philosophy. (2). Definition of success. (3). Coaching style. And, by analyzing field notes describing the cultural artifacts of coaches' offices.

In Chapter IV it was noted that accommodation and resistance occurs at both the individual and group level, as the practice of both individuals and groups. In this Chapter I suggest a somewhat different way of thinking about human agency by raising a slightly different question: To what extent does resistance to the dominant sport culture by women coaches exist as a sub-cultural form; made up of norms, values, and material artifacts? In other words, does the "female model" of sport continue to "live" in a "sub-culture" of women coaches? Is their a social space within the dominant sport culture that women coaches claim as their own? Is their a "female voice" in coaching, a set of norms, values, and practices which pose a challenge to the "male/professional model?"
Are the coaching philosophies, definitions of success, and coaching styles of
the women coaches in this study evidence of a sub-culture among women coaches which
embodies the "female model" of sport and poses a challenge to the dominant sport
culture? Are the artifacts which adorn their offices additional evidence of resistance?

The female coach spends much of her time on administrative tasks and recruiting
female athletes to her school. Her work has been influenced by the encroaching dominant
sport culture: it is increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented. Analysis of coaches'
descriptions of changes in women's collegiate sport and in their own jobs revealed that
accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture exists on two levels: on the
one hand in actual practices, and on the other in philosophical beliefs.

Despite the fact that the majority of coaches interviewed have accommodated in
practice to the changes imposed by the "male/professional model" of sport, most are
philosophically opposed to it. They recruit and do paper work because they have to;
however, except among several "new" coaches, these tasks have yet to be integrated into
the female coach's occupational identity. The overwhelming majority of female coaches
interviewed in this study resist the dominant sport culture by maintaining a
philosophical approach to women's collegiate sport consistent with the female model of
sport. By mocking, deriding, and naming "recruiting" as a foreigner to their occupation,
women coaches in Division I, II assert their philosophical resistance to the encroaching
dominant sport culture. Those in Division III resist more in practice--they simply
choose not to recruit as much as they think they should.

The interview data for this chapter were analyzed by cohort and by NCAA Division
within cohorts. Overall, this analysis strategy revealed more similarities than
differences among the coaches in this sample. While there was a small difference in
responses by cohort groups and little difference by Division. However, the patterns which did occur within Divisions were important and revealing. In the sections which follow the data are presented for the sample as a whole to illustrate the similarities in responses. Variations by Division which did appear are also noted and discussed. The responses presented here are "typical" statements used to illustrate a pattern in the data, or a notable and interesting finding.

**Coaching Philosophies**

In section five of the interview guide coaches were asked to explain their coaching philosophy. Responses to this question are discussed in this section. There is no way of knowing from this study whether or not coaches' philosophies are consistent with their practices. The results presented here are not meant to imply that this is the case, but can only show what women coaches value about coaching as an occupation. Coaching philosophies may be closely related to occupational ideals, and thus to occupational socialization, including anticipatory socialization, pre-service, and in-service training. Research on teacher socialization makes clear that individuals both adjust to situational demands of the work place and retain the philosophical approach they bring to their training (Goodman, 1985a, Goodman and Adler, 1985; Shulman, 1987; Tabachnik, 1980; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1985; in Staton and Hunt, 1992). Given this research one could argue that coaches' philosophies encompass the changes, shifts, and adaptations all workers make in adapting to the exigencies of work environments. As such, for women coaches, coaching philosophies exist within and in light of the context of recent changes in women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture.
Authority is generally associated with masculinity, according to R.W. Connell "the main axis of the power structure of gender is the general connection of authority with masculinity" (Connell in Theberge, 1990: 64). Coaches are in positions of authority, they have control over athletes and their programs. Moreover, research on the athlete-coach relationship shows that athletes expect coaches to be authoritarian (King, 1972; Snyder, 1975).

In her paper "Gender, Work, and Power: The Case of Women in Coaching" Nancy Theberge finds that, "women coaches are generally uncomfortable with an attribution of power to themselves or their position" (1990:67). Despite working in a domain which defines power as the ability to produce results, women coaches articulated an alternative conception of power (Theberge, 1990). While the women in Theberge's study acknowledged the authority vested in their coaching role, and their power over athletes; they were reluctant to describe their work role in terms of dominance and control and instead conceived of their coaching role and their relationship with athletes in terms of support, encouragement, and influence. They viewed influence as cooperative, enabling, and supportive, not coercive or controlling (1990:67).

In sum, Theberge finds that women coaches re-define the notion of power traditionally associated with coaching. She argues that their enjoyment of their work is dependent on their ability to redefine power in the coaching role. She states,

In confronting the power in the athlete-coach relationship, women coaches face a dilemma. The dilemma arises from their rejection of a view of coaching as a position of control. The coaches understand that this is a dominant view of coaching and it is one that troubles them. Comments about the misuse of power and practices that fosters athletes' dependence provide the backdrop for their own statements about the way they would like to work. Their vision of coaching rejects a conception of power as dominance in favor of a vision of coaching as empowering. (1990:72)
When asked to describe their philosophy of coaching the women in this sample used terms and concepts similar to the coaches' in Theberge's study. They described their philosophies in humanistic terms and explained that they focus on skill acquisition, improvement, individual self-actualization, and achieving team potential. They strive to help young women develop physically, socially, and emotionally and they see sport as the perfect vehicle for this. They are committed to helping their athletes develop as human beings, not just as athletes; and they are concerned with developing a team made up of individuals who cooperate to achieve group goals and who genuinely care about one another. These Division I coaches explain,

Q: Could you tell me about your coaching philosophy?
A: My role is to teach my players both on and off the field. I want to help them become better skilled athletes and better as a team. But also better people. I try to teach them a lot about communication and about working together. We talk a lot about team unity, being one group and not a collection of individuals.

Another explains,

A: I am not so driven that I think these kids need to be thinking, eating, breathing field hockey 24 hours a day. I have enough interests...I feel like the experience for them ought to be as well rounded as possible, we take side trips all the time. Go look at things statues, paintings, museums. I tell them about the history of places I know. We need to understand they are there to learn in every setting and I think my job is more than coaching. I think it is trying to understand where they are coming from and trying to help them with issues outside of the athletic world, whether it be steering them in the right direction for a counselor, or getting them into an eating disorder clinic or identifying a disability they didn't know they had. I feel I have the ability to impact all those things, and I value them just as highly as the winning and losing.

This coach concurs,

A: My goal is to give these kids a good experience and see that they grow. And it is not going to be easy to grow when they lose all their races, but that's why I coach. It's like I had to tell my self last year when we were looking pretty bad...just suck it up Joan. Suck up the losing because it looks really bad. So that was how I went into the year. That is the fundamental bottom line of what I want them to get out of here. To leave here with...is learning and growing. If [the emphasis is] you gotta win you gotta win...how are they going to feel when? I really feel that the fundamental reason to row is to learn and grow, that's what happened to me in college. I want to win, I...
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want to win, and they want to win too. Come on...we all want to win, but.

As teachers and educators women coaches assume responsibility for the growth and development of their female student-athletes. It is a responsibility they take seriously. They believe it is their job to teach about and enforce good sportsmanship and fair play, in part because they believe in the carry-over value of sport for real life. Philosophically, the women coaches in this study are as committed to helping young women develop off the field as they are concerned about their performances on the field.

There was striking similarity in coaching philosophies among all coaches in this sample regardless of age, work experience, and current Divisional affiliation. Because the "male/professional" sport model is more apparent at the Division I and II level one might expect coaching philosophies to vary with Division. However, this was not the case. The following two responses, one by an "established" Division I coach, the other by a "new" Division III coach, are used to illustrate the similarity in coaching philosophies among all coaches in this sample.

Division I coach:

My whole general philosophy is that this is basketball, it should be fun and I want them to grow as a person.

Division III coach:

I try to coach to provide a competitive experience, enjoy the sport, and grow from the experience. And also try to provide support in other areas, in terms of their life and academics.

Analysis of interview data revealed seven general themes related to coaching philosophies, each emphasizing some aspect of the coach's role as facilitator of student-athlete growth and development: (1). helping individuals and teams reach their athletic potential; (2). teaching young people the value of cooperation and building team unity;
(3). teaching about the value of fair play and sportsmanship; (4). having fun;
(5). balancing hard work and fun; 6). contributing to student growth and development
off the field; (7). balancing athletics and academics. In sum, the women coaches in this
study believe sport should be fun, and they seek to empower their athletes and to help
them grow and develop as young women.

Despite the similarity in coaching philosophies across cohorts and Divisions, two
patterns emerged which illuminate the changing context of the female coach's work
world and the challenge this poses for women coaches. The first involves coaches'
attempts to balance an educational approach to collegiate sport with the desire to produce
winning teams. The second involves coaches' experimenting with and in some cases
adopting a philosophy more focused on winning, then moving back to their original
student-centered/humanistic philosophy.

Balancing an Educational Approach with the Desire to Win

While many coaches described the need to balance hard work with fun, others
explained that they have "two sides" to their coaching philosophy: one side of the
philosophy centers around the desire to field competitive teams and win contests; the
other includes the desire to empower young women. This was most evident among
Division I coaches. The following coach explains,

Ultimately there are two sides to my philosophy, the winning side and then there is
the personal side of it. I love to win no question. I am a competitive person. But
what I love about coaching is the rest of it. The relationships and the friendships, not
like your peers, but the relationship that develops between the team and you as the
coach. And I love being a role model for them. Hopefully I am giving them something
similar to what my high school coach gave me, which was an opportunity to learn
about myself, to excel, not just athletically, but emotionally...it's hard to explain,
you know what I mean? Helping them grow, learn to be strong, tough compassionate,
good winners and losers, a team person as well as having individual goals. All of those
things is what I think coaching is all about.

The coaches interviewed for this study strive to produce successful teams, and many want to achieve conference, regional, and national level success. While they talked at length about their educational approach to coaching, many were also quick to assert that they wanted to win games. At Division I where the pressure to win is greatest, coaches cope with the inherent conflict between the need to produce winning teams and the desire to educate individuals by "splitting" their philosophy in two. This "divided" philosophy was described time and again among Division I coaches and appears to help coaches hold on to the educational approach to coaching in the context of an encroaching dominant sport culture.

**Experimenting with the Male/Professional Model**

When asked if their philosophy had changed over the years, the majority of coaches explained it had not. However, several coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts explained that they had strayed from their original philosophy and tried another approach, but ultimately returned to the philosophy which led them to coaching in the first place. The following Division III coach explains,

Q: Has your philosophy changed at all over the years?
A: That has basically been my philosophy over the years, but there are times, I think at times my style has changed sometimes I have grown more towards the male model and then come back from that, been more authoritarian and now I've come away from that.

Q: What made you model that and what made you move back?
A: I think that was the model that was modeled me. I had to learn to coach within my own personality and values.

Q: Is it easy to maintain that philosophy?
A: Sometimes the stress on winning makes you stop trying to maximize everybody's playing time or potential, you may have two or three players on the team and it is hard to really maximize their experience during the season when you are focused on
winning...So I try to be competitive and give them the best technical coaching I can. We work hard but also have fun. We do goal setting each year and I am concerned about them outside of sport as well.

Another Division III coach explained,

Q: Has your philosophy changed over the years?
A: I think it has changed, but some people might say for the worse. I think I got caught up in all that.
Q: All what?
A: You need to win, you need to look like a competitive team. I really got caught up in that for a while, I thought that was what was important, and then I kind of snapped to, and said...what happened to me? I took a look at myself professionally and figured out I should be doing what was important to me and not what other people wanted me to do.

Q: Have you always had the same philosophy?
A: There was this period I went through I wasn't true to myself. I bought into the other philosophy and the most important thing was how well we were doing. So, yes, I think I was not true to myself. But now I know it was me, I was focusing on me and not on what was happening for them.

These same sentiments were echoed by Division I coaches. The following coach explains,

Q: Have you always had the same philosophy?
A: As I look back at the years that frustrate me the most-1 came off what I really became a coach for.

Q: What do you mean came off?
A: Came off my path, because winning the game, winning the stupid game became more important than those 12 or 13 kids on the team. And that's why I got in the first place. I can see how I got very much wrapped up into: our program will receive more if we win the conference, if we are more successful we will go on TV....I tell people in my life now, "If I ever go back to what I was like in 88' then I need to know that."...I have watched some of my colleagues in the bigger conferences and I have made a personal decision I don't want to go that route. I want to be at an institution where I can honestly say I don't work for the A.D. or the president, or the trustees, I work for my players, and the day I don't is the day I will resign from this institution.

A: I think there is gross negligence in the administrations in what is really going on for student-athletes, which is really hurting the athletic experience. I know this from history...from seeing women's basketball, because that is what I know, it is becoming more like men's basketball. And men's basketball and football is very dirty, ethically...in what they teach and in what the coaches are reinforced for. I think if you have a weak administration or an administration that looks the other way, or that is only interested in TV contracts and winning, I think that if those things are more important the athlete becomes least important.
The following Division II coach describes how difficult it can be to maintain a philosophy grounded in empowering female student-athletes when the surrounding sport culture is more interested in the team's competitive success.

I often wonder what would happen to me if I went to a big time Division I school. It is easy to get caught up in things, when you are competitive; going to nationals sort of slapped me in the head. If I was going to get caught up in all that I would have. I didn't, I went the other way. I was sick, I felt a lot of pressure. I knew we had a great team. I can see where you can really fall into that—people are always telling you are wonderful. I got to thinking, "What do I really think is important?" Was it my success as a human being, or how many games I won.

These coaches also described walking a fine line between two competing philosophies of collegiate athletics and the difficulty this posed. While most described moving back to their original approach after trying the "other" way, a few explained they had adjusted their original philosophy to fit the demands of the dominant sport culture; the male/professional sport model.

Q: Has your philosophy changed over the years?
A: Yes. It has changed a little. Because of the expectations for the program, the expectations that are placed on you means that expectations have to be placed on the players. That is what is real hard. It is a really fine line.

Q: How do you feel about that?
A: I don't like it. Because of the expectations, because of the expectations and the pressure you just end up putting a lot of pressure on everybody.

Despite the encroaching "male/professional model", its effect on the structure of women's sport and the accompanying work tasks of female coaches, the majority of women coaches in this study continue to define their philosophy of coaching in humanistic terms and continue to be more interested in empowering female students than in having power over them. Ultimately they are concerned with their student athletes' overall growth and development, and with what they gain from the athletic experience. Despite the recognition of another approach to coaching, and another model of collegiate sport, the women in this sample continue to hold on to the philosophical...
ideals which led them to coaching in the first place.

The women in this sample resist the dominant sport model in part by maintaining a commitment to an occupational identity consistent with the female model of sport. Although the changes in women's collegiate sport led some to stray from their original "path," most described this as a transitory phase; others described feeling the pressure to conform but found ways to resist, ultimately retaining the coaching philosophy they entered the profession with. Moreover, the analysis of responses on this measure indicate that the women coaches in this sample are far from assimilated to the "male/professional" sport model.

Definition of Success: Process vs. Product

In her study of women in coaching, Theberge argues that although women coaches "recast" their power as influence and support in an effort to resolve their ambivalence and provide a more acceptable basis for their own involvement" (1990:72), they continue to accept that "success is based on achievement and production" (1990:72). Thus, Theberge concludes that in their attempt to gain acceptance in this male defined and male controlled domain of sport women have failed to critique a central tenet of sport ideology: that success is based on achievement. She concludes that as a result, women coaches fail to pose a challenge to the dominant ideology.

The responses in this study pose a contrast to Theberge's findings. Before discussing the contrasting findings it must be noted that the subjects of Theberge's study were elite and national level coaches from Canada. They differ from the coaches in this sample in two important ways: (1). Most were involved in coaching a national team. (2). Many were coaching in non-educational settings. Although some of the coaches in this sample
also coach or have coached at the national level, many do not and have not; in addition all of the coaches in this sample are collegiate coaches, their coaching endeavor is tied to educational institutions.

When asked, How do you define success in your job?, again, coaches' responses revealed their commitment to and interest in the general welfare of their student athletes. In a variety of ways they explained that "success" is derived from the process, not the product. For the majority of women in this sample, success in coaching is not something which can be quantified; rather, it is a qualitative measure...a feeling. While most coaches explained that winning matters, they also explained that what matters most to them is what the athletes get out of the experience, how they "feel" about their playing experience.

Analysis of responses by cohort and Division revealed strong similarities despite differences in age, years of coaching experience, and Division. Five themes dominated coaches' responses to this question including: (1). athletic improvement; (2). achieving individual and team goals/potential through effort; (3). personal/individual growth; (4). positive and enjoyable experience; and 5). academic success. Of these, the most persistent theme was positive/enjoyable experience.

**Positive/Enjoyable Experience**

The following coaches describe measuring success in terms of the experience their athletes have. They see success both in terms of the athlete and teams' "positive experience," and "personal/individual growth." The following "old" Division III coach describes how she measures her coaching success,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: If my students accept what I have to offer. If they have a good experience. If the relationship among them and between me and them is good and they have enjoyed the experience and improved, then that is success. If they feel better about themselves and if I have helped them with that.

An "established" Division III coach explained,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: First when my athletes graduate, second when they feel they have had an experience which has helped them to grow as a young woman and athletically.

This same theme was echoed by "established" coaches in Division I and II,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: Having the kids who go through your program feel they grew from it, learned from it...they become better parents, mothers, workers...good people. Like when you have your alumni gathering and they want to come back and they have great feelings about your program.

And this "new" Division I coach stated,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: The way the team is...my team finishing well. We get to the finals but we can't win, but I think you can see success in the players.

Q: What do you mean?
A: Just everything. How they finish the season. Are they upbeat, how things went. That's how I gage my success. Did I put a capable team together that plays well, grew together, we were strong at the end of the year and they enjoyed the season. Success also in their G.P.A.'s, I do look at that too. How I see them, how I am coaching—all of that. Last year we didn't do that well, but we grew a lot. The team was very young and we really improved. So I think we were successful. They came back less scared, more confident—it was a growing time. I'm not big on stats and win loss, it's not the biggest thing.

