

“Think Athletic Director, Think Masculine?”: Examination of the Gender Typing of Managerial Subroles Within Athletic Administration Positions

Laura J. Burton · Carol A. Barr · Janet S. Fink · Jennifer E. Bruening

Published online: 7 May 2009
© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2009

Abstract To examine the influence of gender stereotyping of administration positions in intercollegiate athletics, the present study evaluated the gender typing of managerial subroles by undergraduate and graduate sport management students from two northeastern universities in the U.S. (59 women, 189 men). Participants indicated importance of managerial subroles for the positions of athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator. Participants rated masculine managerial subroles as most important for athletic director, however feminine managerial subroles were rated of similar importance for both the life skills coordinator and the athletic director. There were no differences between women and men on evaluation of the importance of managerial subroles across all positions. Results of the current study provide some support for role congruity theory within athletic administration.

Keywords Athletic administration · Gender role stereotyping · Managerial subroles

Introduction

A persistent decline in the number of women represented in intercollegiate athletic administration positions has continued

despite the increases in girls and women’s participation in sports (Acosta and Carpenter 2008). Scholars have examined the lack of women in senior level athletic administration positions from a variety of theoretical frameworks, including homologous reproduction, hegemonic masculinity, human capital theory, social capital theory, symbolic interactionist theory, among others (Sagas and Cunningham 2004; Sartore and Cunningham 2007; Whisenant and Mullane 2007; Whisenant et al. 2002). However, there has been little research designed to use gender role theory as a framework to specifically explore if senior level athletic administration positions are constructed in a manner that may be biased toward women. Researchers have used gender role theory as a theoretical framework in order to understand why as more women have entered into entry level and mid-level management positions at rates comparable to their male counterparts, there is a persistent lack of women in leadership positions within management in both the United States and other major industrialized countries (Catalyst 2009; Eagly and Karau 2002). When gender role stereotypes are applied to men and women, certain jobs can be viewed as more appropriate for men or women (Cejka and Eagly 1999; Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra 2006; Sartore and Cunningham 2007). For this particular study, we used the tenants of gender role theory to examine whether the expectations and perceptions of managerial subroles required of senior athletic administrators were stereotyped as more masculine, more feminine or more gender neutral. Specifically, we examined the gender typing of managerial subroles when evaluating three positions in intercollegiate athletics: athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator using a sample of undergraduate and graduate sport management students attending two major northeastern US universities.

L. J. Burton (✉) · J. S. Fink · J. E. Bruening
Department of Kinesiology, University of Connecticut,
2095 Hillside Road, Unit #1110,
Storrs, CT 06269, USA
e-mail: laura.burton@uconn.edu

C. A. Barr
Department of Sport Management, University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, MA, USA

Women's Under Representation in Athletic Administration

Since the implementation of Title IX, Acosta and Carpenter have systematically tracked playing opportunities, as well as coaching and administrative positions, for girls and women. While the data regarding participation opportunities show increases in the number of women playing sports, data show steep declines in the percentage of women in coaching and administration. In 2008, only 42.8% of women's intercollegiate teams have women head coaches compared to over 90% of women's teams coached by women prior to 1972 (Acosta and Carpenter 2008). The most glaring lack of female representation occurs at the athletic director position, with women holding 21.3% of those positions. This statistic is even more alarming at the Division I level where only 29 women (8.4%) hold the position of athletic director. Analysis of the data provided by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (DeHass 2007) comparing the number of men and women represented in various administrative positions across all divisions revealed that men were significantly overrepresented in all administrative positions except the senior women's administrator (SWA) and life skills coordinator categories. Three positions had a balanced representation of men and women: academic advisor, compliance coordinator, and ticket manager.

Several theoretical frameworks have been utilized to study male and female representation in athletic administration and to try to understand why the percentage of women in these positions has continued to decline since the passage of Title IX. Results from studies using various theoretical frameworks have provided several important findings. For example, within the context of interscholastic athletics, Lovett and Lowry (1994), Stangl and Kane (1991), and Whisenant and Mullane (2007) applied the theory of homologous reproduction first conceived by Kanter (1977). Kanter (1977) proposed that those in control within organizations carefully guard their power and privilege through homologous reproduction or the selection of those who they see as like them in the hiring and promotional processes. Lovett and Lowry (1994) and Stangl and Kane (1991) found support for homologous reproduction within the Texas and Ohio interscholastic athletic departments; whereas Whisenant and Mullane (2007) did not find support for homologous reproduction as a factor in sustaining the male dominated structure of high school athletics in Florida. Within intercollegiate athletics, Whisenant et al. (2002) found the presence of hegemonic masculinity, defined as the reproduction and maintenance of power by certain social groups over others.

Sartore and Cunningham (2007) applied a symbolic interactionist perspective which proposes that gender-role meanings and stereotypes associated with sport may limit the ability of women to hold leadership positions within

sport organizations. Additionally, studies have shown women within senior leadership positions continue to be relegated to athletic director positions at Division II and Division III universities; these positions tend to be considered less powerful or less esteemed positions when compared to Division I athletic director positions (Whisenant et al. 2002). Women within intercollegiate athletics also reported being relegated to less important administrative responsibilities within their positions in athletic departments, including being assigned to oversee more female appropriate sports (e.g., tennis, gymnastics, golf) instead of the more significant, revenue producing sports (e.g., football, basketball) (Inglis et al. 2000). Further, there is empirical evidence that male athletic administrators with high social capital investments (i.e., investments in personal networks and contacts) advance more often than men with lower social capital investment, but this difference is not observed for female administrators. This difference suggests that there may be discrimination in the hiring process, as men are rewarded for their social capital investments, but women are not benefiting from such investments (Sagas and Cunningham 2004).

