Journal of Sport Management, 2014, 28, 447-456
http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2013-0241

Coaching Fathers in Conflict: A Review of the Tensions Surrounding the Work-Family Interface

Jeff Alexander Graham and Marlene A. Dixon
University of Texas

The work-family interface continues to be an important research area as the positive (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Sieber, 1974) and negative (Duxbury, Lyons, & Higgins, 2011; Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Mullen, Kelley, & Kelloway, 2011; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996) consequences of successfully balancing work and family have implications for both individuals and organizations. Within sport management, most research has focused on issues surrounding the work-family interface of coaching mothers (Bruening & Dixon, 2007; Dixon & Bruening, 2005, 2007; Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Schenewark & Dixon, 2012; Palmer & Leberman, 2009). Recent research outside of sport management suggests that fathers also perceive tension between work and family (Galinsky, Aumann, & Bond, 2011; Harrington, Van Deusen, & Humberd, 2011; Parker & Wang, 2013). Therefore, this article examines the work-family interface of coaching fathers, with a focus on the further development of a research agenda.

Keywords: work-family balance, work-life balance, work-family enrichment, work-family conflict, fatherhood, fathering through sport, masculinity, sport culture, working in sport, sport management

"You weren't there." Urban Meyer's daughter uttered these words to her father at a school assembly while signing her letter of intent to play collegiate volleyball (Thompson, 2012). It was 2009, and at that time Meyer was the head football coach at the University of Florida. He was notorious for working long hours, nights, and weekends in an ever-elusive pursuit of perfection. Later that season, Coach Meyer collapsed on the floor in his home. He chose to retire, but then decided to return for the 2010 season, only to retire again at the conclusion of that season. At the press conference he said, "I have ignored my health for years, but recent developments have forced me to re-evaluate my priorities of faith and family . . . it was the pattern of what I was doing and how I was doing it. It was self-destructive" (Long, 2009).

In 2011, Meyer decided to return to coaching, taking the position of head football coach at The Ohio State University. But this time, his return was accompanied by some conditions imposed by his family intended to break the self-destructive pattern (to himself and his family) that he displayed at Florida. Two items symbolized the shift he was trying to make. The first was a blue rock strategically placed on his desk with the word "balance" etched into it (Thompson, 2012). Second, and perhaps more importantly, in a frame above his desk written in pink notebook paper, hangs an important document. It is the contract Urban Meyer's daughters made him sign when he accepted the position at The Ohio State University (Thompson, 2012). The contract has 10 points:

1. *My family will always come first.*
2. *I will take care of myself and maintain good health.*
3. *I will go on a trip once a year with Nicki–MINIMUM.*
4. *I will not go more than nine hours a day at the office.*
5. *I will sleep with my cellphone on silent.*
6. *I will continue to communicate daily with my kids.*
7. *I will trust God's plan and not be overanxious.*
8. *I will keep the lake house.*
9. *I will find a way to watch Nicki and Gigi play volleyball.*
10. *I will eat three meals a day.*

Urban Meyer left the University of Florida in part because he was unable to balance work and family obligations. His lack of balance led to the development of unhealthy habits, weakening of family relationships, and reductions in quality of life (Thompson, 2012). Meyer, although distinct in situation and status, represents a growing tension for coaches who devote long hours to their careers, perhaps at the expense of their families' and/or their own personal well-being.

Within both human-resource management and the family-studies literatures, the past 20 years has seen a massive increase in the attention given to work-life balance of employees (for reviews, see Carlson & Kacmar,

Jeff Alexander Graham and Marlene A. Dixon are with the Department of Kinesiology and Health Education at The University of Texas in Austin, TX. Address author correspondence to Marlene A. Dixon at madixon@austin.utexas.edu.

2000; Greenhaus, & Powell, 2006; Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002; Pitt-Catsouphes, Kossek, & Sweet, 2006). With increasing economic and financial demands and shifting cultural and organizational expectations, both organizations and families have felt the strain between work and family roles and responsibilities (Pitt-Catsouphes et al., 2006). Much attention has been given to individual, organizational, and sociocultural explanations, responsibilities, and outcomes regarding the work-life interface (e.g., see Dixon & Bruening, 2005). Most of the work to date has focused on mothers and their changing roles associated with a stronger presence in the paid workforce, yet more attention is needed to these same interactions involving fathers (Lamb, 2010; Pleck, 2010; Reddick, Rochlen, Grasso, Reilly, & Spikes, 2012). Managers must understand more about the ways that work and family interact for mothers *and* fathers, and how to help workers successfully navigate the tensions arising from dual roles.

The collective work in the area of work and family shows both positive and negative outcomes from the interaction of work and family realms. Workers who can manage their work-family interaction well have been found to experience security in their life status (Sieber, 1974), enrichment to their personality (Parasuraman & Greenhaus, 2002), an increase in their ability to function in each life role (Carlson, Kacmar, Wayne, & Grzywacz, 2006), and an enhanced overall sense of well-being (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006). On the contrary, studies show that suffering from a high level of work-family conflict leads to negative outcomes, such as a feeling of dissatisfaction and distress in both the work and family domains (Barnett & Marshall, 1993; Frone, Yardley, & Markel, 1997; Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; Parasuraman, Purohit, Godshalk, & Beutell, 1996), physical and emotional exhaustion (Duxbury, Lyons, & Higgins, 2011), a display of higher levels of dysfunctional social behaviors (Frone, Russell, & Barnes, 1996; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1993; Stewart & Barling, 1996), a decrease in exercise (Payne, Jones, & Harris, 2002), an increase in job burnout and dissatisfaction (Netemeyer et al., 1996), an increase in health problems ranging from minor to major (Mullen, Kelley, & Kelloway, 2011), and a decrease in one's overall life quality (Barnett, Marshall & Pleck, 1992; Greenhaus & Parasuraman, 1999; Higgins, Duxbury, & Irving, 1992; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992).

