

Western New England University

Digital Commons @ Western New England University

Faculty Scholarship

School of Law Faculty Scholarship

2015

Barriers to Leadership in Women's College Athletics

Erin E. Buzuvis

Western New England University School of Law, buzuvis@law.wne.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.wne.edu/facschol>



Part of the [Civil Rights and Discrimination Commons](#), [Entertainment, Arts, and Sports Law Commons](#), and the [Law and Gender Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Erin E. Buzuvis, Barriers to Leadership for Women in College Athletics, in INTRODUCTION TO INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS (Eddie Comeaux, ed., 2015)

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law Faculty Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Western New England University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Western New England University.

BARRIERS to LEADERSHIP for WOMEN in COLLEGE ATHLETICS

Erin E. Buzuvis

KEY TERMS

- ▶ gender
- ▶ women
- ▶ coaching
- ▶ leadership
- ▶ athletics

Today there is an enormous gender disparity among collegiate head coaches and athletic administrators in the United States. Women fill less than a quarter of head coach and athletic director positions in college athletics and are even minorities among coaches of women's teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Few other professions are as impervious to gender integration. Leadership in college athletics is, in the words of one scholar, one of the "few male bastions remaining" (Kane, 2001, p. 115), which raises the question: Why are women so starkly underrepresented in leadership positions within college athletics? There is no easy answer, but rather a variety of factors that exclude, deter, or cause an early exit for women who would have otherwise pursued careers in college athletics. After presenting the demographics of leadership in college athletics to illustrate this gender disparity, this chapter considers the unique barriers women face when seeking entry to the profession, the ways in which athletic departments operate to constrain women's advancement and retention in their jobs, and the combined effect of these and other factors on women's interest and motivation to pursue or remain in leadership positions in college athletics.

THE CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS OF COLLEGE ATHLETICS

Today the number of female college head coaches is at an all-time high. According to the most recent update by Acosta and Carpenter (2012) to their 35-year longitudinal study of the gender demographics of college

athletics, there are 3,974 women serving as head coaches of women's teams, plus another estimated 200–300 women who coach men's teams.

Yet despite the gains by women in absolute terms, two comparisons suggest that the number of female head coaches is not as high as it could or should be. First is the comparison to the number of men serving in similar positions. The 3,974 women coaching women's teams constitute only 42.9% of head coaching positions in women's college sports. More than 5,300 women's teams (57%) have a male head coach. Men outnumber women as head coaches of women's teams in all three athletic divisions, but are particularly overrepresented in Division II, where they coach 62.5% of women's teams. Male dominance in head coaching positions also varies by sport. Men are the extreme minority among coaches of women's sports like synchronized swimming (0%), field hockey (6.2%), equestrian (10.0%), and lacrosse (14.9%). Men are also outnumbered—though considerably less so—among coaches of women's softball (37.9%), basketball (40.5%), and volleyball (46.7%). Yet men dominate as head coaches of women's sports like rowing (63.1%), soccer (67.8%), tennis (70.1%), swimming and diving (73.8%), ice hockey (75.5%), cross country (78.8%), and track and field (80.8%). In contrast, the number of female head coaches of men's teams amounts to only 2%, demonstrating that cross-gender coaching is almost entirely the domain of men.

The second relevant comparison is to the percentage of female head coaches over time. According to Acosta and Carpenter's (2012) data, the percentage of female head coaches in women's college sports has been declining since the passage of Title IX. In 1972, when Congress passed the law prohibiting sex discrimination in education, there were far fewer women's teams than there are today; yet women coached a vast majority (90%) of them. By 1978, the year the federal government initially designated as the deadline for compliance with Title IX, the number of women's athletic teams more than doubled—from an average of about 2.5 teams to 5.6 teams per school—creating many new coaching positions in women's sports. Correspondingly, the percentage of women coaching women's teams decreased to 58.2% in that short time. The percentage has dropped fairly steadily since then, reaching its lowest in 2006 (42.4%) and recovering slightly between then and 2012 (42.9%).

Acosta and Carpenter (2012) have also reported on the gender demographics of college athletic administrators. In 2012 there were 215 female athletic directors—36 in Division I, 46 in Division II, and 133 in Division III. Expressed as a percentage, 20.3% of college athletic directors are female. For historical perspective, it is important to note that in 1972, men's and women's athletic programs were separate, and the vast majority of women's programs were led by a female director. Today, nearly all colleges have merged once-separate programs into a single department. The fact that only 1 in 5 athletic directors are women suggest that mergers more often expanded the jurisdiction of male administrators of men's athletics at the expense of female administrators of women's athletics than the other way around (Hoffman, 2011).