While coaches measure success in terms of the student-athlete's positive experience, they also measure it in terms of improvement. They are less concerned with the score at the end of the game, than they are about what happened during the game. And they are less concerned about the record at the end of the season than they are about what happened during the season. While all coaches want to win, the women coaches in this sample explained that they are ultimately more concerned with how they play, the process not the product. The following Division III coach explains.
Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: I think that has changed for me. Winning is important to me and it always has been like the most important thing, and it still is. But I have really learned that playing well is just as important. Seeing players do everything they absolutely can do and do so incredibly well and not necessarily win, that feels so good. So that's what really matters, kids just giving it their best.

In a response to a different question, the following Division I coach describes that despite the increasing emphasis on winning, she is ultimately interested in the sports process, and works to maintain her approach.

Twenty years ago 95% of the female coaches were nurturing, humanistic in their approach, and educators in their approach. Now I bet 20, to 30 or 40% of the coaches are not that way anymore. Just look at the models. You know the screaming, or swearing at athletes in a practice situation, demeaning. Way too results oriented. Not process oriented at all, like we didn't win because we didn't try hard enough. I think it is the pressure, maybe there is more pressure because you know you are getting more support from the university. Twenty years ago I think that what women were trying to get out of athletics was very different from what men were trying to get out of athletics. Things have changed and it has definitely happened in field hockey. It may come back to why people are getting into coaching. I got in because I wanted to be an educator first and foremost. But I am also a very competitive person so I want to win a national championship as well. But I want to make sure that I don't lose sight of the process. I really think you have to take your ego out of it. Do your best, work hard, do your homework, be committed. But I will get out of coaching the moment it is not fun anymore. For my athletes, if they ever felt that going to practice was a job because they are on scholarship, then I should be fired.

Measuring Success Internally and Externally

Of the forty coaches who responded to the question, “How do you define success?,” only eleven (28%) mentioned winning, and no coach said that winning was her only measure of success. In many cases coaches would interrupt their discussion of success with a comment like: "don't get me wrong I like to win," or "winning is part of it for sure," reminding the interviewer that for coaches, the desire to produce successful, winning teams is a given. While there was strong similarity in responses among cohorts and Divisions which revealed women coaches' commitment to the sports process, it was also clear that many coaches use dual measures of success, an "internal" one and an
"external" one. This pattern was most evident among Division I and II coaches, but was not exclusive to them (8 in Div. I,II and 3 in Division III). The following coaches explain,

Q: How do you define success?
A: More so, two things, more internally than anything else, than the factual success, which I have to admit feels pretty good when it comes, when the team finally has a winning record or goes into tournament. Which I finally felt these last two years. I have to admit it feels quite nice. Admittedly that is really nice, and it is a wonderful feeling, but what kept me here for eight years? So success really, the true, true success is feeling like; it is sort of emotional towards my team. I want my players to be able to stand in that doorway after four years and say, Diane, thanks that was a great experience...you know what I mean. That's important to me. I want them to feel the respect, not just that it was fun; they were into it, they were dedicated, they had respect for me as a coach, that kind of feeling; also nice team atmosphere kind of thing. Also, the success of just taking this group of 20 bodies and seeing the improvement, that's the factual part too, and getting the best out of them. To see the improvement, they are starting to click, doing things I have been teaching, that makes me feel good too.

This Division III coach also described a similar dual measures of success, one external and one internal,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: The win loss record is one way of defining it. I think I also define it in terms of how well my students are getting along with each other and enjoying the sport, and how successful they are in this environment.

Finally the following Division III coach captures the essence of what the majority of coaches expressed, that the two measures of success go hand in hand. Rather than see winning as a product, and end to be achieved, they see it as part of the larger sports process.

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: Ultimately it is based in obviously the impact or the progression of people I deal with, in terms of if they graduate from school, being able to learn about themselves and learn to work with the group and how successfully we accomplish that. Ultimately I think that is the bottom line. I think that if you do the right things and have a sufficient level of talent, if you are taking people to their potential, and getting them to work together, you also win games. So I think that I would be lying if said winning isn’t a component, because I feel that if we are not winning there is something wrong with my system. So the bigger picture is people are growing, working together and
respecting each other...graduation from college too. But if you are doing that you are going to win games. They go together I think.

Success as a Feeling

Women coaches define success in a variety of different ways, but mostly in terms of positive experience and improvement. They measure improvement by recording skill level at the beginning and end of the season, then determining the difference between the two. They measure positive experience by observing, listening, and informally gathering feedback from their players. The attitudes and the emotions their athlete’s express help coaches determine whether they have enjoyed the experience; whether they have judged it to be worthwhile. In short, coaches derive their own "feeling" of success from their players. If their players feel good about the season, then they do too.

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: It's not always about wins and losses. We set season goals and we look and see if we have met those goals at the end of the season. We look to see if we are improving as a team and as individuals. Did we accomplish our goals. I also look at our academic rate how successful were we in the classroom. It's more about how we feel at the end of the season, the feeling you have when it is all over.

And another explains,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: Some of it is winning, some is how the team feels about itself in terms of closeness, did you reach your potential as a team, what are the kids doing when they graduate? Do they have jobs, are they successful when they get out of here, do they turn to you for help when they need it. Do they come back to the school. All of those things.

Influences on Definition of Success

Two factors appear to influence a coach's definition of success: (1). Her own experiences as an athlete. (2). The norms and values which dominate her work world. Coaches spoke a length about their desire to create the kind of experience they had as collegiate athletes, and their desire to live up to the ideals of their profession. They seek
to recreate for their athletes the kind of athletic experience they had as college students, including: fun, friendships, an emphasis on sportsmanship, individual growth and achievement, and a feeling of team unity working with others towards a common goal. However, for many coaches, especially those in Division I the values and norms of their work environment are in conflict with what they valued as athletes and with the occupational identity they adopted when they entered the field.

The importance of winning may be conveyed explicitly in a coach's contract or through expectations communicated verbally by her athletic director, and it is also conveyed implicitly by society and by student's parents. Analysis of responses relating to definitions of success reveal that the work world of many women coaches, especially those in Division I and II, is increasingly influenced by the "male/professional model" of sport which places more emphasis on the sports product than the sports process. Two coaches who said they define success in terms of winning explain,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: I would say winning, and the whole thing is to play to the level we should. It is not that easy, it is difficult to recruit here. You could call that a cop-out but I think people would agree. We are a state school but not even as good a school as some others. If you recruit well then you can do well. If I can accept that and win the games I should win...but I should get out. Yeah, I should get out, because we are not winning.

Q: Do you really believe that?
A: Yes, because society does.

Q: Is it the norm for Division I?
A: Yes. And it is the norm for men. And if you let me stay here you are saying it is O.K. for women to lose. Now if the higher ups tell me they really have the philosophy everyone is supposed to have, where you are here to educate and get the most out of your kids, if everybody said that then I say O.K. I can stay, but that's not how it is. It is about whether you win or not.

Another Division I coach explains,

Q: How do you define success in your job?
A: Winning [laughter]. It comes down to just winning. But it goes back to my philosophy. We are here number one for the education. So I would say we are
successful, we have the highest G.P.A. of all the teams here. When we get down or when the team gets down, you think about those other things, even though those are not the real expectations, they make you feel good. That they are doing well in school and that you have helped them. You just kind of sit back and take a look at that. But the expectations about winning, that is another thing. For me personally I am afraid to fail. I have always had a lot of success as an athlete and as a coach. When I experienced losing a couple of years ago it was like AGHHH. Oh my god it was devastating, it was really devastating. But now I have come to realize it is not going to be that way. You are going to have your ups and downs. But when you are expected to be conference champs or 75% or whatever...all the fun is taken out of it. So...I hope I am answering your question. For me, the most satisfying thing is to see, even if the kids come out and go through the program, and they are mad at me because of lack of playing time or whatever...I don’t care, maybe 10-15 years from now they will appreciate it.

The athletic director’s expectations may be a crucial link between the dominant sport culture and a coach’s definition of success. The following coach explains how her definition of success was influenced both by the dominant sport culture, and her athletic director’s expectations.

This was when we had won the championship and had all the materialistic things, all the support, media attention, more money, TV. I really started to question why I was doing it. I really got caught up in “I’ll show him.” I can remember that as a thought pattern “I’ll show him, I’ll show him.” The A.D played me like a musical instrument. Then the A.D.’s switch and we bury my dad and this reflection starts. The new administration is very much involved in student-athletes. Now I have a real total reflection on why I am doing what I am doing. Why did I begin to do this profession of coaching in the first place? What is the difference between why I got in it and why I am doing it today? What the hell happened?...I believed at the time that winning would take care of everything. Come to find out it was a very hard experience for the players.

Something was missing. I mean we were successful, I know from a journal and things I have. We were cutting the nets down [after conference championship] and I am not internally happy and I don’t know why. I have no idea. It felt so bad. You succeed, you have people to share with and yet you don’t feel good. That is pretty lonely on the mountain top I guess. And so, I am saying...wrong mountain top. Go find the goddam mountain you should be on. And I think that is what I have done.

Even where there are no expectations from the athletic director, several coaches described “getting caught up in the winning.” Moreover, the analysis of data dealing with coach’s definitions of success reveals a pattern which mirrors one described earlier in the section on coaching philosophies. Several coaches described “getting
caught up" in the focus on winning. This focus on winning created a cognitive dissonance for coaches leading them to re-evaluate their approach, and ultimately, to re-assert their commitment to the sports process. Whether influenced by the more general sport culture, their immediate work environment, or the expectations of their employers, coaches repeatedly described a pattern which reveals their attempt to retain the values and ideals which lead them to coaching in the first place. They moved from a definition of success which emphasized winning and the sports product, back to a definition of success more focused on the sports process and the educational value of collegiate sport participation; a definition more consistent with their occupational identity and the female model of sport. The following coach explains,

I really was getting caught up with it at one point. We are still competitive. Having coached now for several years I have learned that if you put all your goals on how many wins and getting to nationals you are going to burn out. You will burn out and you will go through all this personal stuff. If you put your own feeling into...if you make that your success-I have seen coaches become cynical, burned out, and start to take it out on their athletes. I put that aside and said, and I think being a mother has really helped, I said, "What is really important here? The educational process.

Finally, this Division II coach describes the experience which led her to reaffirm her own process oriented definition of success.

A: I didn't think we were successful because we didn't get to that next level. The funny thing was, once we got there I didn't feel any differently then I did when we didn't get there. Do you know what I mean? I think for myself. I don't know what I expected to happen to me...like stars were going to run around my head, I was going to get a Porsche, and this was going to happen...but it didn't...it was like...O.K. There was excitement, we flew out West and played out there and it was a great experience, but it wasn't like. When you calmed down and you got home it was like...that's all it is? All my kids have graduated, they are real nice kids, and we have had winning seasons, and I guess that is success. I think before that time I would judge it, and I mean for me as a coach, that it was a personal disappointment we couldn't get to the next level. And that I wasn't doing the right things. And now I say well, I am doing the best job I can. I am not disappointed in myself and how it went. When I went out there [National Tournament] and then came back it was like this funny feeling-that I feel the same way we did when we lost in the first round of the regionals here.
The female coaches in this sample define success in a variety of ways and some use two measures of success, an internal one and an external one. Responses to the question, How do you define success in your job?, revealed that while coaches care about winning they are ultimately more concerned about what their student-athletes gain from the experience. Most believe the two go hand-in-hand, that if you focus on the process-winning will happen. The analysis of definitions of success illuminates the extent to which coaches see success in terms of the sports process, and the factors which influence this definition.

Coaching Style: Authoritative vs. Democratic

In American society coaches are stereotyped as inflexible, conservative, and traditional. However, studies indicate that the personality traits of coaches are similar to those of the general population (Coackley, 1994). Studies further indicate that female coaches may differ from their male counterparts in the emphasis they place on sportsmanship, maintaining good grades and providing a good learning experience for athletes (Bain; Eitzen and Pratt, in Coakley, 1995:191).

In this study a close ended question was used to assess the coaching style of women coaches. Coaches were asked: How would you describe your coaching style?, and were given the following three choices: (1). authoritative, (2). democratic, or (3). combination of both. An analysis of coaches responses revealed the following: Of the forty six coaches interviewed for this study 3 (7%) described their coaching style as authoritative, 28 (60%) described their coaching style as a combination of authoritative and democratic, and 11 (23%) described their style as democratic. There was no difference in coaching style among cohorts. There was however, a difference in coaching style by Division. The majority of Division I and II coaches described their
coaching style as a combination of authoritative and democratic (19 of 23 or 82%), the remainder of responses were split between democratic and authoritative. In contrast, while many Division III coaches also described their coaching style as a combination of democratic and authoritative (12 of 23 or 50%), a similar number asserted their coaching style is democratic (11 of 23 or 47%). No Division III coach described her coaching style as authoritative.

It is important to note that all of the coaches in this sample believe that coaches are teachers. When asked: "Which would you say better characterizes coaching as an occupation?," the coaches in this sample were almost unanimous in their responses. Thirty seven (86%) said that coaches were like teachers; one (.02%) said coaches are like business managers, and five (12%) said coaches were both teachers and business managers. While all of the coaches in this study agree that coaching is becoming more businesslike in nature and there are more administrative tasks and paperwork than ever before, they continue to assert that coaches are teachers. This understanding of the occupation may influence how coaches actually approach their work and may lead them to be more democratic. Several coaches explained that student-athletes learn and grow when they are given responsibility, thus they allow students to share in the decision making when and where they can. Moreover, many women coaches believe it is their job to teach leadership skills and believe that the only way to help students learn leadership is to allow them to have some control over their athletic experience.

While the majority of coaches believe they teach much more than sport skills, and that the sport setting is the appropriate place to teach "about life," there was a difference in the extent to which coaches were willing to cede power and control to their student athletes. The difference between Division I and II coaches and Division III
coaches in coaching style appears to indicate that the pressure to win and to produce successful teams leads Division I and II coaches to maintain tighter control over decision making. In Division III where there is less emphasis on the sports product; thus, coaches are more democratic and more willing to let athletes share in the decision making.

There is no way of knowing from this study whether the difference between coaches on this measure is a selection effect: coaches who are more democratic in nature choose to coach in Division III, and those who are somewhat more authoritative in nature choose to coach in Divisions I and II. Nor do we know the extent to which those involved in the hiring of coaches select individuals with certain coaching styles. In other words, it is unclear whether or to what extent coaching style is influenced by the Division one coaches in, or whether coaches with different styles choose different Divisions (and athletic directors tend to hire coaches with particular coaching styles); a selection effect. Regardless of the source, it is clear that the majority of coaches in this sample, even those in Division I, believe it is important to allow student-athletes to share in the decision making; it is also clear that Division III coaches are more willing to let students make decisions that can impact the outcome of games than are Division I and II coaches.

Cultural Artifacts

Responses to the in-depth interview portion of this study indicate that women coaches are more process oriented than product oriented, are more interested in empowering than having power over their athletes, and are more democratic than authoritative. Field notes from observations made during the interviewing process provide additional data for analyzing the female voice in women's coaching.
After each interview, the cultural artifacts adorning the coaches office were recorded. These artifacts present a picture of a profession in transition, an occupation caught between the business-like world of sport focused on data and production, and the residual world of women's sport more focused on the educational and humanistic aspects of sport. Field notes of coaches offices were coded, and the data was placed into one of two categories: the first for indicators of the female model of sport, the second for indicators of the male model of sport. Those items whose cultural meaning is associated with the sports process and sports experience, with learning through sport, and with individual and team growth were coded "female model", those items whose cultural meaning is associated with the world of business, with bureaucracy, and with results and the sports product were coded "male model."

The decision to record observations of coaches offices was not made until several interviews had been conducted, and field notes varied according to the researchers ability to systematically record notes between scheduled interviews. While the notes themselves are derived from a relatively small portion of those interviewed (21 observations), they serve as a valuable indicator of the work world of women coaches and the norms and values women assign their work.

The following is a brief description and analysis of the variety of items observed in coaches' offices: Team pictures adorned the walls of most offices. Among the formal and more serious team pictures, those taken by the schools Sports Information Director for promotional materials and the school archives, were the informal team pictures. These informal pictures revealed the friendships among players, their joy in being with one another, and in many cases, their love for their sport. They were characterized by smiles, laughter, and general fooling around.
There were motivational/inspirational sayings posted on office walls and doors. These varied from expensively framed posters hung just so, to fortune cookie fortunes tacked to bulletin boards. There were stuffed animals of various sorts: bears, tigers, camels… the team mascots. And there were momentos: miscellaneous magnets, figurines, nerf balls, pins, and such; signifiers of the network of interactions which constitute the female coaches' social world. Some of these were strategically placed to make a tacit statement, like the Gumby style doll dressed like a basketball official twisted to a stand at the front of one coach's desk; others stood as simple reminders of past conferences, meetings, interactions and relationships. And there was candy: in boxes, candy jars, and small bowls; sometimes tucked away in the corner, sometimes at the front of her desk; leftovers from some fundraising event, or purchased by the coach in an effort to make her office more inviting to players.

In general, the female coach's office is adorned with a variety of artifacts which indicate that the relationship between the coach and her players is characterized by care and concern. Most striking were the "gifts" from former players and teams many of them signed with the salutation "love." The gifts observed included: plaques, pictures, posters, vases, stuffed animals, and poems. While there is no way of knowing if all these items were in fact given as gifts a variety of indicators point to this conclusion. However, some of these items may also have been collected by the coach at various points in her coaching career or been bought simply to decorate her office.

In the course of one interview the coach stopped, hesitated, pulled a piece of paper from the wall and handed it to me saying, "This...this is why I coach." The sheet of paper she handed me was a gift given to her by last year's team, it read (pseudonym inserted):
To Jenine,

Without realizing it, we fill important places in each other’s lives. It’s that way with a minister and congregation. Or with the guy at the corner grocery, the mechanic at the local garage, the family doctor, teachers, neighbors, [COACHES], co-workers. Good people who are always “there,” who can be relied upon in small, important ways, People who teach us, bless us, encourage us, support us, uplift us in the dailyness of life. We never tell them. I don’t know why but we don’t.