Likewise, within the sport management literature, coaching mothers reported that their profession contributed to feelings of self-confidence, in which women gained a greater perspective on what their life's priorities should be and that "being a coach was their occupation, not their identity" (Bruening & Dixon, 2007, p. 481). In addition, their coaching role gave them a sense of being a complete person because of the fulfillment coming from their family and work roles (Dixon & Bruening, 2007; Dixon & Sagas, 2007). However, coaching mothers also reported feelings of guilt and anxiety because coaching required spending time away from their children so often (Bruening & Dixon, 2007; Dixon & Bruening, 2007). Palmer and Leberman (2009) reported that elite athletes who were also mothers experienced similar feelings of conflict. On the one hand, the elite athletes felt that being a mother enriched their athletic experience, in which motherhood "developed their resilience and adaptability making them more able to deal with the challenges of elite level sport" (Palmer & Leberman, 2009, p. 246). On the other hand, these athletes also reported feeling conflicted because being a mother and athlete required so much planning and scheduling, which increased their stress (Palmer & Leberman, 2009).

More recently, attention within the broader work-family literature has begun to focus more on fathers' experiences (Lamb, 2010; Pleck, 2010; Reddick et al., 2012). It is noteworthy that whereas research about mothers has emphasized shifting expectations in the workplace, research about fathers has largely centered on their changing roles at home. For the most part of the 20th century, the generally accepted notion of fatherhood was that "good fathers were good breadwinners" (Coakley, 2006, p. 155); in other words, they provided financially for the family. The good father of this time was not expected to be involved with child-rearing duties and did not often participate in household chores such as cooking and cleaning. However, the good father expectations of that time period have changed particularly over the past 20 years. A good father now has a much more diverse role that includes coproviding financially for the family, engaging developmentally with the children, accepting the role as a coparent, and participating in domestic responsibilities such as cooking and cleaning (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie, 2006; Goldberg, Tan, & Thorsen, 2009).

Some have argued that becoming more involved at home has led to positive outcomes for men and families (Harrington, Van Deusen, & Mazar, 2012). In a study of fathers who had high levels of involvement with their children, men reported personal benefits, including watching their children mature and develop, building stronger relationships with their children, being involved with their children's daily lives, and knowing that they were having a direct effect on their child's developmental outcomes (Harrington et al., 2012). These benefits are becoming increasingly desired as well. Reddick et al. (2012) reported that men claimed "they would cut their salaries by one fourth if they could have more family or personal time" (p. 2). However, although notions of a "good father" have shifted over time, the notions of a "good worker" have not. As a result, fathers who are becoming more involved in the home may feel conflicted when they are faced with inflexible working conditions, demands, and expectations at the organizational level (Pleck, 1977).

This broader attention to working fathers has also seen a budding development within sport studies and sport management (e.g., Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Kay, 2009; Messner, 2009; Schenewark & Dixon, 2012). The work to date suggests that sport may interact with families in a

number of ways. For example, fathers in general may use sport to try to make up for the lack of their own personal time spent training their children (especially boys) in masculinity and manhood. In addition, the increasingly time-consuming nature of club and elite sport may create time and resource strains on families (Messner, 2009). Sport may also interact with families in distinct ways for those who are employed in the sport industry, coaches in particular (Dixon & Bruening, 2005; Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Schenewark & Dixon, 2012).

Although many employment contexts have particular demands, the sacrificial, immediate, and performance-oriented culture of the sport industry and coaching specifically, undoubtedly influences work expectations among coaching fathers and is a factor in the work-family tensions they experience (Galinsky, Aumann, & Bond, 2011; Harrington, Van Deusen, & Humberd, 2011, Parker & Wang, 2013). The sport industry is characterized by long working hours (including nights and weekends) in which face time is a strongly valued (Dixon & Bruening, 2005), a hypermasculine culture that encourages competition and aggression (Wilson, 2002), and an occupational belief that equates sacrifice with commitment (Dixon & Bruening, 2005). These conditions create a high-pressure work environment that leaves little time or energy for nonwork pursuits, including family.

Consequently, this strong work culture may cause fathers in the sport industry, especially coaches, to feel acute role strain between their responsibilities as employees and their changing responsibilities as fathers. In fact, within the coaching profession, both fathers and mothers report nearly equivalent levels of work-to-family and family-to-work conflict (Schenewark & Dixon, 2012). This mirrors the larger social trend in which men now report high levels of work-family conflict more than ever before (Galinsky et al., 2011; Harrington et al., 2011; Parker & Wang, 2013). Clearly, the change in societal expectations of fathers at home combined with unchanging expectations of fathers in the workplace has led to a clash in cultural expectations for men with clear implications for organizations, individuals, families, and society. This important issue, particularly in sport management, remains largely unexamined and not well understood.

The purpose of this article is to review the literature pertaining to the current trends in society regarding fatherhood and masculinity, the demanding culture in the sport industry, and how this culture clash is leading to increased work-family tensions among fathers, especially those who are coaches. This review integrates literature from work-life studies, sport management, family development, and men's studies to provide a framework for examining work-life interactions for fathers in the sport industry. The review begins by addressing the literature justifying the need for fathers in the home. If fathers are not important to familial and children's development, then the issue of work-family balance loses significance. Next, it examines the societal definitions of the good father and the cultural expectations found in the sport industry, and it explores how these two views clash and why many coaching fathers experience work-family conflict. Third, with role theory and scarcity theory as supports, the review suggests ways that fathers may be approaching balancing work and family responsibilities. Finally, it concludes by discussing future research implications.