Looking more broadly at college athletics administration, women have somewhat higher levels of representation but are still a minority, constituting about a third

of athletic administrators overall. Acosta and Carpenter (2012) have kept tabs on the percentage of colleges in which there is not a single woman serving in the athletic department administration and report that figure to be at an all-time low of 9.2%. Yet many schools employ female administrators in a token capacity, as suggested by the fact that the average number of female administrators per administration is 1.41. While their longitudinal study does not indicate the types of jobs women are more likely to hold within college athletics, others report that women who serve in athletics administration are relegated to support positions such as academic advising, compliance, marketing, life skills, and sports information (Coakley, 2008). They are also assigned to oversee women's sports and excluded from oversight of revenue-producing sports (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000).

Acosta and Carpenter's longitudinal data should also be considered in conjunction with others that examine the racial demographics of college athletics. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) regularly reports such data for its member institutions, most recently, for the 2009–2010 academic year (Irick, 2011). At that time, there were 208 female athletic directors, 21 of whom were black and 3 Asian, 1 Hispanic, and 1 who responded "two or more races." In that same year, women held 4,214 head coaching positions (23%) overall. Of those women, 87% were white, 9% were black, and the remaining 4% reflect the combined percentage of Hispanic, Asian, Native American/Pacific Islander, and those who reported "two or more races." A deeper examination of the data suggests that these low percentages of minority female coaches are disproportionately low in some contexts. For instance, black women constitute 10.7% of head coaches of women's basketball despite making up 50.1% of the athletes participating in that sport (Borland & Bruening, 2010).

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN SPORTS

To understand the gender gap in college athletics, we must first understand the interconnected nature of sport, power, and gender in our society. Sport has, from its origins, operated as a means to ascribe power to men, by creating the highly visible, symbolic linking of power with masculinity in a way that makes that association appear natural and legitimate (e.g., Messner, 1988; Willis, 1982). As a result, the ways in which women are denied access to sports and its associations with power are largely unquestioned and unseen. In fact, the hegemonic nature of this phenomenon means that men and women alike perpetuate the association of masculinity and power through sports. Women are excluded from opportunities within sports, whether through lawful or unlawful means, or their interest suppressed by external social forces that make their actions appear to be internal and agentic, or their opportunities to engage in the sporting enterprise are constructed on different terms so as to pose no threat to the gender order. Evidence of hegemonic masculinity in sports can help explain the imperviousness of college athletic departments to leadership of women (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002), as it offers a framework

to explain the barriers to entry, job constraints, and the construction of women's athletic interest and motivation that all contribute to the gender imbalance of leadership in college athletics.

BARRIERS TO ENTRY

Women's representation among the ranks of coaches of collegiate women's teams dropped precipitously in the early years of Title IX, as the new law motivated colleges and universities to rapidly expand and improve athletic opportunities for women. Before the statute's passage in 1972, women's sports was, in the words of one historian, "a small time venture, hardly noticed by anyone but the participants" (Festle, 1996, p. 99). Women had opportunities to engage in intercollegiate competition, but these opportunities were less numerous, less visible, and received considerably fewer resources than the athletic opportunities afforded to men. Women with backgrounds in physical education organized and coached athletic opportunities for women, and did so through organizations like the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) (1966–1972) and the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (1971–1983). These organizations provided opportunities for women's leadership of women's athletics, and they espoused an athlete-centered model of sports rooted in educational values that was distinctly different from the competitive, commercial model of the NCAA (Staurowsky, 2011). But Title IX's passage brought changes to women's sports. The law's mandate for equal treatment and equal opportunity meant that women's sports could no longer be treated like a little stepsister by university athletic departments. To university leaders, this meant striving to conform existing women's sports programs to the dominant, competitive, and commercial model of sports espoused by the NCAA, which had begun holding women's championships in 1981–1982. Perceiving the NCAA to be the more legitimate governing body for what would now be competitive programs in women's sports, colleges and universities withdrew their affiliations with the AIAW, causing its demise, and established the male-dominated NCAA as the premier athletic association for both men's and women's sports (Drago, Hennighausen, Rogers, Vescio, & Stauffer, 2005).