Robert Folghum

We want to take this opportunity to tell you that you are one of those individuals that Robert Folghum had in mind. During the season, none of us stopped to thank you for making us swim until we thought our lungs would burst or for entering us in events we were convinced we would never finish. The fact is we are all still alive and we did finish those events. Many of us have accomplished goals we originally thought were unattainable. Thank you for making us work to our potential. Thank you for taking the time to encourage and support us as not only a team, but as individuals.

You will be missed by those of us who are leaving, but know that you are appreciated by everyone. Congratulations on surviving your first year as Head Coach. Here’s to a winning record next year!

SOME TAKE THEIR MARKS, OTHERS LEAVE THEM

Love,
The Swim Team

This gift, and the cultural artifacts described above, are indicators of the norms and values which pervade the world of women’s coaching; indicators of the relationship between the coach and her players.

While these indicators of the “female voice” in coaching stood out clearly, often there was a striking contrast in cultural artifacts. In many cases, among the artifacts which reflected the coaches’ emphasis on the sports process were another set of indicators of an entirely different set of values. As if to pose a challenge to the humanistic approach to coaching evident in the artifacts mentioned above were cultural artifacts which indicate that the world of women’s sport has grown increasingly bureaucratic and businesslike.

For example, in one coaches office, standing below a poem given by the 1990
A championship team was a new Compaq computer filled with the data on next year's recruits. In another next to the ball signed by the members of the 1986 squad was the "Official Film Exchange Folder" and a neatly stacked row of game videotapes.

In another interview one coach railed against the increasingly businesslike nature of women's sport and the bureaucratic nature of the NCAA, and yet her office arrangement stood out as having assimilated to the norms and values of the male/professional model of sport. To enter her office I first passed by two assistant coaches in an outer office working diligently at their computer terminals, neither one stopped to acknowledge my presence. The office situation and the demeanor of the assistant coaches point to the increasingly hierarchical nature of women's coaching and the business-like nature of the profession.

Field notes collected in conjunction with the interviewing process for this study repeatedly point to the contrast between indicators of the humanistic approach to coaching and the increasingly businesslike aspects of the profession. However, analysis of artifacts observed in coaches offices appear to support other analyses in this chapter. Despite the encroaching dominant sport culture, the world of the female coach continues to resonate with the meanings and values associated with the "female model" of sport. As one coach explained, "My A.D. puts it this way...men get money, and women get poems."

**Summary**

The analysis of coaches' responses presented in this chapter indicate that in terms of philosophy, definition of success, and coaching style, women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a female model of sport. Despite the changes in women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture women coaches continue to
be concerned with the overall growth and development of their student athletes. They are more process oriented than product oriented, more interested in empowering than having power over, and more democratic than authoritative. The artifacts which adorn their offices are additional indicators of the norms and values which pervade the female coaches work world and of the tension between the educational and humanistic approach to coaching and the increasingly bureaucratic and businesslike nature of women's collegiate sport.

The pattern of responses in this section also reveals that women coaches resist the dominant sport culture: on an abstract level, in their philosophical beliefs, they reject the product oriented approach to sport entirely; on a more practical level, in their definitions of success and their coaching styles many are more pragmatic. In an effort to remain true to their values and beliefs and to the occupational identity of the female coach, many measure success two ways: one is based on quantifiable results and "external" standards, the other is a qualitative measure based on "internal" standards—the coaches inner voice. Although many coaches described a two-part measure of success, they also explained that "the true, true" success, is measured in terms of their athlete's positive experience; the process, rather than the product. While coaches acknowledge that sport is a perfect vehicle for teaching leadership and democratic decision making, they carefully balance their desire to use the sport setting for this purpose with the pressure to win and their own desire to produce successful teams. Division III coaches were more likely than those in Division I, II to describe their coaching style as democratic and to assert that teaching democratic values and producing successful teams are equal in priority.

The data presented in this chapter are evidence that women coaches actively construct
the culture of their work worlds, in this case: the work world of women's collegiate
sport and the work world of women coaches. They bring to the work setting their own
set of norms, values, and practices and create their own unique work culture. Recent
changes in the structure and culture of women's collegiate sport have not, as some have
suggested, left women coaches "little choice but to accept the male/professional model."
Rather, women coaches consciously and actively strive to maintain an approach to
coaching characterized by the "female model" of sport. Rather than simply accept a
model of sport at odds with their vision of coaching as a profession, they negotiate with
it. In the end, women coaches protect what they value about their profession. They
create social spaces, both physical and abstract, which allow them to assert and to put
into practice the values, philosophies, and ideals which led them to coaching in the first
place.

In short, they put into practice an approach to coaching espoused by early leaders in
women's physical education and sport. In doing so they illustrate the importance of
history for shaping the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women in the
1990's.

In this chapter three research questions have been addressed, questions number two,
three and four:

2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a
   "female model" of sport?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport,
   "male" and "female" models?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?

To summarize: The overwhelming majority of coaches in this sample coach from the
standpoint of a "female model" of sport, however, they must consciously work to
maintain this approach. Their philosophies, definitions of success, coaching styles, and
the material artifacts which adorn their offices combine to create a sub-culture among women coaches which reflects and serves as a carrier for the female model of sport. However, the encroaching dominant sport culture is a constant challenge to women coaches and the "female model" of sport; they must constantly assert and re-assert what they value about coaching. While recent changes in the structure and culture of women's collegiate sport led some coaches in this sample to experiment with the "male/professional" approach, the majority eventually moved back to an approach to coaching consistent with the female model of sport.

It is also clear from the analysis in this section that coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, a "male" approach and a "female" approach (their language). They characterized the female approach as concerned with educational values, individual growth, sportsmanship, and the value of sport participation; the male approach as focused on winning and the end results. Several coaches explained that the female approach to sport and coaching was less ego involved, more interested in giving than in taking, and many described that the difference in approach is related to socialization and differences in achievement orientation. Moreover, while it is evident that women coaches recognize two distinct models of sport, they also feel that the lines between the two are growing more blurred, with women moving more towards the "male model."

The analysis in this chapter makes clearer the extent to which women accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture. Despite the imposition of values, norms, and practices, individuals actively construct their own cultures; they interact with received wisdom, negotiate with it, then ultimately assign their own meanings. The women coaches in this sample resist the dominant sport culture by maintaining a
philosophy which puts the student and her overall welfare at the center of coaching; by defining success in terms of the player's overall welfare and choosing a coaching style which is more democratic than authoritarian. While it is clear from this analysis that all coaches in this sample work to resist the dominant sport culture, those in Division I and II may be more influenced by it and appear to have accommodated to a greater extent: they more readily assert that winning is important to them and the pressure to produce winning teams may lead them to be somewhat more authoritarian in approach. It is also possible that differences in coaching style may be the result of a selection effect. However, there is no way of knowing from this study if this is the case.

The occupation of coaching involves a variety of tasks, many of which are performed in isolation, but coaching is also an occupation which entails a great deal of interaction. Moreover, the part of coaching coaches enjoy most is the part which involves face-to-face interaction with student-athletes. In Chapter IX the "female voice" in coaching is further explored by looking at the female athlete's influence on the female coaches' approach to coaching. While the analysis in this section illuminates the extent to which women coaches approach coaching from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, the social source of this approach remains an enigma. Analysis of the female athletes' influence on the female coach is undertaken in an effort to further uncover the underlying reasons for the female coaches' approach and her accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture. Gender socialization and occupational identity appear to influence the female coaches' approach to coaching; however, her approach may also be influenced by the individuals with whom she works most closely.
CHAPTER IX

THE FEMALE ATHLETE'S INFLUENCE ON HER COACHES

In this chapter I demonstrate that the female voice in coaching is related, in part, to the female athlete. While gender and professional socialization may account for much of the female coaches' approach, the extent to which she maintains a more educational and humanistic approach to coaching in the face of the encroaching dominant sport culture may also be related to the nature and make-up of those individuals who are at the center of her work: the female athlete. For example, if the female athlete needs encouragement and emotional support in order to perform well, and to get the most out of her athletic experience, then coaches may adapt their approach to meet these needs.

In the first part of this chapter the female athlete's influence on the female coaches' approach to coaching is explored. I look first at the general nature of the coach-player relationship, then at changes in the female athlete i.e., pressures relating to academic performance, work, and family life. I also show how changes in the female athlete have influenced how coaches approach their work.

In the second part of this chapter I tie findings arrived at here to conclusions reached in Chapter VII, "The Increasingly Product Oriented and Bureaucratic Nature of Coaching," to show that the female collegiate coach of the 1990's is essentially caught between two worlds: between the dominant sport culture and female model of sport; between the product-oriented and bureaucratic world of collegiate sport and the human, process oriented world of the female athlete. In a section titled "Survey Results," I present survey data which further support the thesis that women coaches are caught
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between two worlds: they accept certain aspects of the "male/professional model" of sport and reject others. Moreover, the world of women's sport and women's coaching as defined by coaches in this study is a world with a somewhat different configuration of values. It exists within but poses a contrast to the dominant sport culture.

The purpose of this chapter is to draw tentative conclusions about one social source of the female coach's approach to coaching, to further reveal the nature and extent of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture, and to show that the women coaches in this sample are, in effect, caught between two worlds.

The analysis of interview data for this section of the study was conducted by cohort group and Division. Overall there was little difference between cohort groups on the measures analyzed; there were, however, important differences between Divisions on some measures. Those statements which best reflect emergent patterns in the data are presented here along with a discussion of the similarities and differences between Divisions. The analysis of survey data presented later in this chapter was analyzed by cohort and Division; it reveals an interesting pattern of difference between cohorts and less difference between Divisions.

The Coach-Player Relationship

In an effort to understand the relationship between players and coaches the women in this study were asked the following: "What is your relationship with your players like?" And, in another section of the interview guide coaches were asked about the amount of time, and the nature of their informal meetings with players. Responses to these questions were analyzed and are presented here. In addition, throughout the interviewing process several coaches made reference to the nature of their relationship
with their players and teams; these also are included here. Analysis by cohort and Division on these measures revealed little difference.

**Nurturing**

The coach-player relationship is perhaps best characterized by the word "nurturing." Coaches described spending tremendous amounts of time talking to players in informal meetings about things like: family problems, relationship problems, alcohol problems, eating disorders, team dynamics, academic pressures, demands of work, financial pressures, and playing time. This pattern was evident for coaches in both Divisions I, II, and Division III, and for coaches in all three cohorts ("old", "established" and "new"). Coaches referred to this part of their job as "counseling" or "inter-personal work" and explained it is an essential part of their work; as one coach explained, "without it female athletes cannot, and will not perform." Consequently, female coaches spend hours "nurturing" female athletes, for both altruistic and instrumental reasons.

This trend is illustrated in the following quotes; examples of typical statements which make up this pattern. The following "established" Division I coach explains,

This is a pretty accessible office, and kids often come to the boathouse to do extra workouts. At the end of the day I think, shit, I didn't call that recruit, I didn't get that done. But I realized I spent three hours talking to three kids...Some kids I need to nurture. In order to get the most out of them and for them to feel good about it, I need to help them get through what it is going to take to get where we are going. With others it is simple time management. It's like, well how do you spend your day that you feel so stressed out about not being able to do what you want to do?

And this "new" Division III coach explained,

Q: What is your relationship with your players like?
A: Very personal. I like the individual work with them, I find that very rewarding and I get to know them better, and that helps them in the long run. I think it is an
important part of what I do. Any athlete gets much closer to their coaches than to faculty. We do more as far as counseling and teaching in that respect than anyone on campus.

This "old" Division III coach describes the same phenomenon,

Q: What do you think is the most important for becoming a successful coach?
A: I think it is meeting with the athletes, I think of that as coaching, I think that is part of what we do, they will come in here and talk about their problems, dating problems, alcohol problems, school problems. I almost feel like I am a guidance counselor, you know. Half my job is just trying to get these kids so they can get on the tennis court and leave all this other garbage behind. It helps them to know they can come to someone who is really interested in them, beyond what they can do on the court, and I will help them try and solve some of their problems if I can.

Q: Do you see that as an important part of your job?
A: Yes. To me it is important. I think a lot of coaches actually spend more time on the actual coaching, but I spend a lot of time just talking to these young women.

Q: How much in a typical day?
A: Well, like last week was a bad week. I think I spent 80% of my time counseling students and 20% of my time actually coaching. Sometimes it comes down to 50%-50% of my time actually coaching. It is a little different in tennis than basketball, I don't think the coach can make as much of an impact on a tennis match. Once they are out there I have no control, that is why I think I spend a little more time with them before I put them out there, so we have a good understanding of each other. And if they are having a problem, like in basketball you can take a time out. But in tennis you have sixty seconds and you have to know that student. Some you can get in their face, but others if you did that they wouldn't win another game, so you have to understand a little bit about them and what they really need. Do they need to be told they are doing great, or do they need to told to get ready, move your feet or whatever. I think I really might spend more time than I want to one on one, but in the end it makes the coaching of the athlete actually easier, they are more adaptable.

While the coaches in this sample agree that recruiting is the most important determinant of coaching success, there was also strong support for the idea that good communication skills are imperative. Coaches recognize that female athletes want and need to be treated like thinking and feeling human beings, not cogs in a wheel or pawns on a chess board.

Even coaches who didn't spend a lot of extra time "communicating" with their athletes said they feel close to their athletes. They explained that coaches and athletes spend so much time together that a natural bonding occurs. The following Division I coach
explains,

Q: What is your relationship with your players like?
A: I try to treat everybody the same. I certainly do when it comes to making boats [winning a starting position on the crew team]. But I have much more ability now to be much more empathetic. And I am very emotional, especially when it comes to the end of the year. I see them six times a week nine months a year and I miss them. Sometimes when I drive in my car, in my free time, I think about it. Every year two or four or six athletes will be graduating and it becomes harder every year. Not that I... I mean it is O.K. when it happens but I really develop a relationship with these people, and you see them grow and change and it is great.

When asked about her relationship with her players another Division I coach explained,

Q: Do they come to you because you are a role model?
A: Yeah, I think so. I think we are the adult that is in between the parent and their peers. I think we are the adult contact that potentially, they think we are well invested in them and care about them and we have a genuine trust. More from a selfish standpoint because without them our jobs are not worth anything. But also because when you spend so much time with people like we do now you can't help but have a bonding kind of thing, and it's not like you even have to be close with the team, but there is just a natural, you just spend so much time together. You know what they are doing all the time, you know how they are feeling, if they are struggling with things. There is also that obligation on their part to let us know when things are going wrong, we instill in them a commitment to them, and we expect it in return. I'd like to think that is part of it.

And this Division I coach explained,

When you travel with 12 women all the time you really get to know them, we really laugh sometimes, you find out what goes on, you have a lot of fun. It's not always them coming and sit down and you ask what is going on, it's more just traveling together, talking...things come out.

This Division III coach's response reflects the same pattern,

You get quite close to them during the season, we are like a family in a lot of ways. Really, you spend and awful lot of time together. Riding together on away trips you hear a lot about what is going on. They tell you things or they tell others and it just comes up.

Kids and Families

Coaches described their relationship with players as nurturing, and characterized by
mutual respect. In addition, many used analogies which revealed that in many ways a team is like a family and the female coach is like a mother to her children. While it is important to note that only 13% (three Division I, II coaches, and three Division III coaches) of the coaches in this sample have children, there was no difference between coaches on this measure.

Throughout the interviewing process coaches referred to their athletes as "kids," and while this use of language may be no more than a simple colloquial term, or argot for the profession, other responses indicate that this is not the case. In the "Profile" portion of the interview coaches were asked, "Do you have any children?" The response to this question, often accompanied by laughter, revealed that many coaches "feel like" parents to their athletes; typical responses included: "No, [laughter] I have no biological children," and "Yes, fifteen, [laughter] no... I don't have any children." At the end of the interview coaches were asked, "Is there anything else you would like to add that you think might help me to better understand coaching in the 90's?" one coach responded with, "Coaching is like...you are in between a mother and a teacher." In discussing how she balances the demands of coaching with the demands of her family another coach explained,

Q: Could you tell me a little bit more about your experience as a mother and how that fits in with coaching?
A: It kind of came automatic. Being a coach helped me to be a mother, it was easy. It was the same kind of thing like caring for somebody you care about, like seeing my child walk or something, or even when she said her first words-it's just like when you are asking them to run their best time, it is the same kind of feeling the same kind of joy [for them and you], of..."gee I did it." Like that first step, or like my daughter lost her first tooth last night and she was like, "Mommy I lost my tooth." You should have seen me, I was so excited...you know...the tooth fairy and all. We were like telling her about the tooth fairy. So, it's the joy. Like one of my runners just got accepted to Harvard medical school; I was so proud of her, it's the sense of accomplishment, more for what they do.
The fact that coaches "feel like parents" was also revealed in the way they talked about their teams. At different points throughout the interviewing process they described their teams as "families" or "like families." For example, in describing the demands of coaching, one coach explained that the time and emotional energy spent in coaching had contributed to the break-up of her marriage. She explained, "If you want to have a family you need a husband who really understands, it is not nine to five. You have your family here and your family at home. Sometimes it is easier not to have a personal life."

Summary of the Coach-Player Relationship

When discussing the nature of their relationships with players, the coaches in this sample spoke with a uniform voice: their relationships vary depending on their own personalities and the students they coach, but in general they are good, warm, caring, and characterized by mutual respect. Coaches agree that good communication is essential for effective coaching and team success. To get the most out of female-athletes coaches have to know them as people, what motivates them, and what inhibits their athletic performance. Regardless of the level of play coaches in this sample agree...coaching female athletes isn't all x's and o's. As coaches they have to deal with the "whole" athlete, especially her human and emotional side.

Whether by design or a consequence of the sport environment, the coaches in this sample explained that they spend a significant amount of time with their athletes, and the majority expressed feelings of warmth for and closeness to the athletes on their teams. However, there were interesting differences between coaches in Division I, II and Division III in how they felt about the amount of "extra" time they spend with the
female athletes in their programs. Some do so willingly, others reluctantly.