Fathers and Family Development

Family-relation studies consistently indicate that fathers play an important role in the positive developmental outcomes of children in the family (Sarkadi, Kristiansson, Oberklaid, & Bremberg, 2008). Research suggests that fathers influence the positive development of their children in at least three specific ways: (a) father love, (b) engagement, and (c) indirect support.

Father love is characterized as a qualitative dimension of parenting and includes factors such as warmth, closeness, and the responsiveness of the father-child relationship (Pleck, 2010). Father-child relationships that are characterized as close or responsive are associated with positive outcomes, such as increased child happiness (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001), increased general well-being, and reduced risky alcohol behavior (Goncy & Van Dulmen, 2010). Lamb (2010) reported that children with highly involved fathers showed higher levels of "cognitive competence, increased empathy, fewer sex-stereotyped beliefs, and a more internal locus of control" (p. 7). Conversely, children who grew up with absent fathers had difficulty "in the areas of sex role and gender-identity development, school performance, psychosocial adjustment, and perhaps in the control of aggression" (Lamb, 2010, p. 5). As fathers foster warm, close, responsive relationships with their children, they can contribute to positive developmental outcomes.

Fathers also influence positive developmental outcomes in their children when they engage them with interactive activities. Scholars suggest that interactive engagement activities with young children might include "outings away from home, playing at home, and reading" (Pleck, 2010, p. 62). For older children, engaging interaction might include "leisure activities, working on projects or playing at home, having private talks, or helping with reading and doing homework" (Pleck, 2010, p. 62). Research suggests that father engagement may lead to reduced behavioral problems in boys, reduced psychological problems in girls, enhanced cognitive development in general, and decreased criminal behavior in children from families of low socioeconomic status (Sarkadi et al., 2007). However, realizing these benefits is not strongly linked to the total time a father spends with his children (Hawkins & Palkovitz, 1999). "The amount of time that fathers and children spend together is... less important than what they do with the time" (Lamb, 2010, p. 11). Rather, fathers should focus on "development-promoting activities" (Pleck, 2010, p. 63), such as those listed above, to maximize the positive influence on their children. These findings should encourage fathers with busy schedules and help them realize that even if they can spend only short amounts of time together, this time

can still lead to positive developmental outcomes in youth when fathers effectively engage their children.

Finally, fathers also indirectly influence their children through (a) economic support for the family (Mollborn & Lovegrove, 2011) and (b) emotional support to the mother (Coley & Schindler, 2008; Fletcher, 2009). First, fathers indirectly support their families by providing financially for them. With the above discussion of the changing societal expectations of men as the primary breadwinners in the family, it could be argued that this indirect influence has lessened in recent years as more and more women have become financial providers for the home. However, this role for fathers is still expected and, as Lamb (2010) argued, "Economic support of the family constitutes an indirect but important way in which fathers contribute to the rearing and emotional health of their children" (p. 9). Research suggests that stable economic support, even from nonresident fathers, is linked to improved cognitive and social development in youth (Mollborn & Lovegrove, 2011). Second, fathers influence their families indirectly by supporting the mother of the family emotionally. Research indicates that positive emotional support from fathers to mothers may reduce the negative effects of maternal depression, thereby increasing the quality of mother-child relationships and enhancing child development (Fletcher, 2009). Furthermore, by supporting their wives, fathers may decrease maternal stress and encourage improved maternal parenting (Coley & Schindler, 2008). In these two ways, fathers indirectly facilitate the positive development of their children.

As discussed, the literature suggests that fathers fill an important role in families. "The direct and indirect influences of fathers on children's development reveal the complexity of fathers' influences" (Roggman, Bradley, & Raikes, 2013, p. 192). This understanding supports the investigation of work-family balance issues with fathers. If fathers did not significantly influence developmental outcomes in children, then work-family balance might be only a personal comfort issue. However, because research indicates that fathers indeed play this important role, understanding the impact of work and family interactions on fathers remains a necessary area of inquiry.

Changing Societal Expectations of Fatherhood

Fathers are continuing to fulfill the fatherhood role differently today than in previous generations (Galinsky et al., 2011; Pleck, 1985). In the past, many fathers satisfied familial expectations simply by providing financially and disciplining children (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001). However, postmillennial accepted fathering duties extend beyond breadwinning and incorporate "physical care of children and the socialization of children in the realms of cognitive, social, and moral development" (Goldberg et al., 2009, p. 161). Today's fathering role now incorporates duties such as childcare, cooking, and cleaning in addition to traditional breadwinning and disciplinarian duties emphasized in the past (Bianchi et al., 2006). Longitudinal statistical research supports the above claims and suggests that, compared with 30 years ago, today's fathers spend more time in the home, more time with their children in general, more time caring for their children, and more time cooking and cleaning (Galinsky et al., 2011; Parker & Wang, 2013). Some fathers are even reprioritizing family time to take precedence over work time (Reddick et al., 2012). At the heart of this issue is a discussion of the changing attitudes about what constitutes the dominant masculine ideal in society and how this masculine ideal relates to fathering responsibilities.

Historical hegemonic masculinity includes concepts such as power, strength, machismo, violence, patriarchy, and dominance (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). From this hegemonic masculine perspective, historically accepted fathering duties mostly constituted indirect support activities (Lamb, 1975). The most important fathering duty was working to provide financially for the family, so that the wife could stay home to take care of the household and the children (Goldberg et al., 2009), and research suggests that this situation was accepted by the majority of men and women. For example, Galinsky et al. (2011) reported that in 1977, 74% of men and 52% of women supported the statement, "It is better for all involved if the man earns the money and the woman takes care of the home and children" (p. 9). However, evidence now indicates that support for traditional hegemonic masculinity is eroding, which may have consequences on fathers.