These rapid changes in the early years of Title IX explain the precipitous decline in the ranks of female leaders in women's sports. The integration of women's sports into the prevailing, high-stakes commercial model of college athletics squeezed out women leaders, with their athlete-centered, educational approach. Some left head coaching and other leadership positions rather than compromise their values, while others were likely seen as unqualified to coach newly created women's teams that were expected, like their men's counterparts, to win at all cost (Hasbrook, Hart, Mathes, & True, 1990). Men, in turn, were likely attracted to the new positions of leadership in women's sports now that those positions were infused with Title IX's promise of support and the NCAA's venire of legitimacy.

Since that time, men have been successfully competing with women for positions in women's sports, but the reverse is rarely true. Discrimination, motivated by stereotypes about women and their compatibility for leadership in competitive athletics, is believed to erect significant barriers for entry to women seeking to advance into head coaching or senior administrative positions in athletics.

Homologous Reproduction

Researchers have offered several theoretical lenses through which to examine and explain these barriers to entry. One is homologous reproduction, the tendency for the dominant group to preserve that dominance by "systematically reproducing themselves in their own image" (Stangl & Kane, 1991, p. 50). The theory helps explain why athletic departments led by men have fewer women in other positions of leadership, as several studies have shown (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Stangl & Kane, 1991; Welch & Sigelman, 2007). The homologous character of a dominant group of insiders is reproduced by extending a presumption that those of the same sex or race as the insider group are qualified to be insiders, and requiring others to prove their qualification for membership. As applied to athletics, this may explain other research findings that women who are hired for head coaching positions are in some ways better credentialed than their male counterparts (Hasbrook et al., 1990), why those credentials do not help women in the pipeline for head coaching positions as much as they help men (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002), and why "social capital" (stronger interpersonal networks) is more predictive of job success for male than for female administrators (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). It could also explain why male athletic directors are generally hired younger and at more prestigious institutions than their female counterparts (Whisenant et al., 2002). Without access to the same favorable presumptions of legitimacy, it takes women longer to reach the top.

Social Role and Role Congruity Theories

Another set of related theories, social role theory and role congruity theory, also explain how stereotypes and biases hamstring women's entry into leadership positions in college athletics. Social role theory is the idea that society has different expectations for men and women. While women are expected to be communal in nature—described with such adjectives as "affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing, and gentle"—men are ascribed "agentic" characteristics, such as "being aggressive, dominant, forceful, self-confident and self-sufficient" (Burton, Grappendorf, & Henderson, 2011). Therefore, jobs that society associates with characteristics expected of women are viewed as incompatible for men, and vice versa. Known as role congruity theory, this idea explains why jobs deemed to require communal characteristics are seen as more appropriate for women, while jobs seen to require agentic characteristics are deemed appropriate

for men. Role congruity theory also explains prejudice against both men and women who hold or aspire to positions that are inconsistent with their perceived roles.

Researchers have found evidence suggesting that role congruity theory operates in college athletic departments. For example, participants in one study perceived certain managerial qualities to be masculine, as well as associated with the expectations of an athletic director (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruening, 2009). These associations could contribute both to bias against female applicants for athletic director positions, a possibility supported by a follow-up study in which college athletic administrators predicted that a hypothetical male candidate was much more likely to be selected for an athletic director position and that a hypothetical female candidate was more likely to be selected for the position of life skills director. Internalized perceptions of gender roles and expectations about role congruity may also explain why women would engage in self-limiting behavior, such as choosing not to apply for an athletic director position or expressing disinterest in leadership (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007).

Pervasive gender roles also create the expectation that women serve as the primary caretaker of children. This expectation leads many hiring decision makers, consciously or otherwise, to assume that a female applicant for a leadership position in college athletics is less capable of succeeding in demanding job like head coach or athletic director. A male applicant may be seen as less encumbered by family responsibilities, and thus more likely to be devoted to the job (Dixon & Bruening, 2005). Expectations that women are not competitive or aggressive may also disadvantage women aspiring to head coaching positions. These expectations may also explain why positions coaching men are largely off-limits to women, and why when women are hired to coach men it is usually in men's sports with the least prestige and in the least competitive divisions (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010).