**Changes in Female Athletes**

Coaches' perceptions of changes in female athletes were explored through responses to the question, "Have female athletes changed during the years you've been involved in coaching?," and with the follow-up question, "How?" Analysis of the data revealed both a uniform pattern regarding changes in female athletes, and important differences by Division. Overall, the coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts agree that female athletes have changed.

**Division I and II Female Athletes**

Coaches in Division I, II described female athletes as more pampered and wanting more external rewards for their play. They explained that fewer and fewer athletes play for the sheer joy of it and that many play just to get and keep their athletic scholarships. Coaches perceive that many athletes are "burned out" by the time they reach college, the result of over training and sport specificity. Finally, they speak with a uniform voice when they assert that athletes today, "feel more pressure" and "have more problems."

At the Division I level, coaches explained that the changes in female athletes are related to two sets of phenomena: one in the world of sport, the other outside sport. Both create a set of forces which impact the lives of female athletes, and ultimately...the job of coaching. Inside the world of sport, coaches described changes in youth sport programs which emphasize specificity at a young age. They also pointed to the competition for athletic scholarships and the camps and leagues which have emerged.
around this phenomenon. According to coaches, amateur leagues and camps which cater
to college coaches' recruiting needs are profit oriented endeavors which exploit athletes.
They lead to athletic injuries and emotional burn-out and most athletes who attend the
camps have little chance of getting an athletic scholarship.

One "old" Division I coach explained,

They are playing too hard, too long to get better. It is a meat market. I think there
are more opportunities to play and that is great for them but I think it should be
handled differently, especially their bodies, not the x's and o's. Why should they play
3-4 games a day. Whoever said that was good for you? We see more injuries now,
they come like that. AAU ball and some leagues, and Shoot Out Camp. And some kids
have no hope of getting a scholarship. They go to get identified. Coaches with
scholarships watch these kids, that's the point, and yet 75% of them are not
scholarship athletes. They should know that before. They pay $300.00 to play five
or six games. Blue Chip and Blue Star Camp, that is what they do-it's a meat market,
run kids through and have coaches see them.

When asked, "Have athletes changed during the years you've been in coaching?" an
"established" Division II coach explained,

A: Oh sure. One thing I see, compared to when I played, you just couldn't wait to play.
There was no AAU and State Games. You had to go down to the park and wait to get on a
court now they have too much of it, they can play all the time. There are no gym rats.
They used to be gym rats, you had to kick them out of the gym, but now you kind of
have to coax them into the gym.

Q: Why?
A: So many opportunities in their life, some burn-out also, face it...to play college
ball at this level you can't play six months out of the year any more, you can't. You
have to be a basketball person, play 9-10 months out of the year. If you are not,
well you might get by, but you may not be all that successful. Sure there is some
burn-out, and it is because we have become more specialized.

Coaches explained that the underlying impetus towards specialization is parents'
quests for athletic scholarships and the rising cost of higher education. Parents who
invest a lot of time, money, and energy in their daughter's athletic talent want a return
on their investment. This coach explained,

Q: Have athletes changed during the years you've been in coaching?
A: Yes. Ten years ago they didn't have these AAU programs they have now. We had a
recruit here last Saturday and that was the first Saturday she had off all year. She is playing on a school team and in AAU four nights a week. When my season was over last year I was sick of it, I didn't want to see a basketball game or see a recruit, and this is my job. When I was growing up it was like, OK now it's time to play softball. And I don't think kids are all that different, they get bored, they want to do different things set different goals. I think the big thing is that no matter what socio-economic status the family comes from college costs a lot of money. Parents put a lot into their kids athletics and they want them to get that scholarship.

The emphasis on sport specialization coupled with the availability of athletic scholarships have contributed to changes in the nature of the female collegiate athlete. According to coaches in this sample these changes have made athletes both more demanding, more interested in the extrinsic rewards of sport participation, and less motivated by the intrinsic rewards of play. As one coach explained, "They are less in it for the joy of participation and it is all about their ability to get an award or named MVP or All Big Ten. Many are burned out and play to keep their scholarships, and many more experience over-use injuries." In an interesting irony while most coaches described players as less committed to collegiate sport participation, a few Division I, II coaches said they were more committed. It appears that some highly motivated athletes have adapted well to the changes described by coaches, while others have found it harder to do so.

Changes in female athletes are also perceived by coaches to be related to changes in the American family. Coaches explained that athletes come to college with more "baggage:" they have more family problems and feel pressure in other areas of their lives. According to coaches many of these young women have been taken care of all their lives and their coping skills are not very good, on the other hand they also explain that young women today do have more issues to deal with than in the past.
Division III Female Athletes

Coaches in Division III also felt that female athletes have changed. Like their Division I counterparts that come to college with more "baggage." Coaches described players as feeling more "pressure," and explained that the source of this pressure was related to the high cost of a college education, the desire to get good grades, and the fear that failure to achieve good grades can influence job and graduate school opportunities. As one coach explained, "I think they have more going on now. More of them work and there are more pressures." When asked if athletes felt more pressure to perform athletically the following coach explained that at the Division III level that was less an issue. Her response is typical of others in the sub-sample:

No. I think it is more other pressures, like financial pressures, they have jobs, they have to work. When I was at school money was not an issue. More of these kids are on financial aid. There have been more kids on financial aid here in the last five years than I saw in my first few years. They do talk to me about that and that is new, they never used to talk about financial aid and money. I am aware of that stuff, I hear about it.

Division III coaches also described female-athletes as having more "problems" like eating disorders, alcohol problems, relationship problems, and family problems. Many described these as ultimately related to changes in society and the American family. However, the most important change in Division III female athletes appears to be related to the cost of higher education and changes in the American economy.

Unlike her Division I and II counterpart the female athlete at the Division III receives no monetary rewards for her athletic participation. However, like athletes in Division I and II the Division III female athlete feels the "pressures" related to changes in the American family, especially divorce and single parent homes. She is unlike her Division I and II counterparts in the extent to which she feels the financial pressures of
college. Coaches described that in addition to her athletic pursuits, the typical Division III athlete works between 10-20 hours a week to help defray the cost of her education.

When asked how athletes have changed, Division III coaches were quick to point out the biggest change was a lack of commitment and/or lack of interest in playing. They also explained that this was related both to the demands of work and to academic pressures. The following Division III coach explains,

A: When I was in school two sport athletes was the norm, today it is the exception. Now people say it just takes too much energy and too much time. I just think a lot of kids today, I find a lot need to work. I have people who are juggling, like one kid on our team had to work overnight a couple time and came in the next day, went to classes, then practice...that type of change. And six years ago an athlete would be recruited and come and play four years of a college sport. Today the expectation that people will play four years is minimal. Of a recruiting class of six who will come in maybe two will graduate as part of your program. Anything can get in the way. They want to focus more on academics, have a dual major, they have to work, they are student teaching. If there is no immediate reward they might not want to be there.

Q: What do you mean?
A: Before when I had a team of twelve, of that twelve a few may not play that much like number 11, or 12, and you might worry about them accepting that role, but number 6, and 7 were fine, they were very much a part of it, felt very important, like key people on the team. Now the sixth and seventh people say it is not quite good enough, I’m not starting, I’m not playing enough. For athletes if it is not immediately rewarding, even though it may be challenging, I find more and more will walk away from the challenge for what to them feels like good reason. Now an athlete will come in the middle of the season, or a week before and say, I’m not going to play I need to get a job. Kids are much more self centered now. I think they used to value just being part of the team, period. Even with injuries, now don’t misunderstand me, but their nature is they just are not as committed.

Another Division III coach explained, "They are less committed than they used to be, they have more going on."

In short, coaches described that many Division III female athletes weigh the benefits and costs of collegiate athletic participation and decide that given the financial, academic, and other pressures associated with college life, it simply isn't worth it. All of the Division III coaches I spoke with described this same phenomenon. In addition,
coaches explained that although there is more support for women's athletics in general, female athletes still get little day to day support for athletic participation, especially in Division III. Although being a female athlete carries less stigma than in the past, for young women, there is still little status to be gained from athletic participation. Overall, at the Division III level the rewards of participation are still mostly intrinsic, and the Division III female athlete is left to defend her decision to participate against the demands of academics, work, and a product oriented society which values external rewards over intrinsic ones. As one coach explained, "This is something I have seen this change very slowly. If after freshman year these kids don't see themselves as being an "impact player" they quit." Recognizing the same phenomenon another coach analyzed the situation this way, "It's funny but it is like it has gone full circle. For a while it was like it was important to be a female athlete. Now it is like it has gone back the other way, like it isn't as valued as it used to be." Moreover, as coaches explained, it appears to be valued by athletes only if it is accompanied by extrinsic rewards, or immediate gratification, if they have something to show for their time and energy.

**Summary of Changes in Female Athletes**

The analysis of coaches responses regarding changes in female athletes shows that despite the differences, some of the changes in female athletes transcend Division. More specifically, all of the coaches in this sample explained that athletes feel more "pressure" from outside sources than ever before, and that these "pressures" are related primarily, but not exclusively, to academics and the high cost of education. The coaches in this sample feel that female collegiate athletes are less committed to sport participation and more interested in the extrinsic rewards of sport than athletes in
Changes in female athletes, especially the increased "pressures" and decrease in intrinsic motivation and commitment, have had an important influence on the nature of coaching as an occupation. As a result, coaches explained they spend more time "counseling" athletes than in the past. This was particularly evident among Division III coaches. While many Division I,II coaches described spending more time talking to and trying to help their athletes many had less direct informal contact with athletes as compared to Division III coaches. Division I coaches typically have one or two assistants, and while they described the increase in "problems" noted by other coaches, many explained that their assistants are closer to the athletes and are more likely to deal with them on non-sport related issues. At the Division I,II level the assistant is more likely to play the role of confidant and helper. At the Division III level it is typically the Head Coach because most Division III coaches don't have full-time assistants.

So how do Division III coaches feel about "counseling" athletes? Most like their role as counselor and confidant; they see it as part of their job, a natural extension of the helping behavior associated with the teaching aspect of coaching. They enjoy spending time talking to players because it helps them get to know them better, and ultimately help their athletes perform better. As one coach stated, "You can't just throw them on the field and expect them to play. You have to deal with the whole person."

While most Division III coaches feel good about the time they spend with athletes, for some, the extra time athletes ask of them is a burden. More time spent talking with
athletes means less time to get other work tasks accomplished, and coaches feel
pressured about keeping up with the other demands in their jobs. While most of the
Division III coaches I spoke to had mostly altruistic reasons for spending time with
athletes, they also realize that time spent with athletes can produce tangible results on
the court or field of play. Thus, even when they don't want to Division III coaches make
time to talk to athletes, they feel they have to. Helping female athletes off the field
translates into helping female athletes perform better on the field, which ultimately
affects the teams performance. In short, as described in the section on "nurturing,"
coaches have both altruistic and instrumental reasons for spending so much time
"counseling" their athletes.

In addition, especially in Division III, coaches realize that the athlete's relationship to
her sport is more tenuous, so they work to keep them committed and "attached" to the
team and the sport. In addition to helping their athletes with outside pressures and
concerns they must help them to feel that the time and effort they put into playing is
worthwhile. As one coach explained, "You have to spend time talking to them, making
them feel important, or they will walk."

The instrumental motive behind spending extra time with female athletes was even
more evident among Division I and II coaches. While Division I and II coaches explained
they enjoy getting to know their athletes and enjoy talking to them, the athletes need for
emotional support is an even greater burden on Division I and II coaches. Division I
coaches were more ambivalent about playing the role of counselor and confidant and
many simply allowed their assistants to take on that role. They know they need to build
good rapport with their players, and most are genuinely interested in their athletes'
welfare, but the pressure to win and the need to spend time recruiting makes spending
too much time with athletes very costly.

Complicating matters for Division I, II coaches is the fact that Division I and II athletes also feel "pressures" inside the world of sport, i.e. the pressure to perform and win games. According to coaches in this sample, most female athletes do not cope well with this pressure, and because of it, need more emotional support than ever before.

The following coach explained,

They [athletes] feel that competing at this level and throwing everything they are all their energy into it is a big risk. They want to know they will be supported win or lose. They are afraid to fail and, I have more kids afraid of failing than I do afraid of succeeding. They need a lot of emotional support. I think there are many more emotional needs now for athletes. I often thought that maybe I am more sensitive to their emotional needs now, but now as I look back and talk to athletes from past years, they didn't have the same kinds of needs. They came from different family structures.

Another stated,

I think I maybe talk to my athletes more now than I used to. Maybe it's age I don't know, you sort of mellow. You just try not to think about the demands and the pressures of the job. I also think that some of it is the less pressure you put on the kids, the better they perform.

Survey Results

Forty three of the forty six subjects in this study, 93%, also completed a short survey on the values reflected in collegiate sport (see Appendix B). The survey included three fixed response questions: (1). Which of the following reflect the current state of collegiate sport? (2). Which of the following reflect what you feel collegiate sport for women should be like? (3). Which of the following reflect the nature and focus of your program. For each question subjects were asked to choose five values from the list of twenty two and to rank order their choices from one to five with one being most reflective. The list of twenty two words included eleven "male/professional model" values and eleven "alternative model" values (Blinde, 1989). (Note: Blinde uses the
term "alternative" values as opposed to "female values" to better reflect the realities which transcend gender in collegiate sport and the commonalities in non-revenue producing sports.)

The survey was analyzed by cohort and Division. Those values chosen most often and ranked the highest were organized in three tables corresponding to each of three questions. This way of analyzing the data allowed for a more complex interpretation of the findings but also revealed problems which emerge with a small and disproportionate sample: relatively few responses from "old" coaches from which to draw conclusions. However, because the sub-samples (cohort and Division) are analyzed separately and comparatively and are not used here to construct a composite picture, the differential sampling used in this survey is less problematic (Babbie, 1990:94). Even so, the following analysis is cautiously presented. It is acknowledged here in hindsight that a stratified probability sample would have produced more conclusive results; what would have been lost however, is the opportunity to compare interview and survey data within the same sample.

The values selected most often by coaches in each cohort and Division were recorded and are shown in the Tables 9, 10, and 11 below. In cases where equal numbers of coaches selected two different values, the value rated highest (lowest cumulative score) was selected. Results reveal that the coaches in this sample perceived collegiate sport to reflect the "male/professional model" of sport (see Table 9). In Division I, II coaches selected male/professional values most often to describe the current state of collegiate sport. In Division III coaches also selected male/professional values most often. When alternative values were chosen they were chosen most often by "old" and "established" coaches in both Division I, II, and in Division III.
In contrast, when asked what collegiate sport for women should be like, coaches in all Divisions and all cohorts selected more alternative values (see Table 10). In each of the cohorts and in both Division I, II and Division III the top five values selected by coaches included two alternative values. In addition, those alternative values which were selected were selected more often by "old" and "established" coaches than by "new" coaches.

Overall, the coaches in this sample felt that collegiate sport in general reflects male/professional values, and that collegiate sport for women should include more alternative values. They felt women's collegiate sport should be more enjoyable, student centered, fun, and should focus more on friendships, self actualization, cooperation, and sportsmanship than is currently the case. As compared to their "new" colleagues, "old" and "established coaches in both Divisions felt more strongly that women's collegiate sport should reflect alternative values.

While it is clear that in recent years structural and philosophical changes in women's sport have led to increased emphasis on values typically associated with men's programs (Blinde, 1989:44; for further support see also Boutilier & SanGiovanni, 1983; Grant, 1984; Lopiano, 1984) the analysis of responses to Question 2 revealed that women coaches do not feel women's sport should mirror men's athletics. Although feminists assert that women's collegiate sport has succumbed to the "hegemonic practice of the dominant sport culture" (Blinde, 1989:44) responses to Question 2 of this survey appear to imply just the opposite: women coaches' support a model of women's sport which differs from the dominant sport culture.

When asked about the nature and focus of their own programs, Question 3, coaches answered in ways which almost mirrored their responses to Question 2 (see Table 11).
Coaches believe their own sport programs are more reflective of alternative values than is the world of collegiate sport. In addition, in both Divisions coaches in the "old" cohort were more likely to describe their programs in terms of alternative values than their "new" counterparts; and coaches in Division III were more likely than those in Division I, II to describe their own sport programs using alternative values.

### Table 9: Current State of Collegiate Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I, II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old</strong></td>
<td><strong>Established</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. demanding</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. competitive</td>
<td>competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. hard work</td>
<td>enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. serious</td>
<td>hard wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. fair play</td>
<td>competitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10: What Women's Collegiate Sport Should Be Like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I, II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old</strong></td>
<td><strong>Established</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. enjoy.</td>
<td>competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. stud.ctr.</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. dedicated</td>
<td>enjoyable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. demanding</td>
<td>fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. hard wk.</td>
<td>hard wk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Nature and Focus of Coaches’ Sport Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division I, II</th>
<th>Division III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stud.ctr.</td>
<td>hard wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard wk.</td>
<td>competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoy.</td>
<td>hard wk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedication</td>
<td>enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three patterns can be discerned from this survey data: (1). "New" coaches were most likely to describe the collegiate sport world in terms of male/professional values and the least likely to assert that women's collegiate sport should reflect alternative values. They were also less likely than "old" coaches in all Divisions, and "established" coaches in Division III to describe their sport programs in terms of alternative values. (2). "Old" coaches in both Divisions I, II and III were more likely than their "established" or "new" counterparts to feel that women's collegiate sport should reflect alternative values and are more likely to emphasize alternative values in their own programs. (3). "Established" coaches were more likely than "New" coaches, and less likely than "old" coaches, to feel women's sport should reflect alternative values. They were also less likely than their "old" colleagues to focus on alternative values in their own programs. Established coaches in Division III were more likely to emphasize alternative values than were their colleagues in the "new" cohort.

In general, this survey revealed that the women coaches in this sample felt collegiate sport reflects male/professional values; that there is an overriding collegiate sport culture which is demanding, business-like, competitive, serious, requires dedication
and emphasizes hard work. They felt that women's sport should emphasize some of these: it should be competitive, demanding, require dedication, and emphasize hard work; but it should also be enjoyable, student centered, fun, lead to self-actualization and teach cooperation and sportsmanship. While the women coaches in this sample felt women's sport should reflect both male/professional and alternative values, they clearly do not feel it should be as business-like or serious as the current state of collegiate sport.