Some scholars suggest that an emerging form of masculinity, termed *inclusive masculinity*, is gaining increasing acceptance in society (Anderson, 2009). Inclusive masculinity embraces traits such as nurturing, comforting, and caring. This is not to suggest that inclusive masculinity is displacing hegemonic masculinity as the new ideal; rather, inclusive masculinity is emerging as an equally appealing outlet for building and maintaining a masculine identity among men (Anderson, 2011). The nurturing and caring traits of inclusive masculinity also do not conflict with emerging fathering expectations such as childcare, cooking, and cleaning. Galinsky et al.'s (2011) most recent study found that only 40% of men and 37% of women supported the statement quoted above. As support for the traditional hegemonic ideal in society erodes, changing expectations of successful fathering are emerging. However, this shift in fatherly expectations may be leading to new challenges for fathers.

Reports inside the sport industry (Schenewark & Dixon, 2012) and outside the sport industry (Galinsky et al., 2011; Harrington et al., 2011; Harrington et al., 2012; Parker & Wang, 2013) indicate that fathers today are experiencing increased levels of work-family conflict and, in some cases, even greater levels of conflict then their female counterparts (Harrington et al., 2011). Increased expectations of fathers' familial involvement may be causing tension for men as they strive to balance conflicting role obligations. However, experiencing only greater familial involvement pressures should not lead to

increased levels of work-family conflict (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Pleck, 1977). However, when increased familial pressure is coupled with inflexible workplace demands, a second influence, greater work-family conflict, is likely to occur. If demands in the family role increase as workplace demands remain unchanged, or become even more pronounced, then employees will probably experience tension as they seek to balance these demands (Pleck, 1977). The sport industry may provide such an example of an inflexible work environment that continues to have uncompromising expectations of fathers in the workplace.

Sport and Coaching Subculture

The coaching subculture in sport may provide a context in which fathers face strong demands from both family and work, which provides fertile ground for studying the work-family interface. This section discusses the pervading culture in the sport industry, particularly in coaching. Although other factors certainly play a role, three specific cultural norms that may influence work and family interactions for fathers are (a) hypermasculinity, (b) time requirements, and (c) sacrifice.

First, sport may particularly inform the interaction of work and family because the sport environment has been described as hypermasculine (Wilson, 2002). This hypermasculine culture is characterized by violence, aggression, confrontation, and competition, especially in the context of contact sports such as football, wrestling, hockey, soccer, basketball, or rugby. Some coaches perpetuate this masculine culture by encouraging especially violent play, then justifying such behavior as "necessary to develop young male athletes into men and to prepare them for life" (Wilson, 2002, p. 214). Previous sport management research examining mothers in the sport industry suggests that the masculine culture in sport acts as a barrier preventing women from connecting with their male coworkers as strong in-groups and out-groups are formed (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). For men, however, the male-dominated nature of sport may also act as a strong influence.

Rather than being a barrier for entry for men, the hypermasculine culture in sport may influence fathers to behave with more aggression or machismo and ultimately to reject more inclusive masculine traits that are being encouraged in the home. Steinfeldt, Rutkowski, Orr, and Steinfeldt (2012) suggested that social gender norms influence acceptable behavior for both men and women. They argue that such norms "guide and constrain men's and women's understanding of how they are supposed to think, feel, and act in society. Specifically, masculine gender norms are socially constructed unwritten rules that convey strong messages about what it means to be a man" (Steinfeldt et al., 2012, p. 343). Acosta and Carpenter (2012) reported that men coach four out of every five intercollegiate teams (both men's and women's teams of all sports) in 2012. Because men are in so many influential positions in athletics, it is likely that these gender norms are passed down from coach to player. Steinfeldt et al. (2012) explained that "sport is an influential environment wherein boys learn values and behaviors (e.g., competition, toughness, independence) that are considered to be valued aspects of masculinity within American society" (p. 343). In fact, sport studies literature suggests that many men are turning to sport as a way to fulfill fathering responsibilities (e.g., Kay, 2009; Messner, 2009). By fathering through sport, research suggests that men are using a gender-comfortable platform (i.e., sport) from which to relate, communicate, and engage with their children. Although a full discussion of the ways in which fathers use sport to fulfill their fathering responsibilities, the drawbacks and benefits of this tactic, and/or the long-term consequences of this practice are beyond the scope of this review, we can draw from this literature support for the assertion that sport presents a highly masculine culture that is likely to influence the attitudes and behaviors of those involved in it.

A strong traditionally masculine sport culture, therefore, is likely to create, strong gender-role expectations for those working in that industry (e.g., coaches, sport administrators, general managers). These messages and expectations do not include encouragement for men to be coparents with their spouses, to be developmentally involved with their children, or to be cofinancial providers for their families (Miller, 2009). As a result, the pervading hypermasculine culture in sport directly conflicts with a more nurturing and inclusive masculinity society is increasingly embracing. At the sociocultural level, this conflict of masculine expectations is likely to be a source of tension felt by fathers working in the sport industry who feel strong pressures from home and work to behave in certain ways.