Intersectionality

Stereotypes about race and sex orientation intersect to magnify the barriers to entry experienced by those who are or are perceived to be minorities in additional ways than sex. People of color are also underrepresented among positions of power in college athletic departments, so the tendency of homologous reproduction puts women of color at a double disadvantage. Women of color also report serving a "token" candidate to help hiring committees create the appearance of inclusivity and cover for the fact that a nonminority candidate had the inside track all along (Borland & Bruening, 2010).

Heterosexism and antilebian bias suppress the hiring of women as well, due to the perception that lesbians do not comply with expected social roles for women and are thus destabilizing to male-dominated culture (Griffin, 1998). Lesbians are saddled with negative stereotypes such as sexually seductive and predatory, masculine, aggressive, and harmful toward children (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). "In general, it is perceived that lesbians are bad for the 'image of women's sport.' Lack

of sponsorship, fan support, and respect for women's sport is often blamed on the 'lesbian presence' (Krane & Barber, 2005, p. 68). These stereotypes and negative attitudes force female applicants who are lesbian to remain closeted and privilege indicia of heterosexuality. As one research participant told Borland and Bruening (2010), "The easiest way to get a head coaching position is to be married" (p. 413). A strong bias operating against a large subset of women—that is, those who are not married to male partners or can otherwise claim heterosexuality—cuts significantly into the pool of women deemed hireable by athletic departments trading in such concerns and surely contributes to women's overall underrepresentation in coaching and leadership hires.

CONSTRAINTS TO WOMEN'S ADVANCEMENT AND RETENTION

College athletic departments may be structured in ways that constrain women's opportunities to advance or remain in head coaching positions and in positions of administrative leadership. One such constraint is due to the fact that women's athletic programs, the programs to which women's coaching opportunities are effectively limited, in general receive less support than men's programs, which can set female coaches up to appear less successful than their male counterparts. A female coach with comparatively fewer assistant coaches, a lower operating budget, fewer resources for recruiting, and diminished access to quality equipment and facilities does not have the same potential for success as her well-supported male counterpart (Inglis et al., 2000). Yet, especially at the most competitive institutions, a coach's ability to produce wins is highly influential in the decision to renew her job contract. The fact that more female head coaches are found in prestigious institutions that devote more resources to women's sports (Welch & Sigelman, 2007) supports the notion that resource allocation is essential to the success of female coaches.

Another set of constraints to retention and promotion of women in athletics can be found in the way job responsibilities are distributed. Women report being "set up to fail" by the assignment of "hidden" job responsibilities and expectations that do not appear on paper (Inglis et al., 2000). Women are also more likely to be saddled with the responsibilities that are not as valued within the department. Gender equity, for example, is marginalized as an issue of concern for female staff, not the entire department (Inglis et al., 2000). Yet women who take on this responsibility may be targeted for retaliation for advancing an agenda that may conflict with the objective of the dominant group, which has a stake in men's athletics (Buzuvis, 2010).

Women's job responsibilities may also position them outside the track to advanced levels of leadership. For example, black female assistant coaches in basketball reported that they must also serve as "token recruiters" (i.e., of black female athletes) and, as a result, are not exposed to other facets of the job that would enable

Sex Discrimination in College Athletics

In 2006 two former head coaches and one former associate athletics director filed lawsuits against California State University, Fresno. The three plaintiffs, all women, alleged that they had lost their jobs in retaliation for having spoken out against sex discrimination within the athletics department. The facts of their cases demonstrate how dangerous it can be for female coaches and administrators to challenge hegemonic masculinity in athletics. At the same time, however, the outcomes of these cases should serve as a cautionary tale to deter other athletics departments from behaving similarly in the future.

One plaintiff was Associate Athletic Director Diane Milutinovich, a 22-year department veteran who in 2002 filed a complaint with the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, alleging that Fresno State was violating Title IX by failing to devote sufficient resources and opportunities to female athletes and by discriminating in the compensation of employees of women's athletics. Soon after filing this complaint, Milutinovich learned that her position had been eliminated and that she was being transferred outside the department. When she continued to advocate for gender equity in athletics, she was terminated from that position as well.

Head volleyball coach Lindy Vivas also filed a complaint about Title IX violations stemming from the department's lack of support for her program. In addition, she blew the whistle on the department's practice of awarding shorter employment contracts to female coaches. In apparent response, the athletics director decided not to renew Vivas's contract, despite her success as a coach for 14 years. Soon thereafter, the director terminated another female head coach, Stacy Johnson-Klein, who was threatening to complain pub-

licly about sexual harassment and discriminatory treatment of the women's basketball team.