The survey results also revealed that the women coaches in this sample also believe that their own programs focus more on alternative values than collegiate sport in general. Division I, II coaches chose the following values to describe their programs: demanding, competitive, and emphasize hard work and dedication; they are also chose student-centered, enjoyable, fun, and focus on developing comradery. These were the same values chosen to describe what women's sport should be like. Responses by Division III coaches reflected this same pattern.

In short, their was an important contrast between the nature of collegiate sport as perceived by women coaches, and their philosophy of sport; between what the collegiate sport world values and what they feel should be emphasized in women's sport. In addition, there was a marked contrast between what women coaches in this sample perceived is valued in collegiate sport and what they emphasize in their own programs. While there is no way of knowing from this study if in fact the women coaches in this sample do focus on those values described in the survey, the comparison between responses to "the current state of collegiate sport" and "focus of program" still revealed an interesting contrast: coaches believe that their own sport programs emphasize a different set of values, and that their programs are more focused on alternative values.
than is true of the collegiate sport culture overall.

Analysis of the data from this survey also revealed that women coaches appear to accept certain male/professional values and to reject others, that women coaches feel women's sport should reflect certain alternative values, and that coaches work to implement these values in their own programs. They believe that collegiate sport should be hard work, competitive, and require dedication, but they also feel it should be enjoyable, fun, student-centered, and contribute to student athletes' self-actualization.

The data from this survey supports data obtained from in-depth interviews in this study and revealed that women coaches are, to an extent, caught between two worlds. Their work world is both product oriented and bureaucratic, a result of the encroaching dominant sport culture. On the other hand it is also humanistic and oriented towards educating female athletes, a product of occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes.

Both in terms of what they feel women's sport should be like, and in terms of what they focus on in their own programs, the women coaches in this sample appear to resist, to an extent, the dominant sport culture of male/professional values. They do not feel that women's sport should mirror the current state of collegiate sport, nor do they coach in a way which mirrors what they perceive are the dominant values in collegiate sport. However, the extent to which they resist male/professional values varies.

Coaches in the "old" and "established" cohorts appear to resist the dominant sport culture more than their "new" colleagues: fewer "new" coaches chose alternative values both to describe what they feel collegiate sport for women should be like, and to describe the nature and focus on their own programs. The difference between cohorts in this survey may be exaggerated due to disproportionate sampling. Thus, conclusions reached
here are presented with caution and are considered tentative. On the other hand, the results appear to fit conclusions reached in other parts of the qualitative portion of this study, that "new" coaches appear to be more assimilated to male/professional collegiate sport values than their "old" or "established" colleagues. Differences by Division were harder to discern; however, work setting appeared to be less influential than age and experience. Coaches in both Division groups felt that women's sport should reflect more alternative values than is the case in the general sport culture, and focus on these in their own sport programs.

While this survey supports the hypothesis that women coaches resist certain values characteristic of the dominant sport culture, it is also clear from this survey that they accept certain male/professional values. What is less clear is whether the acceptance of certain male/professional values is a reflection of accommodation to the dominant sport culture, and adaptation to the world of collegiate sport; or a reflection of the male/professional values which are part of the female coach's occupational identity. While it can not be proven here, a consideration of the historical portion of this thesis would suggest that latter to be the case. Women coaches, like early leaders of women's physical education support demanding, competitive sports for women; what they reject is its increasingly product-oriented and commercial nature: sport as business, more serious than fun.

Between Two Worlds: A Recapitulation

In this section I attempt to establish the interconnections between the analysis presented in Chapter VII, "The Increasingly Product Oriented and Bureaucratic Nature of Coaching" and Chapter VIII, "Coaching with a Female Voice." Consideration of the
findings in both chapters illuminates the consequences for coaches of the dynamic relationship between agency and structure in the world of women's coaching.

In Chapter VII I showed that coaching as an occupation has grown more bureaucratic and product oriented. For Division I and II coaches especially, increased emphasis on winning has resulted in coaches spending substantial portions of their time on recruiting. Even at the Division III level, successful sport programs have grown increasingly important and recruiting is an expectation which accompanies the job of coaching. The data presented in that chapter revealed that "old" and "established" coaches (women who graduated from college on or before 1984 and have been coaching for ten years or more) in all Divisions accommodate to the changes in the structure of women's collegiate sport in practice, but remain philosophically opposed to it. They recruit and do paper work because they have to. And, especially in the case of recruiting, most distance themselves from it because it is a job task which is inconsistent with the female coaches' occupational identity.

In Chapter VII I also showed that while changes in the structure of women's collegiate sport have influenced women's coaching and forced women coaches to accommodate to the demands of the dominant sport culture, women coaches in Division I, II display small acts of resistance such as cynicism, and humor to register their philosophical opposition to recruiting. Those in Division III are not only philosophically opposed to recruiting, they resist it in practice by consciously choosing not to spend much time on it, even though they know they are expected to. In essence, they "avoid" it.

In Chapter VII I conclude that an analysis of coaches' work tasks reveals that "old" and "established" coaches do accommodate to the dominant sport culture in practice, despite their philosophical conflict with it, especially those in Division I, II. In Chapter VIII,
"Coaching with a Female Voice," I showed that while Division I and II coaches accommodate to the dominant sport culture in practice in areas such as recruiting and paper work, they also look for ways to control their work. They seek social spaces which allow them to implement an educational approach to collegiate sport, to coach in a way which reflects the norms and values consistent with their occupational identity and the female model of sport. They find this social space in their definition of success, their philosophy of coaching, their coaching style, and through material artifacts which celebrate an alternative set of norms and values. In and through these social spaces coaches attempt to resist the dominant sport culture and control, to an extent, the meaning and nature of their work.

In Chapter VIII I concluded that the female voice in coaching continues to exist and argue that, in fact, there is a sub-culture among women coaches of alternative values and norms which acts to preserve and carry the "female model" of sport. Women coaches have not, as some have argued "succumbed to the hegemonic forces of the dominant sport culture" (Blinde, 1989:44).

The purpose of this chapter thus far has been to show that the female athlete has an important influence on the female coaches' approach to coaching. The women coaches in this sample explain they must take time to get to know their athletes and they must pay attention to their human and emotional needs, if they don't their athletes can not and will not play for them, or at least they will not play as well. The patterns in the data reported here reveal that the female athlete is a counter force to the encroaching dominant sport culture. She forces the female coach to remain focused on the humanistic and educational aspects of coaching, despite the increasingly bureaucratic and product oriented nature of collegiate sport.
The analysis of interview data in Chapters VII and VIII combined presents a picture of the female coach caught between two worlds, between two models of sport: the male/professional model which pervades Division I and II collegiate sport in the form of the dominant sport culture and is "trickling down" to the Division III level, and the female/human model which exists as a sub-cultural form among women coaches, and as I have shown here, also among female athletes. While there is no way of knowing from this study which is the most important source of the female voice in coaching: gender, occupational socialization, or daily interactions with female athletes; it is clear that the nature and needs of female athletes forces coaches to remain grounded in the human and educational aspects of coaching. Female athletes of the 1990's are in effect a constant reminder to coaches of the ideals espoused by the early leaders in women's physical education: that coaching is teaching and that its ultimate aim is the growth and development of female students.

A Concluding Word

The analysis presented here helps to explain why, in the face of changing sport culture and increasing pressures to produce winning teams, women coaches continue to espouse a player-centered and educational approach and to behave in ways which expresses their overall concern for female-athletes. This analysis uncovers an additional source of motivation for women coaches to work to retain the values and beliefs which led them to the profession in the first place; a social source which keeps them "on the path."

The analysis presented here reveals that the nature and needs of female athletes in the 1990's insures that women coaches will be humanistic in their approach to
coaching, and that they will treat female athletes like human beings not commodities. In
effect, the pressure on coaches to produce winning teams does only so much to influence
their approach to coaching; the female athlete's nature and needs is equally if not more
influential.

Women coaches in the 1990's are in many ways social carriers of the female model
of sport. Absent the organizational and institutional structures which legitimate norms,
values and practices, women coaches continue to espouse a philosophy and approach to
coaching which recalls the earliest years of women's intercollegiate sport, and more
directly, the model of intercollegiate sport espoused by the AIAW. It exists not in an
institutional form, but as a sub-culture of norms, values, and practices the source of
which includes: occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and
needs of female athletes. However, the female model of sport is a residual sport form
which poses a challenge to but can not transform the dominant sport culture.

Overall, the women coaches in this sample both accommodate to and resist the
dominant sport culture of male/professional norms and values. In areas of their jobs
where they have little control, they accommodate to the imperatives of a bureaucratic
and product oriented dominant sport culture; where they can control their work they
espouse more humanistic and educational philosophies and implement more process
oriented practices. Moreover, the survey presented in this chapter illuminates that
women coaches do not necessarily reject all aspects of the male/professional sport
culture; rather they reject certain values over others; and...they reject a sport culture
which fails to acknowledge that sport is play, that playing is fun, and that sport as part
of education should be educational.

In the final chapter of this dissertation, Chapter X, I briefly review the following:
the purpose of this study, the theoretical framing, the historical roots of coaching and the female model of sport. I then summarize findings from the empirical portion of this study presented in Chapters VI - IX, show how these findings bear on theories presented earlier, and make concluding statements regarding research questions one through four. I also present findings which relate to the future of coaching as an occupation for women, discuss these in relation to research question five, and conclude with a brief statement on the nature of agency and structure in the work world of women coaches. Suggestions for further research are also discussed.

To review, the research questions which have guided this study are:

1. How do women coaches experience their work; what values and meanings do they assign their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, and what are the social sources of this approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?
5. To what extent does a woman's reason for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?
CHAPTER X

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In this last chapter, I review the purpose of and theoretical framing for this study, summarize the findings of the historical and empirical portions of this research and integrate the literature with my findings. The research questions and hypotheses which have guided this investigation are revisited and concluding statements put forth. Research questions one through four (see page 5 and 325) are addressed in turn; research question five is dealt with separately and considered in light of the future of coaching as an occupation for women. This chapter and dissertation conclude with suggestions for further research.

Purpose, Research Questions, and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study has been to explore the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's and to discover the extent to which women coaches accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture (a sport culture which reflects the influences of rationalization, capitalism, and patriarchy). Since 1972 when Title IX mandated equal opportunity for girls and women in educational institutions, the structure and philosophy of women's collegiate sport has undergone significant change; these changes were hastened when the NCAA assumed control of women's intercollegiate sport in 1982. The changes in women's intercollegiate sport have been characterized as an "emulation" of the "male/professional model" of sport. According to some researchers, this emulation is manifested in a shift among women coaches and
administrators from a "female model" of sport, a model which emphasizes collegiate
sport as an educational endeavor and the overall growth and welfare of student-athletes,
to a "male/professional model" of collegiate sport, a model which focuses on collegiate
sport as a commercial enterprise and de-emphasizes the educational aspects of sport
participation.

The changes in women's collegiate sport have also been characterized here in terms of
the dominant sport culture's influence on women's athletics. This notion of a "dominant
sport culture" encompasses three social processes: rationalization in modern society,
the logic of capitalism, and patriarchal relations. Throughout this dissertation these two
terms, dominant sport culture and male/professional model, have been used
interchangeably. Despite slight differences in focus their meanings overlap, and both
can be used to describe the nature of collegiate sport. Both refer to a sport culture
which focuses on rationalization and productivity.

The overarching theme of this project has been that there is a dialectical relationship
between agency and structure in the construction of meaning. Action and the meanings
individuals assign their practices are an intersection of individual choice and the limits
imposed by historically specific social structures, that is, dominant groups and their
symbolic systems. Moreover, because sport is an aspect of culture which exists
independent of the political economy of society, the opportunity to resist dominant
meanings and challenge dominant practices is greater in this realm than in others.
Despite the constraints of social structure, coaches can and do actively construct the
meaning they assign their work. They are part of an active struggle to define and control
the realm of sport. But there are limits to individual agency: structure does constrain
action and meaning. Thus, their challenges alter, but cannot transform the dominant
sport culture. The power of women coaches to construct meaning and control action is best understood in historical context; in terms of the limits created by historically specific social structures i.e., patriarchy, capitalism, and the dominant sport culture.

To explore the nature of coaching, the meaning women coaches assign to their work, and the extent to which women coaches accommodate to, and resist, the dominant sport culture, the following research questions were addressed in this dissertation:

1. How do women coaches experience their work; what values and meaning do they assign to their practices?
2. To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport; what are the social sources of this approach?
3. Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models?
4. Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?
5. To what extent does a woman's reasons for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?

It was hypothesized that:

**Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis I:** Female collegiate coaches believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport, but these beliefs are compromised by the dominant sport culture which dictates work tasks and the definition of occupational success.

**Hypothesis II:** Women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a female sport model, but they adapt their approach to meet the demands imposed by the dominant sport culture. This adaptation makes coaching more difficult: (1). Coaches must reconcile two different philosophical approaches to sport; one which focuses on the process, the other on the product. (2). They must spend more time on those tasks which they value least and find least rewarding. (3). They must focus more on those tasks which produce winning teams, at the same time they attempt to meet the athletic and emotional needs of their female athletes.

The social sources of the "female model" approach include: gender socialization, socialization into the profession, and the nature and needs of female athletes.
Hypothesis III: Coaches perceive two different models of sport, but the models are not differentiated by gender. Women coaches describe two prevailing sport models in intercollegiate sport: one is product oriented and the other is process oriented. Women coaches believe that more men tend to fall in the first category and more women in second, but they also believe that many female coaches are becoming increasingly product oriented, while many male coaches are adopting a more process oriented style.

Women coaches recognize that male and female athletes are different. So, despite the convergence in coaching styles, coaching women is still different from coaching men. They believe that while many male coaches appear to be focused more on winning, this as related in part to the career orientation of male coaches, and the nature of male athletes.

Hypothesis IV: Many women coaches resist the dominant sport culture, but they do so in small ways which pose a challenge to but can not transform the dominant sport culture. Resistance to the dominant sport culture varies according to differences in:

1. socialization into the profession; 
2. experiences as a player; 
3. the nature of the work role (coach, or teacher/coach); 
4. the particular college division of one's school; 
5. the extent of commitment to and nature of the occupational subculture; 
6. number of years coaching.

Despite the growing commodification of sport and the "trickle down" of the professional sport model, women who have stayed in coaching find ways both to affirm humanistic values and implement player-centered approaches. While some coaches may have accommodated themselves to the dominant sport culture, most behave in ways and express values which can be characterized as resistance to hegemony.

Hypothesis V: Women stay in coaching when their work experience is consistent with their reasons for entering the field. They enter coaching because they love the sport they coach, because they want to teach (they see coaching as a form of teaching), and because they feel they can make a difference in young people's lives. Women stay in coaching because they find working with young people extremely rewarding. They consider leaving when they feel an erosion of the values and ideals which lead them into coaching in the first place, when they feel they no longer have much impact on young people's lives, and when they feel that growing older is affecting their ability to coach.

Method and Data

To understand the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's, and to determine the nature and extent of their resistance and accommodation to the dominant sport culture 46 in-depth interviews were conducted with full-time female coaches coaching at an NCAA affiliated institution in 1995-96. The interviews
were semi-structured to allow for in-depth probing and followed the interview guide included in Appendix A. Interviews lasted, on average, between one and a half and two hours. A fixed response questionnaire and observations were used to supplement the interview data. Judgement and quota sampling were used to increase the representativeness of the sample along the following dimensions: NCAA affiliation of institution (see Table 2, page 164), sport coached (see Table 3, page 165), age, number of years in coaching, conference affiliation, and type of institution (public/private; large/small).

Interviews were obtained through snowball sampling and cold calls. The transcribed data was analyzed qualitatively, first using a grounded theory approach to discover emergent themes and categories, then by coding the data and looking for relevant patterns and relationships between themes and categories. The transcribed data were then organized in cohorts by Division (see Table 8, page 187) to control for the effects of age, and work experience on coaching values and practices and to discover patterns of change related to the occupation of coaching and women's collegiate sport. Findings from the analysis of transcribed data, questionnaire responses, and field notes comprise the empirical portion of this study.

Theoretical Framing: A Review

The nature and meaning of coaching and the extent of accommodation and resistance to the dominant sport culture for women coaches in this study has been analyzed in light of a theoretical schema which includes both the macro level of social structure, that is, the over enveloping reality we call institutions and their constraining power; and the micro level of individual agency, the power of actors to act independently of these constraints. The overall schema asserts that agency and structure are ultimately two sides of he same
Cultural Studies and the Nature and Meaning of Sport

The first part of the schema outlines the nature of sport in modern industrial society. It asserts that sport is an aspect of culture which both reflects the political economy and exhibits a degree of independence from it. In American society sport reflects the norms and values of capitalism, it also reflects the patriarchal nature of society. Sport is a male dominated realm which reflects the norms, values, and interests of the dominant classes and men. However, while dominant groups use their resources to insure the world of sport reflects their interests, subordinate groups work to resist domination. Thus, hegemony is never complete, especially in the realm of culture where meaning is continually created and recreated by human agents (Gruneau, 1983). In the struggle to define the nature and meaning of sport, dominant and subordinate groups will both lose and gain something. However, the struggle will always result in the hegemony of one over the other (Hargreaves, 1986:7), but a hegemony which is never final and must continually be renewed (Morgan, 1994:71).

Collegiate sport in American society reflects the norms and values of both capitalism and patriarchy; it too is a capitalist/patriarchal institution. It is controlled by men, and the governing organization for collegiate sport, the NCAA, is a male dominated organization. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, the NCAA fosters a commercial and product oriented approach to sport (Hult, 1980; Staurowsky, 1995).

Following the cultural studies approach to sport, it is argued here that despite the power of dominant groups to define sport experiences, individual actors have the
capacity to act against these definitions, to construct their own sport meanings. While dominant groups seek to control sport practices and meanings, they cannot prevent subordinate groups from establishing their own enclaves of meaning; their own cultural forms (Morgan, 1994:71). These "structures of feeling," are rooted in alternative world views derived from individual social locations, they are the motivation for human agency which resists the hegemonic forces of the dominant sport culture.