Second, the sport industry is known for long hours that regularly extend into nights and weekends. In previous sport management studies, the time pressures experienced by employees, athletes, and coaches have been a consistently reported source of conflict for women working in the sport industry (Bruening & Dixon, 2007; Dixon & Bruening, 2005; Dixon & Bruening, 2007; Lumpkin & Anshel, 2012; Palmer & Leberman, 2009). As pointed out by Dixon and Bruening (2005), "Most occupations within the sport industry require long, nontraditional hours (i.e., nights and weekends), and often extensive travel, making it a context where work-family conflict is highly salient" (p. 230). Working long hours has become so accepted that work addiction can be commonplace. Lumpkin and Anshel (2012) examined work-family interactions by analyzing the issue of work addiction among National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I coaches. They found that both male and female coaches were working high numbers of hours per week, and that the "sources of a high workload were both internally driven and externally-imposed by the expectations of their coach colleagues and the athletic director" (Lumpkin & Anshel, 2012, p. 425). The authors suggested that these coaches' work addiction was rooted in the difficulty of

"trying to separate work and family life" (Lumpkin & Anshel, 2012, p. 426). In the end, committing time and energy to family may be a challenge for coaches because of the high time expectations in sport.

Closely related to time pressures in sport is the cultural expectation of face time, or spending visible time in the office. Bruening & Dixon (2007) found that some athletic directors at the university level even explicitly stated to coaches and front office staff that "time spent in the office was one important measure of job commitment" (p. 472). As a result, coaches in particular experience pressure to show their faces and to spend considerable time in the office "especially at odd hours, to prove that they were willing to make the time sacrifices necessary to have a winning program" (Dixon & Bruening, 2007, p. 393). Face time is one example of an inflexible work expectation for coaching fathers that restricts a coach's ability to balance work and family on his own terms. When this work expectation confronts increased fatherly expectations from the home, a father is likely to feel increased levels of tension and work-family conflict.

Third, the sport industry has adopted and perpetuated a culture in which sacrifice is valued. In sport, sacrifice is often equated with commitment. If an athlete plays with or through pain, coaches and spectators perceive the athlete as being highly committed. Young, White, and McTeer (1994) argued that in sport, tolerating pain levels is a way of "gauging how much a player will 'sacrifice'... for his team" (p. 177). Valuing sacrifice is not limited to athletes, though. Management also equates sacrifice with commitment. Dixon and Bruening (2005) explained that "in many athletic contexts, sacrifice of personal and family relationships for the team, even to the point of divorce, is seen as the ultimate commitment" (p. 233). Research has shown that for women, there is a limit to the sacrifice they are willing to give when it comes to deciding between sport and family. Palmer and Leberman (2009) found that "motherhood has been highlighted as a significant reason why women do not participate in sport... pregnancy and childbirth historically have implied the end of professional sport involvement for women" (p. 243). However, comparable findings have not been investigated for fathers and fatherhood. Instead, men in sport seem to be the source of continuing the sport culture of sacrifice. Young et al. (1994) wrote that "tolerance of physical risk... carries enormous symbolic weight in the exhibition and evaluation of masculinity" (p. 177). Therefore, the sacrificial nature of sport may reinforce the inflexible masculine expectations placed on men, as discussed above.

These structural and cultural norms in the sport industry may create an environment in which fathers are likely to report high levels of conflict, yet the nature of that conflict and the ways that fathers experience and cope with it are not well-understood. Especially from a coaching father's perspective, individuals may be feeling pulled and pushed by a number of influences. These influences may include professional cultural norms that encourage hegemonic masculinity, other sport-specific pressures that manifest in different sports (e.g., golf vs. football), societal pressure to adopt a more gender neutral and inclusive approach, as well as personal ideas individuals hold about what is best for a family. It is this pool of tension surrounding coaching fathers that is less understood by scholars and may require further research.

Theory-Based Strategies

Reviewing economic and social theories is useful for identifying potential strategies for managing work-family balance. Scarcity theory and role theory may be informative for identifying sources of tension and solutions for fathers and organizations as they seek to maximize the positive outcomes of work and family.

Scarcity theory has its roots in economics. It posits that resources such as time, energy, and attention are finite (Greenhaus & Powell, 2003), and as an individual devotes greater resources to one role, resources are depleted for other roles in a person's life, which may lead to conflict. Edwards and Rothbard (2000) call the process of using up resources unequally among differing roles "resource drain - the transfer of finite personal resources . . . from one domain to another" (p. 181). Scarcity theory is often the basis for recommendations for improving work-life balance. Suggestions for improving work-life balance stemming from scarcity theory include: improving time management skills, increasing multitasking abilities, reducing work and/or family commitments, becoming more organized, or eating and sleeping more regularly. For example, Mark Turgeon, head men's basketball coach at the University of Maryland, understanding that he can only be in one place at a time, holds early morning practices partly for the reason that he can then have evening dinner with his family most nights (Markus, 2013). Likewise, based on a scarcity approach, a coach could develop a calendar with specific time allotments for work and family obligations, being careful to allot sufficient time for each, and being cautious to be strict with boundaries around each obligation. Although these suggestions are logical and effective, the ultimate outcome is still zero-sum and resources remain finite.

According to scarcity theory, successfully finding balance between work and family simply means creating an environment in which roles—and their accompanying responsibilities—do not overlap. Clearly, this perspective provides some insight, particularly into the causes of work-family conflict. However, this theory tends to oversimplify the emotional and mental tensions that exist beyond simple time conflicts of role overlap (i.e., one does not stop being a father simply because one is at work). Further, proponents of this theory tend to view work and family as adversaries, which means that the best possible outcome is "no conflict," because the possibility that work and family could also be allies or enrich each other is not embraced (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006).

A second strategy for addressing work-family tensions is role theory. Role theory is informed by the early studies of Goode (1960). Goode postulates that organizations

are made up of individuals fulfilling roles. As individuals seek to fulfill role obligations, they inevitably encounter situations in which differing roles conflict. Goode (1960) explains, "If [the individual] conforms fully or adequately in one direction, fulfillment will be difficult in another... he cannot meet all these demands to the satisfaction of all the persons who are part of his total role network" (p. 485). As one accumulates additional roles, their perceived role strain increases as membership in one role often necessitates conflicts with other roles in a person's life (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964).