All three women filed Title IX lawsuits challenging these acts of apparent retaliation. In October 2007, Fresno State settled with Milutinovich for \$3.5 million. But Vivas's and Johnson-Klein's lawsuits both went to trial, where they produced not only multimillion-dollar verdicts for the plaintiffs but volumes of testimony about the department's hostile and homophobic environment and discriminatory treatment of female coaches and staff. For example, one witness in Vivas's trial testified about the athletics director's vilification of those he perceived to be lesbians and his preference for hiring female coaches who were "straight and attractive." And the testimony in Johnson-Klein's case revealed how attractive, feminine coaches were vulnerable to sexual harassment and exploitation.

The jurors in both cases agreed that the plaintiffs were unlawfully terminated. In Johnson-Klein's case, this verdict came notwithstanding the fact Johnson-Klein had suffered from an acknowledged drug addiction, the university's stated reason for firing her. The jury nevertheless believed that her termination was retaliatory, because known drug problems in the men's basketball program were not punished as severely.

In the end, both coaches won multimillion-dollar verdicts that were the largest ever in a Title IX case. Fresno State had to pay \$4.5 million to Vivas and will pay another \$9 million to Johnson-Klein over the course of 23 years, the largest compensation ever in a Title IX case. Because of all three Fresno State plaintiffs, university athletic departments everywhere are on notice that Title IX protects those who challenge sex discrimination in athletics and that retaliation doesn't pay. ■

them to be strong, well-rounded candidates for head coaching positions (Borland & Bruening, 2010). A similar tendency was reported by women who serve as senior associate athletic directors at Division I institutions, who were kept at arms' length when it came to the facets of the job that serve as a proving ground for future athletic directors (Hoffman, 2011). A gendered division of labor among senior administrators operates to deny women the opportunity to cultivate business credentials—by

working on football and men's basketball and in such areas as fundraising, development, and contract negotiation. The areas in which women's leadership is welcome, while crucial to the department, are not valued as strongly by those setting hiring priorities (Hoffman, 2011).

Negative recruiting is another way in which female coaches are constrained in their abilities to succeed and stay or advance in their jobs (Krane & Barber, 2005). Negative recruiting is when a coach uses the perception of another coach's lesbianism during the recruiting process, in an effort to undermine her with potential players and their parents (Griffin, 1998). This tactic relies on the susceptibility of recruits and parents to the antilesbian bias, which studies show is still present in significant ways despite the improving public perception of gays and lesbians (e.g., Gill, Morrow, Collins, Lucey, & Schultz, 2006; Sartore & Cunningham, 2008). Relatedly, married male coaches are able to use their wives and children to help construct the image of their team as "family" in order to enhance their recruiting efforts. This tactic trades in heterosexual and marital privilege as it is unavailable to unmarried female coaches. These gendered recruiting practices have the potential to put many female coaches at a distinct professional disadvantage, especially in programs with high expectations for head coaches to recruit a winning team.

STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVE

Success Coaching Men: A Product of Belief

Jennifer Kolins is the head coach of the men's and women's tennis teams at Western New England University in Springfield, Massachusetts. She is among the small minority of women who coach male athletes at the college level. Though she did not set out to coach men, she attributes her unique position to her own playing experience growing up with mostly male opponents and teammates in high school and in the National Junior Tennis League. Having played successfully with and against boys, it never occurred to Kolins that she could not coach them. In 2001 Western New England hired Kolins to head coach both the established men's and the then-fledgling women's teams.

Today, the athletic department's website touts Kolins's .591 winning percentage for the men's team, .689 winning percentage for the women's teams, among the highest of coaches in the region. But to Kolins, success is the cultivation of her athletes' self-confidence, a cornerstone of their overall development as students. This attitude underscores her strong, athlete-centered coaching philosophy, which she modeled after that of her tennis hero, Arthur Ashe, who taught that success is an outcome of believing in oneself.