Structural Constructivism: Agency and Gender

The second part of this theoretical schema presents a way to think about and understand human agency, more specifically, the agency of women coaches in collegiate sport. While the cultural studies approach to sport illustrates the dynamic struggle between agency and structure, it fails to take account of the various objective structures which may condition human agency. Women coaches do construct the meanings associated with their work, but they are not entirely free to do so. Rather than create the meanings anew, they select from among a limited number of pre-existing norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs. The meanings they construct and assign are conditioned by their own specific social locations as women coaches, locations which shape the context of human experience and meaning.

Bourdieu's structural constructivism illuminates the extent to which agency is conditioned by structural constraints. For Bourdieu objective aspects of social structure condition and constrain human action and meaning; however, actors both adapt to and interact with social structures. According to Bourdieu the most important objective aspect of structure is social class. The importance of social class for influencing action and meaning is acknowledged; however, the focus here is on gender and
work.

Gender is an objective part of social structure which conditions and constrains action and meaning. Following Lipsitz Bem, it has been argued in this dissertation that the world is perceived through "lenses of gender," and that these lenses of gender shape how we think, feel, and act in the world. Lipsitz Bem's "cultural categories" are what Bourdieu calls objective structures.

The objective structures of gender, are "hidden assumptions about sex and gender which are embedded in cultural discourses, social institutions, and individual psyches" (Lipsitz Bem 1993:2). These objective structures of gender, defined by Lipsitz Bem as biological essentialism, androcentrism, and gender polarization, insure the production of gendered cultural natives. The behavior of women coaches and the meanings they assign their practices is conditioned and constrained by these cultural lenses. They have learned to think, feel, and act in terms of the lenses of gender, in doing so they help to reproduce them.

The nature and meaning of coaching, and the actions of women coaches in this sample is also influenced by their occupational identity. They have internalized occupational norms and values through a variety of socialization experiences, and see themselves as part of the group of women collegiate coaches. The occupational identity they have constructed encompasses the norms and values associated with the "female model" of sport. Moreover, occupational identities function like objective locations, they encompass the gendered nature of work and culturally determined norms and values associated with the profession. Following Lipsitz Bem, it is argued here that women coaches are motivated to construct an occupational identity consistent with the cultural lenses which they have internalized (Lipsitz Bem, 1993:31).
Finally, work settings also condition and constrain agency. The specific structure and
culture of an organization influences what workers do and how they interpret their own
and others' actions. Therefore, work settings function like objective structures.
Moreover, work settings, like occupational identity, are not gender neutral but are
embedded with the cultural discourses of gender.

These objective structures: gender, occupational identity, and work setting, condition
and constrain the action and the meaning women coaches' assign their work and
contribute to the construction and maintenance of an occupational sub-culture which
acts to resist the dominant sport culture. In the absence of an organizational carrier for
the female model of sport, the sub-culture of women coaches works to preserve this
residual sport form.

A Summary of Historical Findings

The Roots of Coaching: Physical Education and the Female Model of Sport

Coaching as a profession for women emerged from within the field of physical
education. As a result, it continues to reflect the norms, values, and ideals of this field.
The ethos of the physical education profession was shaped by the founders of the first
teacher preparation programs for physical education. In Part I of Chapter III of this
dissertation, "The Early Years of Women's Physical Education: Training Programs, The
Normal Schools and their Founders" it was argued that the early founders of physical
education carved a niche for an approach to physical activity for girls and women and
that this approach was reflected in the curriculums and methods of the earliest normal
schools, and in the philosophical ideals of their founders. Despite differences, these
early proponents of physical activity for girls and women shared a vision of the
importance of physical activity for health and well being, and fought for women's rights in the physical realm. The brief historical investigation presented in Part I of Chapter III revealed that the early founders of the field of physical education had these things in common:

1. A belief in the benefits of and support for physical activity for girls and women.
2. A democratic and inclusive approach to physical activity.
3. A belief that schools and colleges should include programs of physical education.
4. A belief that women should and could be instructors in physical education.
5. A belief that women should be exposed to the latest sports and games and engage in vigorous activity.
6. A belief that women should conduct themselves in a manner which would command respect from those who might question their activities.

In Part II of Chapter III it was shown that when the "new physical education" was introduced by Wood, Heatherington, and Gulick at the turn of the century, women physical educators joined others in asserting the educational benefits of games and sports. Although their support for games and sports were tempered by the vestiges of Victorian ideology, their belief both in the health benefits of physical activity and the idea that physical activity should be part of education, insured their early support for games and sports as part of the physical education curriculum in higher education. They quickly adopted the professional creed "education through the physical" and prophesied that through games and sports individuals learn the values and norms of democracy; the skills, habits, and values which make good citizens.

In the early decades of the 20th century the "crisis" in men's intercollegiate athletics galvanized a small but influential group of women physical educators and bolstered their resolve to protect women's sports from the elitism and commercialism which had infiltrated men's collegiate athletics. They also sought to protect female athletes from the exploitation which was growing more apparent outside the realm of
education. Committed to a democratic vision of games and sport and influenced by
Victorian ideology, women physical educators began drawing the philosophical
boundaries around intercollegiate sports for women. They established the first
governing organizations for girls and women's sports, thus insuring that women's
intercollegiate sport would reflect their values and beliefs: broad participation, the
social value of competitive sports, a focus on academics before athletics, and the overall
growth and welfare of young women.

These governing organizations became the institutional carriers for what would
become the "female model" of sport. In effect women physical educators imbued women's
intercollegiate sport with the ethos of the physical education profession; their
organizations promoted a set of athletic ideals in keeping with the ideals professed by the
founders of the field. They set rules, formed policies and standards, created
opportunities for and encouraged participation; they also promoted leadership by
women.

In Part III of Chapter III it was shown that the growth in popularity of women's
sports and new ideas regarding the benefits of competition, insured that women physical
educators would eventually, if reluctantly, accept the idea of varsity intercollegiate
competition and sanction intercollegiate championships for women. As new
opportunities for sports competition emerged, so to did the need for qualified women to
teach those sports. Moreover, as the notion of competition grew more acceptable, so to
did the idea of the "coach." Thus, the physical education instructor, teacher of games and
sports, and organizer and presider over "play days," soon found herself in the role of
"coach." In addition to adapting the idea of competition to fit the educational philosophy
espoused by the physical education profession, women physical educators constructed
their own notion of coaching: a coach was a "teacher" whose focus should be educational.

In sum, the historical research presented in this study makes clear that the "female model" of sport was embodied in the governing organizations for girls and women's sports and despite adaptations the core elements of this philosophy remained unchanged: sport for women should be educational and should contribute to the overall growth and development of young women. Coaching as a profession emerged from within the field of physical education and adopted the same philosophical stance. Moreover, this research suggests that the women coaches in this sample who majored in physical education, played high school and collegiate sports before the fall of the AIAW, and who chose coaching as an occupation, have most likely been socialized (both formally and/or informally) in the "female model" of sport.

The purpose of Chapter III was to uncover the roots of coaching as an occupation, and to show that the underlying values associated with women's physical education and sports, the "female model," were integrated into the notion of the female coach. In addition, the purpose of this chapter was to set the framework for the empirical portion of this study; to provide background information about the "female model" of sport and the history of coaching as an occupation for women. In short, to prepare a context of understanding for asking research question two: "To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a 'female model' of sport?" And, "What are the social sources of this approach?"

The interview data in the empirical portion of this study show that women coaches focus on the educational value of sport participation, place the welfare of their athletes above winning, and believe that intercollegiate sport should foster the spirit of play. Thus, despite the loss of an organizational vehicle for this approach, the "female model"
of sport continues to exist in the values, practices, and beliefs of women coaches. The women coaches in this sample approach coaching from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport.

Moreover, the values, beliefs, and practices of the women coaches in the empirical portion of this study recall the early leaders in women's physical education and sport. These findings suggest three points: (1). The "female model" of sport exists as a residual sport form, an alternative to the dominant sport culture. (2). Women coaches are carriers of the "female model" of sport. (3). The female coaches' approach is related, in part, to occupational socialization. These findings are discussed further in the section which follows.

**Empirical Findings**

In this section of Chapter X answers to the research questions posed at the beginning of this study are presented in summary form and hypotheses suggested at the inception of this study are accepted or rejected. Each research question is addressed separately and the findings presented at various points throughout the dissertation in Chapters VI-IX are integrated into a summary statement of evidence in support of, or against, the hypothesis. To review, the data for the empirical findings was derived from 46 in-depth interviews with women collegiate coaches currently coaching at an NCAA affiliated school in 1995/96, a survey administered to 43 of those same coaches, and field notes based on observations of coaches' office decor (21 observations).

**Research Question I**

The first research question of this study posed the following: *How do women coaches experience their work: what values and meanings do they assign to their practices?*
The hypothesis for this question stated: Female collegiate coaches believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport, but these beliefs are compromised by the dominant sport culture which dictates work tasks and the definition of occupational success.

In Chapter VI "Becoming a Coach" it was shown that the women coaches in this sample all entered coaching for similar reasons: they love sport and wanted to teach and work with young people. It was also shown they share an occupational identity as "teachers." They believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport. The meaning of coaching, and their perceptions of their own and others' behavior, is influenced by this belief. The analysis in Chapter VI also revealed that the experience of coaching is not gender neutral and that the women in this sample experience their work as women. In that chapter it was shown that the occupational identity of the female coach fits social expectations regarding gender behavior: coaches believe it is important to care for and nurture female athletes.

Results from a more practical investigation of coaching tasks were presented in Chapter VII "The Increasingly Product Oriented and Bureaucratic Nature of Coaching." In this chapter it was revealed that coaches strive to make the everyday world of coaching consistent with their occupational identity. They value most the portion of their jobs devoted to student-athletes: the actual teaching, coaching, and informal interaction with players. They value least the businesslike and bureaucratic aspects of coaching: recruiting and paperwork.

There was an interesting difference between cohorts in terms of coaches' feelings about coaching tasks. Those tasks which were adamantly rejected by "old" and "established" coaches (recruiting and paperwork) were accepted by several "new"
coaches. These tasks appear to have been integrated into the occupational identity of these new coaches, especially those not trained as physical educators. While all of the coaches in this sample see themselves as teachers, value the educational aspects of coaching, and experience their work in terms which are consistent with women's gender and work roles, the findings in Chapter VII indicated that changes in women's collegiate sport may be contributing to the emergence of an occupational identity among young women coaches that differs slightly from their older more experienced colleagues.

In sum, the first part of Hypothesis I is accepted: female collegiate coaches do believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport; they demonstrate this both at the level of occupational ideals and occupational identity, and in the meaning they assign work practices. The second part of Hypothesis I, however, is rejected: despite changes in work tasks imposed by the dominant sport culture coaches do not compromise their beliefs regarding the nature and purpose of coaching. Despite the increased emphasis on winning and more time spent recruiting, and small adaptations made by several "new" coaches, overall, coaches hold fast to the occupational identity of the female coach, an identity consistent with the "female model" of sport.

Research Question II

The second research question stated: To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female" model of sport; what are the social sources of this approach? It was hypothesized that: Women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a female sport model, but they adapt their approach to meet the demands imposed by the dominant sport culture. This adaptation makes coaching more difficult: (1). Coaches must reconcile two different philosophical approaches to sport; one which
focuses on the sports process, the other on the sports product. (2). They must spend more time on those tasks which they value least and find least rewarding. (3). They must focus more on those tasks which produce winning teams, at the same time they attempt to meet the athletic and emotional needs of their female athletes. It was also hypothesized that the social sources of the “female model” approach include: gender socialization, socialization into the profession, and the nature and needs of female athletes.

In Chapter VIII “Coaching with a Female Voice” the analysis of coaches’ responses showed that in terms of their philosophy, their definition of success and coaching style, the women coaches in this sample approached their occupation from the standpoint of a “female model” of sport. Despite the changes in women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture, women coaches continued to be concerned about the overall welfare and development of their student-athletes. They were more process oriented than product oriented, more interested in empowering than having power over, and more democratic than authoritative. However, coaches' definitions of success, and their coaching styles, as well as their descriptions of increased time spent on recruiting (Chapter VII) revealed that coaches do adapt their approach to meet the demands of the dominant sport culture, especially those in Division I, II where there is more emphasis on winning and where a coaches’ job may depend on her ability to produce successful teams.

Coaches in Division I, II were more likely to use two definitions of success, an internal and external one. This may reflect the fact that coaches in Division I, II feel they straddle two sport worlds, one focused on the sports product, the other the sports process; and is a reflection of their effort to cope with this. Division I, II coaches were
also less likely to use a democratic coaching style than their Division III counterparts. Where winning matters coaches may attempt to control as much about athletic contests as they can. However, these findings may also be the product of a selection effect, and not necessarily a reaction to the dominant sport culture.

Despite adaptations to the changes in the structure and philosophy of women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture, the women coaches in this sample continue to coach from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport. They adapt to the dominant sport culture in practice where and when they have to, but continue to hold onto philosophies and ideals which are in keeping with the "female model" of sport.

Analysis of the historical and interview data presented in chapters III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX showed that this approach to coaching as an occupational endeavor is related to three social sources: (1). occupational socialization (2). gender socialization (3). the nature and needs of female athletes. In short, the female voice in coaching is derived in part from the influences of occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes. All three sources contribute to the "female model" approach to coaching evidenced in the interview data; and it appears that gender socialization and the nature and needs of female athletes are as important, if not more so, than occupational socialization. In addition, it appears that NCAA Divisional affiliation correlates with coaches' practical adaptations to the dominant sport culture.

In sum, Hypothesis II is accepted: Women coaches do approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport, but adapt their approach to meet the demands of the dominant sport culture. Amidst pressure to conform to the dominant sport culture all coaches in this sample made adaptations, they do more recruiting and paperwork than ever before. Overall Division I, II coaches appear to have adapted the most.
In addition, the analyses presented in Chapters III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX indicate that the social source of female coaches' approach to their work is related, in part, to occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes.

Research Question III

The third question guiding this research was: Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models? It was hypothesized: Coaches perceive two different models of sport, but the models are not differentiated by gender. Women coaches describe two prevailing sport models in intercollegiate sport: one is product oriented and the other is process oriented. They believe that more men tend to fall in the first category and more women in second, they also feel that many female coaches are becoming increasingly product oriented, while male coaches are adopting a more process oriented style.

It was also hypothesized women coaches recognize that male and female athletes are different. So, despite the convergence in coaching styles, coaching women is still different from coaching men. They believe that while many male coaches appear to be focused more on winning, this as related, in part, to the career orientation of male coaches, and the nature of male athletes.

The data presented in Chapter VII and VIII lead to the conclusion that the women coaches in this sample recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, a "male" and a "female" model. They characterized the female approach as concerned with educational values, individual growth, sportsmanship, and the value of sport participation; the male approach as focused on winning and end results. In Chapter VIII,
the analysis presented in the section "Experimenting with the Male/Professional Model," illustrated that women coaches make a clear distinction between "male" and "female" approaches to sport. In addition, they felt the lines between the "male" and "female" approach are growing more blurred with more women slowly adopting aspects of the "male" approach.

While the questions in the interview guide did not produce enough data to draw conclusions regarding perceptions of why the differences in approach exist, several coaches did suggest that the "male" approach is related to gender socialization, differences in achievement orientation, and the nature and needs of male student-athletes. Several also described the "female" approach as less ego involved and more interested in giving rather than taking.

In addition, the survey results presented in Chapter IX revealed that the women in this sample perceive collegiate sport reflects "male/professional" values, that women's sport should include more "alternative" values, and that and their own sport programs emphasize more "alternative" values than is true of collegiate sport in general.

Based on the analyses in this study the first part of Hypothesis III is rejected and the second part accepted. Women coaches recognize two different models of sport and in their minds these two models are differentiated by gender: the "male model" is product oriented and business-like, the "female model" more process oriented and educational. On the other hand, they also assert that the lines between these two models is growing more blurred. According to the coaches in this study, women coaches are becoming more product oriented. There was insufficient data to draw conclusions about perceptions of a shift in approach among male coaches.
Research Question IV

The fourth question guiding this research was: Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture? Hypothesis IV asserted: Many women coaches resist the dominant sport culture, but they do so in small ways which pose a challenge to but can not transform the dominant sport culture. Resistance to the dominant sport culture varies according to differences in: (1). socialization into the profession; (2). experiences as a player; (3) the nature of the work role (coach, or teacher/coach); (4). the particular college division of one's school; (5). the extent of commitment to and nature of the occupational subculture; (6). number of years coaching.

The data presented in Chapters VII and VIII lead to the conclusion that women coaches both accommodate to and resist the dominant sport culture, and that resistance to the dominant sport culture varies by socialization into the profession, the NCAA Division of the college the coach works at, and the number of years in coaching.

At the level of everyday tasks Division I, II coaches were more accommodative to imperatives of their job which reflect the influences of the dominant sport culture: recruiting and paperwork; on this measure Division III coaches exhibited more resistance. At the same time, "new" coaches were more accommodative than their "old" or "established" counterparts of the demands of recruiting and paperwork; moreover, they were more likely to have integrated these aspects of coaching into their occupational identity. Unlike the "old" or "established" coaches who accommodate in practice because their jobs depend on it, and who cope by using humor and cynicism, it appeared that many "new" coaches accommodate in practice because they have, to an extent, assimilated to dominant sport values (while still retaining the core elements of an occupational identity consistent with the "female model" of sport).
In describing their philosophy, definition of success, and coaching style the women in this sample showed more resistance to the dominant sport culture. They showed the most resistance in their philosophical beliefs about the purpose of coaching: they reject the product oriented approach entirely. This was true of all coaches regardless of Division or number of years coaching. However, in their definitions of success and coaching styles they were more pragmatic. On these two measures differences between Division were evident: Division I and II coaches were more likely to have a two part definition of success (one product oriented, one process oriented), and were less likely than their Division III counterparts to be democratic. (As stated earlier, this may be a selection effect.)