Role theory also suggests, as opposed to scarcity theory, that roles do not always create conflict. Scholars such as Sieber (1974) argue that role accumulation does not have the dire consequences predicted by some role-strain theorists. Instead, Sieber suggested that roles could enhance each other in certain instances and wrote, "Our argument is not meant to deny the occurrence of overload and conflict, but only to assert that there are enough compensations to give us pause in our single minded search for the dysfunctions of multiple roles" (p. 577). Marks (1977) argued that some roles provide energy and resources for other roles in a person's life.

Greenhaus and Powell (2006) explain that the transfer of resources from one role in a person's life to another can happen in one of two ways. The "instrumental path" (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 81) is when resources are directly passed from one role to the next. These resources then positively benefit the individual in the latter role. For example, Tony Dungy, former head coach of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers and Indianapolis Colts, comments that the skills and lessons he learned from being a father made him a better coach—more understanding of the whole person and patient in human development (Dungy, 2007). The "affective path" (Greenhaus & Powell, 2006, p. 82) is when resources, such as mood and emotion, are indirectly transferred from one role to the next, positively enhancing the latter role. Greenhaus and Powell (2006) explain, "A positive mood in one role can enhance cognitive functioning, task, and interpersonal activity, and persistence in another role, thereby increasing performance and rewards and promoting a positive mood in the second role" (p. 83). For example, a coach who had a poor game performance can have his mood positively affected by returning home to his children, especially when the children are young and oblivious to the game situation or outcome.

An individual searching for balance between work and family life by using a role theory framework may implement a number of strategies, including negotiating role obligations, communicating effectively between different role authorities, improving one's ability to either compartmentalize or integrate roles, or improving one's ability to transition from one role to another. For example, many coaching families negotiate roles in and out of playing seasons. In season, the father takes a strong work role and reduced daily fathering roles; then, out of season, he transitions to a stronger father role and reduced coach role. He still holds both roles, but the saliency and time commitment can fluctuate. Another strategy may be finding effective transition tools from one role to another. For example, a number of coaches report that they exercise between practice and returning home. This allows the coach to mentally and physically transition from coach to father.

Scarcity theory suggests that the optimal outcome is reduced conflict. In contrast, role theory postulates that enrichment in life roles is possible. Because role theory accepts conflict as well as enrichment, it may be the preferred theory for researching work-family tension among coaching fathers. A role-theory perspective may help scholars to understand coaching fathers in many ways, including how their work and family roles develop, how they overlap, how they enrich each other, or how they create conflict. This perspective may also provide rich insight into the seasonal nature of coaching and how balancing work and family may change from preseason, to season, to off-season.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

The work-family interface remains an important area of inquiry for sport managers. The positive and negative outcomes associated with the work-family interface are strong enough to warrant further investigation. Existing research in sport management indicates that healthy work-family interactions affect employee job satisfaction, life satisfaction, organizational commitment, and career commitment (e.g., Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Schenewark & Dixon, 2012). Within sport management, we have little background on how the effects of changing societal expectations may affect men in the sport industry. In essence, a gap is present in the literature and very little is known about the coping strategies of fathers in sport and the outcomes of those strategies. Although men report work-family conflict at a level similar to that of women (e.g., Dixon & Sagas, 2007; Schenewark & Dixon, 2012), they may experience it and cope with it differently. For example, although work-family benefits are available to both mothers and fathers, fathers are less likely to use the supports available (Reddick et al., 2012). Thus, it is possible that the individual and organizational supports provided for women may not be applicable or helpful to men. Understanding the specific needs of fathers would help sport managers better aid employees in achieving work-life balance. Given the importance of work-family interactions to both personal and organizational outcomes, it is imperative that we examine and understand these interactions for both mothers and fathers.

The overarching goal for a long-term research agenda would be to garner an in-depth understanding of the lived experiences of coaching fathers; the sources of conflict for various roles; the meanings derived from their lived experiences; and, from a pragmatic standpoint, the practical implications for change both for sport and for individuals (Creswell, 2013). It seems that within this goal, a broad array or combination of specific methods

or designs could be used (e.g., interviews, observation, surveys). Because these issues are complex and evolving, a starting point for exploration would be to employ an interpretive or inductive approach, grounded in the lived experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2013; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013; Neuman, 2009). For example, an exploration could begin simply by trying to understand coaching fathers' various role experiences. What do they see as their role as a father? As a coach? What does it mean to be a good father? What does it mean to be a good coach? Do they feel pressure to spend more time as a father? Is it possible to live up to the expectations of being an involved father in the home as well as a successful coach in the workplace?

Next, it would be important to understand both the sources of conflict and enrichment, as well as to understand how coaches experience and cope with their work-life roles immediately and over time. To this end, Dixon and Bruening (2005) provided a multilevel model on the work-life interface of coaches. Based in postpositivist assumptions, this model suggests that cultural, structural, and individual factors influence work and family and that outcomes are also manifest at the individual, structural, and cultural levels. Following this approach, it would be important to ascertain what cultural and structural elements within the work and family context influence coaching fathers' work-family lives. For example, we suggested that a hypermasculine subculture, a culture of sacrifice, and the face-time nature of coaching could influence work-family interactions. However, there may be additional cultural or structural elements that have not been identified—including the level of coaching (youth vs. elite), subcultural elements of particular sports (see Green, 2001), particular policies or structures within a given system, and so forth. These may emerge in an in-depth study of the lives of coaching fathers. From an individual perspective, it will be important to explore factors such as coaching and sport background, race, culture, ethnic background, family structure, age of children, gender of children, and family supports that may affect how fathers experience and cope with work-life interactions.