As a female coach of male athletes, Kolins certainly faces challenges that men in her position would not. Opposing coaches and parents of recruits have, on initial

contact with Kolins, questioned her knowledge, ability, and authority. But it is hard for anyone who knows Kolins to hold onto these negative stereotypes for long. Kolins's athletes, successful on and off the court, reflect well on her coaching and convey respect for her and the program she leads. Kolins also benefits from a supportive department, strong mentors, and an understanding partner. But at the root of Kolins's success is the same philosophy that she espouses to her athletes. To succeed—whether as a student, a player, or a coach—you've got to believe you can. And Kolins certainly believes. ■

Female coaches who coach men are also constrained in their jobs by the unique challenges they face to cultivating credibility and respect among athletes, parents, and officials. These women have also reported difficulty cultivating mentors in the profession, since they have virtually no female colleagues within their sport and because many male coaches may be deterred by pride or ego from extending professional support to a female opposing coach (Kamphoff et al., 2010).

WOMEN'S MOTIVATION AND INTEREST

The biases and job constraints not only operate as formal barriers to women's entry, retention, and advancement in college athletic leadership but influence women's desire to pursue or stay in those careers as well. Female athletes have reported less interest in pursuing coaching careers than male athletes for reasons that include many that are gendered in nature, such as the perception that female and minority coaches are treated differently than male and white coaches and that they are held back by exceeding pressure to win (Kamphoff & Gill, 2008).

Researchers examining why female coaches have reported less desire to remain in coaching than their male counterparts have found compelling evidence to suggest that these desires are constructed by the constraints of the workplace. For example, a survey of assistant coaches revealed that women who experience the workplace of the athletic department to be inclusive—that is, free from sexual and racial harassment, accepting of all sexual orientations, striving for equal representation of men and women, and supportive of female coaches' career longevity—are more likely to desire a long career in college athletics (Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2003). And former coaches interviewed by another researcher suggested that inequitable allocation of resources, facilities, compensation, job duties, and administrative support strongly motivated their desires to leave the profession (Kamphoff, 2010).

Due to gendered cultural norms around caretaking, women are more likely to be required to engage in stressful contortions to balance professional and family responsibilities. Coaching is a particularly challenging career to balance with parenting, as it requires availability evenings and weekends when children are not in school and when day care is not readily available (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). This conflict can deter women from continuing on in coaching careers (Bruening & Dixon, 2007), and indeed former coaches with children have reported that they were motivated to leave the profession in part by the lack of support for their caregiving responsibilities (Kamphoff, 2010).

Homophobia and negative recruiting also detrimentally affect women's desires to remain in coaching. Both create internal pressure on women of all sexual orientations to suppress their homosexuality or conform to a heterosexual norm. Both those who can conform and those who cannot can experience this requirement as a source of stress and dissatisfaction and may be influenced by it to abandon career aspirations in college coaching (Kamphoff, 2010; Krane & Barber, 2005).

CONCLUSION

As many sport scholars have acknowledged, the gender imbalance in coaching and athletic leadership is an important social problem because it is rooted in the hegemonic masculinity of sport. The stereotypes, role conflicts, and job constraints discussed in this chapter all operate to construct the appearance that women are less qualified, and less interested, in positions of athletic leadership, so that the narrow associations between sport, leadership, and masculinity remain unchallenged. Women are underrepresented in athletic leadership because their presence there is destabilizing to the patriarchy. But it is precisely because of their destabilizing potential that women must be seen in positions of athletic leadership (Kane, 2001). Not only does their presence suggest “that the field of coaching is a legitimate option with respect to employment, but the visibility and responsibility associated with coaching implies that women are capable of leadership positions of any kind” (Stahura & Greenwood, 2002, p. 2). Therefore, efforts must continue to expose and suppress the bias and stereotypes that infect hiring decisions, to eliminate double standards and job constraints, to affirmatively address and compensate for women’s greater family demands and unique vulnerability to homophobia and negative recruiting, and to compensate for women’s lack of existing power and social capital that is necessary for advancement and success in college athletic leadership.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Why is it important that women are adequately represented among leaders in college athletics?
 2. Does hegemonic masculinity explain how and why biases, stereotypes, and job constraints operate to suppress women’s entry and advancement in athletic leadership?
 3. What should athletic department and other university officials take away from this chapter?
-

References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2012). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study 35-year update: 1977–2012*. Retrieved from www.acostacarpenter.org
- Borland, J. F., & Bruening, J. E. (2010). Navigating barriers: A qualitative examination of the underrepresentation of black females as head coaches in collegiate basketball. *Sport Management Review, 13*, 407–420. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2010.05.002
- Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching II: Managing role conflict. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377–406.
- Burton, L. J., Barr, C. A., Fink, J. S., & Bruening, J. E. (2009). Think athletic director, think masculine? Examination of the gender typing of managerial subroles within athletic administration positions. *Sex Roles, 61*, 416–426. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9632-6