The data derived from interviews did not allow for the exploration of the other three variations suggested in the hypotheses: experiences as a player, the nature of the work role (coach or teacher/coach), and the extent of commitment to and nature of the occupational subculture.

In sum, despite the growing commodification of sport and the influence of the "male/professional model," women do find ways to affirm humanistic values and implement player-centered approaches. Although the coaches in this study showed evidence of accommodation to the dominant sport culture, especially in terms of their actual work tasks, they also showed resistance in their philosophy of coaching, their definition of success, and their coaching style.

The coaches in this sample are carriers of the female model of sport. Through their occupational identity and in their philosophy of coaching, definition of success, and coaching style, as well as their interactions with female athletes, the coaches in this sample help sustain a sub-culture of norms, values, beliefs, practices, and material
artifacts. This sub-culture sustains a residual sport form, the "female model" of sport, and is a collective form of resistance to the dominant sport culture.

In sum, Hypothesis IV is accepted, but with qualification. The coaches in this sample do resist the dominant sport culture, but they also accommodate to it. Their actions, attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding coaching and collegiate sport are a complex mix, revealing the fact that workers attempt to construct work experiences and assign work meanings which fit their self concepts and occupational identities; at the same time they must adapt to the demands of work environments. Their work and the meaning they assign it is an interesting blend of human freedom and constraint.

Staying in and Leaving Coaching

In this section I present data on subjects' feelings about staying in and leaving the profession of coaching, and their responses regarding the main benefits and drawbacks of coaching. The purpose of this analysis is to answer research question five: To what extent does a woman's reasons for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?

It was hypothesized: Women stay in coaching when their work experience is consistent with their reasons for entering the field. They enter coaching because they love the sport they coach, because they want to teach (they see coaching as a form of teaching), and because they feel they can make a difference in young people's lives. Women stay in coaching because they find working with young people extremely rewarding. They consider leaving when they feel an erosion of the values and ideals which lead them into coaching in the first place, when they feel they no longer have much impact on young people's lives, and when they feel that growing older is affecting
The women in this sample chose coaching as an occupation because they wanted to work with young people in a sport they love. Their expectations about the profession included the idea that they would find working with young people rewarding, and that they would enjoy staying involved in the sport they love. Occupations, however, may or may not meet worker expectations. To determine, generally, how coaches feel about coaching, and if expectations prior to entering the field met the reality of the work experience, coaches were asked two questions: (1) "What would you say are the main benefits of coaching?" and, (2) "What would you say are the main drawbacks of coaching?" Responses to this answer were analyzed by cohort and Division.

The analysis of coaches' responses revealed strong similarity between Divisions and no difference by cohort, consequently, the results are presented here by Division. More important, the main benefits of coaching match coaches' reasons for entering the profession. In response to the question, "What would you say are the main benefits of coaching?" Coaches named three items most often (most named one or two):
(1). working with young people (this included one of the following: working with young people, developing relationships with them, watching them grow and develop, seeing athletes achieve success, teaching, and making a difference in young peoples lives);
(2). the flexibility of the job; and (3). autonomy. Nineteen of twenty three (83%) coaches in Division I, II named working with young people as the main benefit in coaching; sixteen of twenty three (70%) in Division III coaches did also. Four Division I, II coaches (17%) named flexibility as the main benefit, while six Division III coaches
Six Division III coaches (26%) named autonomy, while only one (4%) Division I, II coach did. The other "main benefits" cited included: travel, the work environment, meeting people, challenge, constant change, group bonding, summers off, getting paid for doing what you love, and the thrill of working in athletics.

These responses reveal that, to an extent, the reality of coaching matches coaches' expectations, especially regarding working with young people: coaches enter coaching to work with young people and hope to make an impact on their lives, and they assert that this is the main benefit of coaching. On the other hand, while the occupation of coaching meets coaches' expectations in terms of wanting to work with and help young people, they also assert that coaching has some real drawbacks.

When asked, "What are the main drawbacks of coaching?" coaches described a variety of drawbacks, but two were named most often (most named two): (1). the amount of time required in the job (actual hours of work), and (2). the emotional energy it takes to coach. Eleven of twenty three Division I, II coaches (48%), and eleven of twenty three Division III coaches (48%) explained that the time commitment required in coaching was one of the main drawbacks. Nine Division I, II coaches (39%) said the amount of emotional energy required in coaching was a main drawback; eight (35%) Division III coaches named this. The other drawbacks named by Division I, II coaches included: pressure to win, quality of life, working on weekends, no social life, strain on families, financial compensation, and recruiting. Other drawbacks named by Division III coaches included: low status, time away from family, physical energy, number of hats you have to wear.
Thinking about Leaving

Answers to the question, "Have you ever thought about leaving coaching?," revealed interesting variations between cohorts and Divisions. In Division I, II all (100%) of the "old" coaches and ten of twelve (83%) "established" coaches had thought about leaving coaching; while only six of nine (66%) "new" coaches said they had thought about leaving. Overall, in Division I, II eighteen of twenty three coaches (78%) said they had thought about leaving.

In Division III, two of four (50%) "old" coaches said they thought about leaving, seven of eleven (64%) "established" coaches did so, and only two out of eight (25%) "new" coaches. Overall, eleven of twenty three (48%) Division II coaches said they had thought about leaving coaching.

In sum, more Division I, II coaches (78%) than Division III coaches (48%) said they had thought about leaving coaching. And, older coaches (coaches who had been coaching ten years or more) were more likely to say they had thought about leaving coaching: four of six (66%) "old" coaches, sixteen of twenty three (70%) "established" coaches, and eight of seventeen (47%) "new" coaches said they had thought about leaving coaching.

When asked why they thought about leaving, coaches responded with the same reasons cited as "drawbacks" of coaching. Among coaches in Division I, II who said they had thought about leaving coaching, the reasons cited most often were (most cited three or more reasons): (1). emotional fatigue; (2). the time commitment it requires; and (3). the narrowness of the profession. Coaches also cited the following as reasons for considering leaving: emotional highs and lows, pressure to win, recruiting, lack of social life, physical fatigue, and growing older. The reasons cited most often among
Division III coaches were similar: (1). emotional fatigue; and (2). the time commitment required. Other reasons cited included: loss of enjoyment, lack of control, physical fatigue, growing older, family sacrifices, losing seasons, and recruiting. There was no difference by cohort on this measure. Regardless of what Division a woman coaches in, how old she is, or how long she has been coaching, coaches who think about leaving do so for similar reasons: coaching is emotionally draining and requires a tremendous commitment of time.

There was, however, one small but interesting difference between Divisions on this measure which indicates both the influence of the work setting on coaching, and the role that occupational ideals play in determining the work experience: "narrowness" was cited as a reason for considering leaving only by Division I, II coaches, and "loss of enjoyment" only by Division III coaches.

Coaches who said they had thought about leaving were then asked the follow-up question, "What made you decide to stay?" Coaches in Division I, II cited these two reasons most often: (1). still enjoying it (including: having fun, challenge, enjoyable work environment, getting a lot out of it); and (2). like working with young people (including aspects of this cited above). In addition, in-depth probing revealed that several (five of seventeen or 22%) Division I, II coaches had a plan to coach for a limited number of years because they found it very demanding and draining.

In Division III, of the eleven coaches who said they had thought about leaving, eight described deciding to stay for reasons similar to their Division I, II colleagues: (1). still enjoying it (including having fun, challenge, and enjoyable work environment, getting a lot out of it); and (2). like working with young people. Three said they had stayed because they were unsure about what to do next.
Findings for Research Question Five

The findings presented here help to answer research question five: To what extent does a woman's reasons for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?

To review, it was hypothesized that women stay in coaching when their work experience is consistent with their reasons for entering the field. They enter coaching because they love the sport they coach, because they want to teach (they see coaching as a form of teaching), and because they feel they can make a difference in young people's lives. Women stay in coaching because they find working with young people extremely rewarding. They consider leaving when they feel an erosion of the values and ideals which lead them into coaching in the first place, when they feel they no longer have much impact on young people's lives, and when they feel that growing older is affecting their ability to coach.

In Chapter VI it was shown that the women in this sample enter coaching because they love sport, want to teach, and feel they can make a positive contribution to young people's lives. Coaches responses to the questions described above reveal that the main benefit in coaching is working with young people, this is what coaches find most rewarding; they stay in coaching despite thinking about leaving because they continue to find working with young people rewarding and the work environment enjoyable. As hypothesized, they stay in coaching because their work experience is consistent with their reasons for entering the field.

Women coaches in this sample considered leaving because of the time commitment coaching requires, and the emotional toll it takes. Time commitment can be thought of in terms of the hours required for the job. However, to really understand how the number
of hours required in coaching influences women coaches' decisions about staying or leaving, it is important to look at the consequences of this time commitment. For the women coaches in this sample the time coaching takes means these things: time away from family, working on weekends, less time for friends and a social life outside coaching, and a narrow existence. In addition, the emotional toll coaching takes on women coaches is best understood in terms of its derivatives: the ups and downs associated with winning and losing, and the time spent "counseling" female athletes.

While it is not clear from the analysis presented here that coaches consider leaving because they feel an erosion of their values and ideals, it is clear that much of the increased demands on coaches' time is related to tasks they consider antithetical to coaching i.e., recruiting. Thus, in an indirect way, the time coaches must spend on tasks like recruiting and paperwork does challenge coaches' values and ideals. This however, is either not "felt" by coaches, or the questions in the interview guide did not allow coaches to address this issue. It is suggested here that coaches may feel an erosion of their values and ideals because so much time is devoted to tasks unrelated to and in opposition to what they value about coaching, in many cases, tasks they never expected to have to do, or spend so much time on. However, this analysis is more a hypothesis than a conclusion. Data gathered here are insufficient to answer this part of the research question with certainty. On this point further investigation is needed.

Coaches do not think about leaving because they no longer feel they have an impact on young people's lives; quite the contrary. Despite the encroaching dominant sport culture and the drawbacks of coaching, coaches feel they have an impact on young peoples' lives. Simply put, the rewards of working with young women are almost a constant; but coaches consider leaving in spite of it. Finally, coaches appear to consider leaving when
they feel they are getting older and can no longer devote enough physical and emotional energy to their athletes. This was apparent in responses by "old" coaches where five of the six (83%) coaches described growing older and the loss of physical and emotional energy related to growing older as a reasons for thinking about leaving. However, given the small number of responses, conclusions regarding this aspect of the research question should be considered tentative.

In sum, the first part of Hypothesis V is accepted; the second part is rejected and requires further study. Women stay in coaching for the same reasons they enter, to work with young women and to make a difference in their lives. Their reasons for leaving are not related to a decline in the rewards of working with young people, but to increases in the time commitment and emotional energy required in coaching. These reasons for "thinking about leaving" should be understood both in terms of the changes in the structure and culture of women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture; and the persistence of gender role norms in patriarchal society.

**Summary of Research Findings in this Study**

A summary of the findings in this study is reviewed below. Findings are presented as answers to the research questions which have guided this investigation.

In answer to the research question, *How do women coaches experience their work: what values and meanings do they assign to their practices?*, the following conclusion is put forth: Female collegiate coaches believe in the intrinsic and educational value of sport; they demonstrate this both at the level of occupational ideals and occupational identity, and in the meaning they assign work practices. Despite changes in work tasks imposed by the dominant sport culture coaches do not compromise their beliefs...
regarding the nature and purpose of coaching. Despite the increased emphasis on winning and more time spent recruiting, and small adaptations made by several "new" coaches, overall, coaches hold fast to the occupational identity of the female coach, an identity consistent with the "female model" of sport.

In answer to the research question, To what extent do women coaches approach their work from the standpoint of a "female" model of sport: what are the social sources of this approach?, it was discovered: Women coaches do approach their work from the standpoint of a "female model" of sport. The social source of female coaches' approach to their work is related, in part, to occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes.

In answer to the research question, Do women coaches recognize two distinct philosophical approaches to sport, "male" and "female" models?, results indicate: Women coaches recognize two different models of sport and in their minds these two models are differentiated by gender: the male model is product oriented and business-like, the female model more process oriented and educational. On the other hand, they also assert that the lines between these two models is growing more blurred. According to the coaches in this study, women coaches are becoming more product oriented. There was insufficient data to draw conclusions about perceptions of a shift in approach among male coaches.

In answer to the research question, Do women coaches accommodate to or resist the dominant sport culture?, the findings are: The coaches in this sample do resist the dominant sport culture, but they also accommodate to it. Their actions, attitudes, beliefs, and values regarding coaching and collegiate sport are a complex mix of accommodation and resistance, revealing the fact that workers attempt to construct work
experiences and assign work meanings which fit their occupational identities; at the same time they must adapt to the demands of work environments and dominant meaning systems, in this case the dominant sport culture. Their work and the meaning they assign it is an interesting blend of human freedom and constraint.

The coaches in this sample are carriers of the female model of sport. Through their occupational identity and in their philosophy of coaching, definition of success, and coaching style, as well as their interactions with female athletes, the coaches in this sample help sustain a sub-culture of norms, values, beliefs, practices, and material artifacts. This sub-culture sustains a residual sport form, the "female model" of sport, and is a collective form of resistance to the dominant sport culture.

In answer to the research question, To what extent does a woman's reasons for entering coaching influence her decision to continue coaching, and how is this related to why she may consider leaving?, the conclusion is:

Women stay in coaching for the same reasons they enter, to work with young women and to make a difference in their lives. Their reasons for leaving are not related to a decline in the rewards of working with young people, but to increases in the time commitment and emotional energy required in coaching. These reasons for "thinking about leaving" should be understood both in terms of the changes in the structure and culture of women's collegiate sport and the encroaching dominant sport culture; and the persistence of gender role norms in patriarchal society.

It also appears that thinking about leaving is not related to a feeling that the values and ideals which led them to coaching are being eroded. Despite increased time spent on tasks they dislike and the acknowledgment that collegiate sport in general is growing more business-like, the existence of a sub-culture of norms, values, and practices
among women coaches may be a buffer against the dominant sport culture. Within this protected social space, women coaches can implement player-centered approaches and humanistic values. In addition, while it appears that growing older may lead coaches to think about leaving, these findings are tentative and require further study.

Summary of Dissertation

The data presented here supports the cultural studies approach to sport which asserts that in the realm of sport, hegemony is never complete. Despite the power of dominant groups, actors struggle to control their sport experiences. However, actors are not entirely free, they are constrained by objective social structures. The research presented here also shows that gender is an objective structure which conditions and constrains meaning. Bourdieu's structural constructivist theory, adapted to take account of patriarchy, is supported by this study. Subordinate groups may resist dominant meanings and practices, but they always do so on terms created by the dominant culture. However, the analysis presented here poses a contrast to Willis and Theberge's findings. They argue, that women coaches take up the challenge of the dominant sport culture on its own terms, by attempting to prove male equivalence (Theberge, 1990; Willis, 1982:130 in Theberge, 1990). While this may be true in some situations, research findings presented here shows that women coaches resist the dominant sport culture on terms created, not by the dominant sport culture, but by the dominant culture more generally: more specifically, on the terms created by patriarchy. The nature and consequences of their resistance is molded by the ideologies and institutions against which they really stand (Lachman, 1996:7).
The Future of Coaching as an Occupation for Women

It is clear from this analysis that the women coaches in this sample find coaching to be a rewarding occupation; it is also clear that it is a difficult one. In considering the future of coaching for women one point stands out. Women coaches find coaching to be very demanding, both in terms of emotional energy and in terms of time commitment. And they believe it is getting harder. This raises two issues of concern, the first of which has been voiced in earlier research by Knoppers (1987), the second articulated in earlier research by Statham, Miller, and Mauksch (1988). In the first case, Knoppers reminds us that coaching is an occupation which is incompatible with a woman's family role; the responses from women in this sample confirm that this is still the case. In the second case, Statham, Miller, and Mauksch remind us that women, whether they choose to or not, typically engage in those aspects of a work role which fit their gender role. Moreover, they are expected to do so and receive little compensation for it. This point too is supported by the data presented in this study. The women coaches in this sample spend tremendous amounts of time "counseling" female athletes; spending extra time with them, nurturing them, and caring for them. Most coaches explained they enjoyed this part of their job and found it rewarding, however, they also found it very time consuming and in some cases a burden. The result, as cited earlier, is that "women get poems and men get money."

On the other hand this research shows that coaches do derive great satisfaction from their work, they love what they do. Unfortunately, they feel they can only do it for a limited amount of time. As other researchers have shown (Knoppers et al., 1991) women coaches burn out and leave coaching earlier than their male counterparts.

It is important to re-iterate that overall, many more Division I, II coaches in this
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sample had thought about leaving coaching than had Division III coaches, 78% vs. 48%. And, while more "old" and "established" coaches had thought about leaving than "new" coaches, among "new" coaches (those who had been coaching less than ten years) who thought about leaving, six coached in Division I, II; two in Division III. Despite the fact that coaches love what they do, it appears that the time and emotional energy required to coach, especially in Division I, II are greater than the rewards of working with young people, and that this imbalance is quickly felt by new entrants to the occupation.

The dearth of female role models in coaching combined with the increased demands of coaching, especially Division I, II is cause for concern for anyone who believes that women should be involved in leadership roles in women's athletics, and that women athletes should have female role models. The drawbacks of coaching, the time and emotional energy, are problems related to women's gender role in patriarchal society. The demands of coaching are made more difficult because of women's family role, as one coach explained, "it's the demands of two families," both emotionally and in terms of the time required. As Knoppers (1987) has explained, coaching is incompatible with a women's family role. However, as this study has shown, in addition, the gendered expectations associated with women's coaching, i.e., women coaches are expected to spend extra time nurturing their athletes, coupled with the demands of an encroaching dominant sport culture (more time spent on recruiting and paperwork), makes coaching even more difficult for women.

The women coaches in this sample are caught between a changing sport culture which reflects male/professional norms and values and which demands more time spent on tasks they find incompatible with their occupational identity and philosophy, and the nature and needs of female athletes which demands they fulfill the requirements of their
gender role. On both accounts, more time and energy is required of them.