Naturally, following this discussion, other questions must revolve around what strategies men are currently using to cope with work-family conflicts and maximize enrichments. Are they using organizational supports? If they are, which ones are most helpful? If they are not, why not? What individual-level strategies are they using to balance work and family? Do they depend on a significant other to take care of familial responsibilities, or do they pay for these services? If they perceive enrichment, how do they maximize the benefits of role enrichment?

This article serves an important role by beginning the conversation about the interaction of work and family from the perspective of fathers working in sport. The discussion of sport culture, masculinity in general, and the shifting role fatherhood serves as a starting point for research investigating the lived experiences of fathers working in the sport industry (especially coaches) who may be suffering from the tension involved with balancing work and family obligations. Conducting meaningful research and finding answers to questions such as those suggested above will continue to enhance both theory and practice in sport management.

References

Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L.J. (2012). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study thirty-five year update (1977–2012). Retrieved from http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport.

Anderson, E. (2009). *Inclusive masculinity: The changing nature of masculinities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Anderson, E. (2011). Masculinities and sexualities in sport and physical cultures: Three decades of evolving research. *Journal of Homosexuality, 58,* 565–578. doi:10.1080/00918369.2011.563652

Barnett, R.C., & Marshall, N.L. (1993). Men, family-role quality, job-role quality, and physical health. *Health Psychology, 12,* 48–55. doi:10.1037/0278-6133.12.1.48

Barnett, R.C., Marshall, N.L., & Pleck, J.H. (1992). Men's multiple roles and their relationship to men's psychological distress. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 358–367. doi:10.2307/353067

Bianchi, S.M., Robinson, J.P., & Milkie, M.A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York, NY: Russell-Sage.

Bruening, J.E., & Dixon, M.A. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching II: Managing role conflict. *Journal of Sport Management, 21,* 471–496.

Carlson, D.S., & Kacmar, K.M. (2000). Work-family conflict in the organization: Do life role values make a difference? *Journal of Management, 26,* 1031–1054.

Carlson, D.S., Kacmar, K.M., Wayne, J.H., & Grzywacz, J.G. (2006). Measuring the positive side of the work-family interface: Development and validation of a work-family enrichment scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68,* 131–164. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2005.02.002

Coakley, J. (2006). The good father: Parental expectations and youth sports. *Leisure Studies, 25,* 153–163. doi:10.1080/02614360500467735

Coley, R., & Schindler, H.S. (2008). Biological fathers' contributions to maternal and family functioning. *Parenting, Science and Practice, 8,* 294–318. doi:10.1080/15295190802522814

Connell, R.W., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19,* 829–859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dixon, M.A., & Bruening, J.E. (2005). Perspectives on work-family conflict in sport: An integrated approach. *Sport Management Review, 8,* 227–253. doi:10.1016/S1441-3523(05)70040-1

Dixon, M.A., & Bruening, J.E. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 21,* 377–406.

Dixon, M.A., & Sagas, M. (2007). The relationship between organizational support, work-family conflict, and the job-life satisfaction of university coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 78,* 236–247. doi:10.1080/02701367.2007.10599421

Dungy, T. (2007). *Quiet strength.* Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House.

Duxbury, L., Lyons, S., & Higgins, C. (2011). Too much to do, and not enough time: An examination of role overload. In K. Korabik, D. Lero, & D. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration* (pp. 125–140). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science.

Edwards, J.R., & Rothbard, N.P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 178–199.

Fletcher, R. (2009). Promoting infant well-being in the context of maternal depression by supporting the father. *Infant Mental Health Journal, 30,* 95–102. doi:10.1002/imhj.20205

Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Barnes, G.M. (1996). Work-family conflicts, gender, and health-related outcomes: A study of employed parents in two community samples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1,* 57–69. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.1.1.57

Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1993). Relationships of work-family conflict, gender, and alcohol expectancies to alcohol use/abuse. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14,* 545–558. doi:10.1002/job.4030140604

Frone, M.R., Yardley, J.K., & Markel, K.S. (1997). Development and testing an integrative model of the work–family interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 50,* 145–167. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1996.1577

Galinsky, E., Aumann, K., & Bond, J. (2011). *Times Are Changing: Gender and Generation at Work and at Home (1977–2008).* Retrieved from http://familiesandwork.org/site/research/reports/Times_Are_Changing.pdf.

Green, B.C. (2001). Leveraging subculture and identity to promote sport events. *Sport Management Review, 4,* 1–19. doi:10.1016/S1441-3523(01)70067-8

Goldberg, W.A., Tan, E.T., & Thorsen, K.L. (2009). Trends in academic attention to fathers, 1930-2006. Fathering: A Journal *of* Theory, Research, *& Practice About Men as Fathers, 7,* 159–179. doi:10.3149/fth.0702.159

Goncy, E.A., & Van Dulmen, M.M. (2010). Fathers do make a difference: Parental involvement and adolescent alcohol use. Fathering: A Journal *of* Theory, Research, *& Practice About Men as Fathers, 8,* 93–108. doi:10.3149/fth.0801.93

Goode, W. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review, 25,* 483–496. doi:10.2307/2092933

Greenhaus, J.H., & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review, 10,* 76–88.

Greenhaus, J.H., & Parasuraman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender: current status and future directions. In G.N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 391–412). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greenhaus, J.H., & Powell, G.N. (2003). When work and family collide: Deciding between competing role demands. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 90,* 291–303. doi:10.1016/S0749-5978(02)00519-8

Greenhaus, J.H., & Powell, G.N. (2006). When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review, 31,* 72–92. doi:10.5465/AMR.2006.19379625

Harrington, B., Van Deusen, F., & Humberd, B. (2011). *The new dad: Caring, committed, and conflicted.* Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.