- Burton, L. J., Grappendort, H., & Henderson, A. (2011). Perceptions of gender in athletic administration: Utilizing role congruity to examine (potential) prejudice against women. *Journal of Sport Management, 25*(1), 36–45.
- Buzuvis, E. E. (2010). Sidelined: Title IX retaliation cases and women's leadership in college athletics. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy, 17*, 1.
- Coakley, J. J. (2008). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2002). The differential effects of human capital for male and female Division I basketball coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 73*, 489–495. doi:10.1080/02701367.2002.10609051
- Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F. B. (2003). Coaching self-efficacy, desire to become a head coach, and occupational turnover intent: Gender differences between NCAA assistant coaches of women's teams. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 34*(2), 125–137.
- 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
- . (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377–406.
- Drago, R., Hennighausen, L., Rogers, J., Vescio, T., & Stauffer, K. D. (2005). Final report for CAGE, the Coaching and Gender Equity Project. Retrieved from <http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/CAGEfinalreport.doc>
- Festle, M. J. (1996). *Playing nice: Politics and apologies in women's sports*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gill, D. L., Morrow, R. G., Collins, K. E., Lucey, A. B., & Schultz, A. M. (2006). Attitudes and sexual prejudice in sport and physical activity. *Journal of Sport Management, 20*, 554–564.
- Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sport* (paperback ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hasbrook, C. A., Hart, B. A., Mathes, S. A., & True, S. (1990). Sex bias and the validity of believed differences between male and female interscholastic athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 61*, 259–267. doi:10.1080/02701367.1990.10608688
- Hoffman, J. L. (2011). Inside the huddle: Gender stereotyping work among senior level women athletic administrators. *International Journal of Sport Management, 12*, 255–274.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women's Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 9*(2), 1–26.
- Trick, E. (2011). *NCAA race and gender demographics, 1995–2011*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from <http://web1.ncaa.org/rgdSearch/exec/main>
- Kamphoff, C. S. (2010). Bargaining with patriarchy: Former female coaches' experiences and their decision to leave collegiate coaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 81*, 360–372.
- Kamphoff, C. S., Armentrout, S. M., & Driska, A. (2010). The token female: Women's experiences as Division I collegiate head coaches of men's teams. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 3*, 297–315.
- Kamphoff, C. S., & Gill, D. (2008). Collegiate athletes' perceptions of the coaching profession. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 3*(1), 55–72. doi:10.1260/174795408784089351
- Kane, M. J. (2001). Leadership, sport, and gender. In S. J. Freeman, S. C. Bourque, & C. M. Shelton (Eds.), *Women on power: Leadership redefined* (pp. 114–146). Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Krane, V., & Barber, H. (2005). Identity tensions in lesbian intercollegiate coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76*(1), 67–81. doi:10.1080/02701367.2005.10599263
- Messner, M. (1988). Sport and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 5*, 197–211.
- Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G. B. (2004). Does having “the right stuff” matter? Gender differences in the determinants of career success among intercollegiate athletic administrators. *Sex Roles, 50*, 411–421. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000018895.68011.fa
- Sartore, M. L., & Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Explaining the under-representation of women in leadership positions of sport organizations: A symbolic interactionist perspective. *Quest, 59*, 244–265. doi:10.1080/00336297.2007.10483551
- Stahura, K. A., & Greenwood, M. (2002). Sex of head coach as a function of sport type prestige and institutional structure. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual, 17*, 1–25.
- Stangl, J. M., & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of

- homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8(1), 47–60.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (2011). A radical proposal: Title IX has no role in college sport pay-for-play discussions. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 22, 575–595.
- Welch, S., & Sigelman, L. (2007). Who's calling the shots? Women coaches in Division I women's sports. *Social Science Quarterly*, 88, 1415–1434. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00509.x
- Whisenant, W. A., Pedersen, P. M., & Obenour, B. L. (2002). Success and gender: Determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles*, 47, 485–491. doi:10.1023/A:1021656628604
- Willis, P. (1982). *Women in sport in ideology*. In J. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Sport, culture and ideology* (pp. 117–135). London: Routledge.