**Reflections on the "Male Model" of Sport**

Throughout this dissertation the terms "male model" and "male/professional model" have been employed. In fact, many of the findings presented here rest on the assumption that there is in fact a "male/professional model" of sport reflected in the structure and philosophy of collegiate sport, and in the values and practices of male coaches. It is historically correct to claim that for most of the history of intercollegiate sport, men's and women's programs existed as separate entities with separate governing bodies. It is also historically correct to assert that men's and women's programs differed in the emphasis they placed on the educational aspects of sport participation. Some of this is related to the fact that men's intercollegiate sport grew out of extracurricular activities organized by students, and male coaches were often former players or professional coaches, not necessarily educators. In short, men's intercollegiate athletics has never been as closely associated with the field of education as women's intercollegiate athletics; and male intercollegiate coaches have always been as likely to be former players turned professional coaches, as trained physical educators.

This said, it is important to note that this study is about women only, and no attempt is made here to compare women coaches with men coaches. Moreover, the fact that the women in this study believe that male coaches approach sport differently is a finding related to their perception only, and can not be proven here. This raises an important question which can not be answered here, but about which I will conjecture an opinion based on my years of experience in intercollegiate sport and the study conducted here: Would I find different results if I had interviewed male coaches?
Overall, I believe that if I interviewed men using the same interview guide I would find a good deal of similarity in responses; especially on questions related to likes and dislikes related to work tasks, and the rewards of coaching. I do however believe there would be interesting differences in philosophy, definition of success, and coaching style; and the differences in Divisions would be even more pronounced. My own experience tells me that in fact most male coaches are concerned about their athletes' overall welfare; however, it also tells me that male coaches interact with players differently, are more authoritarian, and define success differently from women coaches. I would argue, that overall, male coaches are more product oriented than women coaches, but many are also process oriented.

In short, I do in fact believe there is a distinctly "male/professional" model of sport, and that male coaches approach coaching differently. Some of this may be related to the history of men's intercollegiate sport and men's coaching; some of it to gender socialization. If I were to interview male coaches I think I would find interesting similarities as compared to women coaches, I also think there would be some important differences. In my opinion the "male/professional model" is not a "straw man," it may however be more rhetoric than reality.

Finally, it is important to assert that while perceptions may or may not reflect reality, their existence influences how individuals feel and behave. Thus, the fact that women in this study believe, strongly, that there are two models of sport distinguished by gender is very important. They do in fact see themselves as a distinct group, as separate from male coaches and the world of men's collegiate sport--the dominant sport culture. Despite their accommodation, they feel they are somehow unique, and that they help keep a different "spirit of sport" alive.
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The Importance of the Cohort Experience

Coaching as an occupation for women has changed in recent years. And it appears that the ideology associated with this occupation is changing too. Like social movements, occupations have ideologies which change with the times. This change has been captured in the experiences of three distinct groups of women coaches in this study: those in the "old" "established" and "new" cohorts. It was quite clear from the responses of women in the "old" cohort that they liked the "old" days better, that they feel a sense of nostalgia for the past. Those in the "established" cohort also showed nostalgia for the past, but were less nostalgic than their "old" colleagues.

The generational differences found in this study are unique (for the most part) to women coaches. Although men's intercollegiate athletics has grown more rationalized and product oriented, overall the world of men's collegiate sport has changed very little. The generational differences among male coaches are not nearly as pronounced as those found among women in this study. On the other hand, the world of women's sport in general, and women's collegiate sport in particular, has undergone significant change in recent years. Coaching as an occupation for women has been influenced by these changes.

While it is clear that gender socialization plays a role in the female coaches' approach to her work; it is also clear that the occupational identity of the female coach is changing and with it the "female model" of sport. "New" coaches responses throughout this dissertation appear to imply that the "female model" of sport may die out with the retirement of women coaches whose experiences mirror those in the "old" and "established" cohorts described here. On the other hand, as long as men and women continue to be socialized differently, it is likely that women and men will approach coaching differently. As discussed earlier in this study, individuals adapt to their work
environments, but they also enter the world of work with their own set of values and beliefs. The experience of work is at once and intersection of agency and structure.

In the world of collegiate sport liberal feminism has triumphed. Women have gained equality, but on terms defined by men. The older coaches in this study see this as a loss for women, the younger coaches were not aware there was anything to lose. I hypothesize that in the future women coaches will most likely continue to approach coaching in a way which reflects their gender socialization in patriarchal society; they will care about the overall growth and development of their athletes and continue to focus on the process of sport, not the sports product. However, I also believe that in the future young female coaches will be less likely to reject, and be less resistant to, those aspects of coaching which reflect the dominant sport culture.

In sum, while it is likely the “female model” of sport as we know it will continue to change in the future and will grow more similar to the “male/professional model,” it is also likely that there will always be some difference between male and female approaches to coaching. These differences may become less salient, less like “models” of sport, but they will probably continue to exist in the future, at least for a while.

Just how much the “female model” approach to coaching actually changes will depend on a number of factors including the physical education profession’s ability to regain its status as a training ground for future coaches, and the resilience of gender role socialization. It will also depend on the nature and needs of female athletes. As shown in this study, the female coach’s approach to coaching is influenced by occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes.
A Concluding Word: Sport, Women, and Work

It is hoped that the findings presented here contribute to a deeper understanding of the nature and meaning of coaching as an occupation for women. By looking at coaching from the perspective of women's work in the realm of sport I have attempted to show that the nature and meaning of work is conditioned by a cultural context and that this context both constrains and is shaped by workers. I have also attempted to show sport reflects the influences of rationalization, capitalism, and patriarchy; the dominant sport culture is male controlled and defined and subject to the logic and influences of capitalism. Women coaches exist within, but do not fully accept this culture; rather the influences of occupational socialization, gender socialization, and the nature and needs of female athletes leads them, in part, to hold on to and recreate a set of values and norms characterized as the "female model of sport." In short, women coaches create a social space within their work environment and in the realm of sport which is, collectively, a shield against the dominant sport culture...a sub-culture or "pocket" of resistance. This resistance challenges the dominant sport culture, but cannot transform it. However, in the face of this resistance dominant groups are forced to reassert their meaning systems, and ultimately give up something in the struggle.

It is hoped that the historical analysis and in-depth interviews conducted here have helped to clarify the nature and meaning of the "female model" of sport and the extent to which residual meanings both evolve and are sustained. Moreover, it is hoped that this study has helped to clarify that women coaches do not emulate the "male/professional" model of sport. Despite the loss of institutional vehicles and the influences of the dominant sport culture, the "female model" is alive and well in the norms, values, and practices of women coaches.
In a larger sense it is hoped that the findings presented here contribute to the understanding of the nature and limits of human agency, as well as the power of subordinate groups to define and construct their own experiences. And that the evidence of change among "new" coaches contributes to our understanding of the dynamic interplay between agency and structure as an ongoing process influenced by the historical moment and historically specific social structures.

Finally, this study is a contribution to the body of qualitative research on women's work and women in sport. It is hoped that it both reinforces existing knowledge and adds to our understanding of the nature of gender, and the relationship between gender, practice, and the construction of meaning in patriarchal society, both in the realm of work and the realm of sport.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

This research adds to our understanding of the extent to which individual actors can and do resist dominant cultures, and the ways in which historically specific social structures shape and condition meaning and behavior. It also raises interesting questions for further research. In light of the findings in this study, two avenues for further research are suggested here: one relates to socialization, social change and the intersection of biography and history; the other to the gendered nature of work.

While it was evident that coaches in this sample resist the dominant sport culture, it was also evident that "new" coaches were less resistant. Will the sub-culture of women coaches continue to serve as a carrier of the female model of sport?, or are the findings of this study an example of a residual sport form about to be incorporated into the dominant culture? It is clear we need more research studies which focus on the
intersection of coaches individual biographies with historically specific social
structures, studies which can chart the forces of social change and show their
relationship to individual practices and beliefs.

The research presented here made clear that the relationship between the physical
education profession and coaching is changing. Future research should continue to
investigate this change. Is women's coaching an example of the deconstruction of
professionalization in modern society, or are these findings simply a trend? Is formal
occupational socialization more important for determining occupational identity than
this study indicates?, or, Are occupational identities really developed much earlier? Is
occupational identity better understood as a "core" part of individual identity carried
into, rather than developed in, pre-service training?

We need more research which looks at the emotional labor involved in women's
coaching, and research which investigates the nature of coaching as "women's work."
This project has touched the surface of this issue but we need more qualitative research
that allows women coaches to discuss and explain, in their own words, how they feel
about what they do.

This research project has made clear that women coach with a female voice in the
context of an encroaching dominant sport culture, but it has not illuminated the
consequences of this for women. Women coaches are "caught between two worlds,"
between the dominant sport culture which demands recruiting, paperwork, and judges
success in terms of wins and losses; and the female model of sport which reminds
coaches that the purpose of coaching is to educate and help young women grow and which
encourages them to spend time nurturing their athletes.

Moreover, women coaches are not only caught between two worlds, they are evaluated
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in terms of both. The interview data collected for this study revealed that this is a recurring problem for women coaches which can cost them their jobs. There was not, however, enough data to draw conclusions from. Therefore, we need more research to investigate how and from what standpoint women coaches are evaluated. Are they evaluated as coaches, or as women coaches? Moreover, what gender expectations are associated with their work and how do they cope with these?

It is clear there is a need for more qualitative research which explores the nature and meaning of coaching among male coaches. A study of this nature might help resolve whether "male" and "female" models of sport refer more to sport structures than the behavior of coaches. It is also clear we need more research which explores influence of Divisional affiliation on coaching. This research would help resolve unanswered questions about coaching behavior. More specifically, whether differences in coaching values and behavior are a selection effect or a consequence of the more immediate work environment. And, we need more research on the differences between coaching high and low profile sports. Analysis by Division provides only one way to differentiate coaching experiences. Among women coaches, distinctions between high and low profile sports may be equally if not more important.

This study also points to the need for research on women coaches who have left the profession. The changes in women's collegiate sport may have been felt most by women who have already left the field. A study focusing on their experiences would further illuminate changes in the occupation of coaching. Finally, further research should address the differences in styles of play among male and female athletes and the relationship between styles of play and "male" and "female" coaching styles. The occupational identity of "new" female coaches appears to be changing, and there appears
to be more accommodation among "new" coaches. This may signal the ensuing decline of the "female model" of sport for future generations. However, recent recognition of differences in styles of play implies that despite a single dominant sport structure and culture, gender differences remain. The source of these differences needs to be explored further.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

I. Profile

1. How old are you?

2. Are you single, married or living with a partner? Divorced or separated?

3. Do you have children? How old are they?

4. Racial group? (code black or white)

5. When did you graduate from college?

6. What educational degrees do you have?

7. What were your major and minor fields of study?

8. Did you play intercollegiate sport? Under the DGWS, AIAW, or NCAA?

9. What is your formal occupational title?

10. How many years have you been involved in college coaching? Head Coach? Assistant Coach? High School Coach?

11. Institutions, Division, sport and number of years coaching that sport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Div.</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th># yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Div.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td># yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Div.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td># yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Div.</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td># yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many years have you been coaching at this institution?

13. Do you work for an Athletic Dept., or a combined Athletic/Physical Education Dept.?

14. How many female head coaches are there in your department? Male?

15. What league does your institution belong to?

16. What is your current salary range? (under $25,000; $25,000-$34,999; $35,000-$44,999; $45,000-$54,999; $55,000-64,999; etc.)
II. Early Athletic Experiences
What sports did you play growing up? What was that like?
What were high school sports like for you?
What did you play in college? What was that like?

Choosing an Occupation
What made you decide to go into coaching?
Was anyone a role model for you?
Did anyone encourage you?

III. Occupational Training/Socialization
How did you learn to coach?
How would you compare your formal educational training to your "on the job training?"

IV. Sport in American Society
How would you describe professional sport in American society?
How would you describe collegiate sport in American society?
How would you describe women's collegiate sport?

V. Philosophy
Could you tell me about your coaching philosophy?
Where does this philosophy come from?
How has coaching changed during the years you've been involved?

Have you adjusted your philosophy at all in light of these changes? Explain.

How do you define success in your job?
Is there pressure to win in your job? Explain.
Gender Differences

Do men and women share the same philosophy of athletics?

Coaching Style

Which would you say better characterizes coaching as an occupation?
a. coaches are like teachers  b. coaches are like business managers  c. other (explain)

Do you see yourself more as a teacher, or a manager? Why?
Has that changed over the years?

How would you describe your coaching style?
a. authoritative  b. democratic  c. a combination of both

VI. Work Tasks and Role Strain

Are you a coach and a teacher?
Do you like both roles?

How many hours do you work a week when you are in season?
Out of season?

What percentage of time, in season, would you say you devote to the following tasks: (Coaching portion of job only for coaches who are also teachers and have other administrative duties.)
recruiting _____  administration _____  scouting _____
meeting/working with athletes _____  fundraising_____  other_____  

Which do you like most? Least?

Has your job changed over the years? How do you feel about that?

Which aspect of your job (tasks) do you think is most important for becoming a successful coach?

Role Set/Roles Strain

Can you tell me a little bit about your relationship with your boss, your players and players parents?

Boss

What does your boss expect from you?
Parents

What is your relationship with players' parents like?

Players

What is your relationship with your players like?

Have female athletes changed during the years you've been involved in coaching? How?

Has this changed how you do your job?

Role Conflict

Family

How do you balance the demands of coaching with your family and personal life?

Occupational Sub-culture/Social Support

How often do you talk to other women coaches in your sport? Are they a source of support?

Do you identify more with the institution/organization you work for, or with others in the profession? Why?

Occupational Prestige

On a scale of 1 to 10 with ten being the most prestigious, where does college coaching fit in terms of its status in American society? As an occupation for women?

Are coaches respected by the rest of the faculty and administration on campus? Explain.

VII. Staying/Leaving Coaching

How long do you plan to continue to coach? Why?

Have you ever thought of leaving coaching? Why?

What made you decide to stay?

What would you say are the main benefits of coaching as an occupation? Main drawbacks?
Reflections

As you look back on your career what has been the most rewarding aspect of coaching? Least?

If your job was to advise young women about the profession of coaching, what words of encouragement would you have for them, what words of warning?

What would you say is the most important change that has occurred for in women's collegiate athletics over the past 10-15 years? Has this been positive or negative for women coaches?

What do you think is the biggest misconception about coaching as a profession?

Why do you coach?

Is coaching a vocation or an avocation?

Do you coach more for the love of the sport, or because you love working with young people, or for some other reason?

Is there anything else you would like to add that you think would help me understand coaching as an occupation for women in the 1990's?

*Go to questionnaire.

*Other coaches to call?
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: There are three questions on this questionnaire. Answer each question by circling five words from the list provided. Then, rank order the words you circled from 1-5 by writing the number in the space provided (1 is the highest ranking, then 2, 3, and so on).

1. Which of the following reflect the current state of collegiate sport (both men's and women's)?

   demanding__
   enjoyable__
   serious__
   fun__
   business-like__
   sportsmanship__
   authoritarian__
   self-actualization__
   domination__
   sensitivity__
   hard work__
   helpfulness__
   competitive__
   comradery__
   aggressiveness__
   student-centered__
   intimidation__
   fair play__
   dedication__
   cooperation__
   conformity__
   friendships__

GO TO THE NEXT PAGE.
2. Which of the following reflect what you feel collegiate sport for women should be like?

demanding__
enjoyable__
serious__
fun__
business-like__
sportsmanship__
authoritarian__
self-actualization__
domination__
sensitivity__
hard work__
helpfulness__
competitive__
comradery__
aggressiveness__
student-centered__
intimidation__
fair play__
dedication__
cooperation__
conformity__
friendships__
3. Which of the following reflect the nature and focus of your program?

- demanding__
- enjoyable__
- serious__
- fun__
- business-like__
- sportsmanship__
- authoritarian__
- self-actualization__
- domination__
- sensitivity__
- hard work__
- helpfulness__
- competitive__
- comradery__
- aggressiveness__
- student-centered__
- intimidation__
- fair play__
- dedication__
- cooperation__
- conformity__
- friendships__
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The purpose of this research is to learn about the nature of women's collegiate coaching in the 1990's. I am also interested in how the profession may have changed in recent years and how women coaches feel about those changes.

Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. You may stop or interrupt the interview at any time. These interviews will form the basis for my Ph.D. dissertation in the field of sociology at the University of New Hampshire. Following the guidelines of the American Sociological Association, the information collected in these interviews will be held strictly confidential and will be used only by the researcher. Names and places will not be used, nor will any other identifying characteristics.

I am asking your permission to interview you and to tape the interview. After the interview has been transcribed, the original tape will be destroyed.

I certify that I have read and understand the purpose of this research as stated above. I consent to this interview.

---------------------------------------------
Signature                                    Date

387

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX D

COMPARISON OF COACHES BY COHORT AND DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Div. I</th>
<th>Div. II</th>
<th>Div. III</th>
<th>Cohort Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Coaches</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduation</td>
<td>1971/before</td>
<td>1971/before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age range</td>
<td>46, 57 yrs.</td>
<td>45-51 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years coaching</td>
<td>25, 26 yrs.</td>
<td>19-27 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female coaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys. ed. degree</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org. youth sports</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll. sport org.</td>
<td>DGWS</td>
<td>DGWS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female controlled</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established Coaches</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduation</td>
<td>1972-1984</td>
<td>1972-1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age range</td>
<td>32-43 yrs.</td>
<td>34-42 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years coaching</td>
<td>10-18 yrs.</td>
<td>10-17 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female coaches</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys. ed. degree</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org. youth sports</td>
<td>little</td>
<td>little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll. sport org.</td>
<td>AIAW</td>
<td>AIAW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female controlled</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Coaches</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduation</td>
<td>1985/after</td>
<td>1985/after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age range</td>
<td>27-35 yrs.</td>
<td>27-31 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years coaching</td>
<td>3-10 yrs.</td>
<td>2-10 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female coaches</td>
<td>no/few</td>
<td>no/few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys. ed. degree</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org. youth sports</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll. sport org.</td>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female controlled</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>