Harrington, B., Van Deusen, F., & Mazar, I. (2012). *The new dad: Right at home.* Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for Work & Family.

Hawkins, A., & Palkovitz, R. (1999). Beyond ticks and clicks: The need for more diverse and broader conceptualizations and measures of father involvement. *Journal of Men's Studies, 8,* 11–32. doi:10.3149/jms.0801.11

Higgins, C.A., Duxbury, L.E., & Irving, R.H. (1992). Work and family conflicts in the dual-career family. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 51,* 51–75. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(92)90004-Q

Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). *Organizational stress.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Kay, T. (2009). *Fathering through sport and leisure.* London: Routledge.

Lamb, M.E. (1975). Fathers: Forgotten contributors to child development. *Human Development, 18,* 245–266. doi:10.1159/000271493

Lamb, M.E. (2010). How do fathers influence child development? Let me count the ways. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed., pp. 1–26). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Long, M. (2009, December 27). Florida's Meyer resigns amid health concerns. *Yahoo Sports.* Retrieved from http://sports.yahoo.com

Lumpkin, K., & Anshel, M. (2012). Work addiction among intercollegiate sports coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 35,* 406–432.

Marks, S.R. (1977). Multiple roles and role strain: Some notes on human energy, time and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 921–936. doi:10.2307/2094577

Markus, D. (2013, September 30). Terps coach Mark Turgeon talks about early-morning practices, state of the team. *The Baltimore Sun.* Retrieved from http://articles.baltimoresun.com.

Messner, M.A. (2009). *It's all for the kids: Gender, families and youth sports.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, K. (2009). Sport-related identities and the "Toxic Jock". *Journal of Sport Behavior, 32*(1), 69–91.

Mullen, J., Kelley, E., & Kelloway, K. (2011). Health and well-being outcomes of the work-family interface. In K. Korabik, D. Lero, & D. Whitehead (Eds.), *Handbook of work-family integration* (pp. 125–140). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science.

Mollborn, S., & Lovegrove, P.J. (2011). How teenage fathers matter for children: Evidence from the ECLS-B. *Journal of Family Issues, 32,* 3–30. doi:10.1177/0192513X10370110

Netemeyer, R.G., Boles, J.S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work family conflict and work–family conflict scales. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 81,* 400–410. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.400

Neuman, W.L. (2009). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Palmer, F.R., & Leberman, S.R. (2009). Elite athletes as mothers: Managing multiple identities. *Sport Management Review, 12,* 241–254. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2009.03.001

Parasuraman, S., & Greenhaus, J.H. (2002). Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research. *Human Resource Management Review, 12,* 299–312. doi:10.1016/S1053-4822(02)00062-1

Parasuraman, S., Purohit, Y.S., Godshalk, V.M., & Beutell, N.J. (1996). Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 48,* 275–300. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1996.0025

Parker, K., & Wang, W. (2013). *Modern parenthood: Roles of moms and dads converge as they balance work and family.* Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Payne, N., Jones, F., & Harris, P. (2002). The impact of working life on health behavior: The effect of job strain on the cognitive predictors of exercise. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7,* 342–353. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.7.4.342

Pitt-Catsouphes, M., Kossek, E.E., & Sweet, S.A. (2006). *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives, methods, and approaches.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pleck, J.H. (1977). The work-family role system. *Social Problems, 24,* 417–427. doi:10.2307/800135

Pleck, J.H. (1985). *Working wives, working husbands.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pleck, J.H. (2010). Revised conceptualization and theoretical linkages with child outcomes. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (5th ed., pp. 1–26). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Reddick, R.J., Rochlen, A.B., Grasso, J.R., Reilly, E.D., & Spikes, D.D. (2012). Academic fathers pursuing tenure: A qualitative study of work-family conflict, coping strategies, and departmental culture. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13,* 1–15. doi:10.1037/a0023206

Rice, R.W., Frone, M.R., & McFarlin, D.B. (1992). Work–nonwork conflict and the perceived quality of life. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 155–168. doi:10.1002/job.4030130205

Roggman, L., Bradley, R., & Raikes, M. (2013). Fathers in family contexts. In N. Cabrera & C. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 186–201). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Rohner, R., & Veneziano, R. (2001). The importance of father love: History and contemporary evidence. *Review of General Psychology, 5,* 382–405. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.5.4.382

Sarkadi, A., Kristiansson, R., Oberklaid, F., & Bremberg, S. (2008). Fathers' involvement and children's developmental outcomes: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Acta Paediatrica , 97,* 153–158. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2007.00572.x

Schenewark, J., & Dixon, M. (2012). A dual model of work-family conflict and enrichment in collegiate coaches. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 5,* 15–39.

Sieber, S.D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review, 39,* 567–578. doi:10.2307/2094422

Steinfeldt, J., Rutkowski, L., Orr, T., & Steinfeldt, M. (2012). Moral atmosphere and masculine norms in American college football. *The Sport Psychologist, 26,* 341–358.

Stewart, W., & Barling, J. (1996). Fathers' work experience effect children's behaviors via job-related affect and parenting behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17,* 221–232. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199605)17:3<221::AID-JOB741>3.0.CO;2-G

Thompson, W. (2012, August 22). Urban Meyer will be home for dinner. *ESPN.com.* Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/blog/bigten/post/_/id/55074/urban-meyer-will-be-home-for-dinner

Wilson, B. (2002). The "anti-jock" movement: Reconsidering youth resistance, masculinity, and sport culture in the age of the internet. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 19,* 206–233.

Young, K., White, P., & McTeer, W. (1994). Body talk: Athletes reflect on sport, injury, and pain. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 11,* 175–194.