Gender Role Stereotyping in Management

While the proceeding literature has provided important insights into women's under-representation in athletic administration, it has not explicitly examined sociological influences on this phenomena. Schein (2007) contends that a major barrier to women's progress within management positions is the result of continued gender stereotyping of the managerial position (Schein 2007). Social role theory (Eagly et al. 2000) posits that not only are there expectations regarding the roles men and women occupy, but also that there are qualities and behavioral tendencies believed to be desirable for each gender (Eagly 1987). Based on gender role expectations, women are ascribed more communal attributes such as being affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing, and gentle, traits that women are believed to possess (i.e., descriptive) and also traits women 'should' demonstrate (i.e., prescriptive). Men are ascribed more agentic attributes including being aggressive, dominant, forceful, self-confident and self-sufficient, traits men are believed to possess and 'should' demonstrate (Eagly 1987; Eagly and Karau 2002; Heilman 2001).

In agreement with social role theory and outlined by Schein's early research (1975), characteristics described as important to managers were perceived to be those same characteristics most often associated with men. Leadership ability, desires, responsibility and objectivity were perceived as characteristics important to management and much more likely to be associated with men rather than

women (Schein 2007). The phrase “think manager, think male” first coined by Schein (1975) continues to be supported in current literature examining gender stereotyping in management (Duehr and Bono 2006; Heilman et al. 1989; Martell et al. 1998; Powell et al. 2002; Schein 2001, 2007; Willemsen 2002).

In addition to the continued perception of “think manager, think male”, the sex-matching model (Kiesler 1975) can also provide information regarding why men and women continue to be constrained to particular positions in organizations. The sex-matching model indicates that “men and women are matched to specific jobs based on the ratio of men and women currently occupying such positions” (Sartore and Cunningham 2007, p. 248). Within this model, if more women occupy the majority of positions within a current field, women are perceived as better matches for those positions and the same holds true for men (Glick et al. 1988). Following this line of thinking, then, role congruity theory outlines how, when considering male dominated occupations, the perceptions for success indicate a requirement of masculine personality qualities (e.g., competitive, aggressive, dominant) and/or masculine physical qualities (Cejka and Eagly 1999). This also holds for female dominated occupations, with success requiring feminine personality qualities (e.g., affectionate, nurturing, sympathetic) and/or feminine physical qualities (Cejka and Eagly 1999).

Women face discrimination in management and leadership positions through two mechanisms as described within role congruity theory (Eagly and Karau 2002). First, women are less favorably evaluated for leadership positions, as leadership behavior is characterized by masculine or agentic roles. Second, when women engage in masculine or male-dominated roles or behaviors (i.e., aggressive, ambitious, independent, self-confident), such as those perceived as necessary in management and leadership positions, they are evaluated less favorably than men (Eagly and Karau 2002). Therefore, women are exposed to discrimination from two directions; if women conform to their stereotypical gender roles (i.e., communal roles) they are perceived as lacking the stereotypical skills perceived as

necessary to be successful leaders or managers. In addition, if women do demonstrate the skills perceived as necessary to be successful managers (i.e., agentic roles) they are violating their stereotypical gender roles and are viewed negatively for such violations (Eagly and Karau 2002).

To summarize, management is stereotyped as a masculine domain requiring agentic characteristics more strongly attributed to men. As a result, women may be a) perceived as lacking the appropriate traits required to be successful managers (Eagly and Karau 2002) or b) if women do develop or possess agentic behaviors to be successful managers, they can be negatively evaluated for their success (Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra 2006; Heilman 2001; Heilman, et al. 1989; Rudman and Glick 2001). In a male-dominated organization such as intercollegiate athletics, where men hold the highest positions of power, particularly in Division I athletics (Acosta and Carpenter 2008; DeHass 2007), women desiring to hold leadership or management positions may face these two forms of discrimination (Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra 2006).

Gender Subroles and Stereotyping

Schein (2007) noted that gender stereotyping of managerial positions perpetuates a bias toward women in selection to management roles, training and advancement to upper level positions. Further, research has examined if managerial roles can be divided into subroles, and whether those subroles are gender-typed (Atwater et al. 2004). Yukl (2002) developed a taxonomy of managerial subroles that can be used to better understand the variety of roles that managers engage in to be effective within management. Using Yukl’s (2002) subrole classification, Atwater et al. (2004) were able to examine if particular subroles were associated with stereotypical masculine or feminine behaviors. Atwater et al. (2004) identified 13 of 19 managerial subroles as either more masculine or more feminine. Additionally, they identified “gender neutral” subroles (please refer to Table 1 for a list of these managerial subroles). Subroles which were identified as masculine included allocating resources, delegating and punishing;

Table 1 Gender typing of managerial subroles reported from Atwater et al. (2004).

Subrole	Masculine	Feminine	Gender Neutral
	allocating resources	planning and organizing	evaluating employees
	delegating	developing and monitoring personnel	clarifying roles and objectives
	disciplining	recognizing and rewarding	monitoring work activities
	strategic decision making	supporting	networking
	punishing	communicating and informing	managing conflict
	problem solving	motivating and inspiring	consulting others
		providing corrective feedback	

feminine subroles included providing corrective feedback, planning and organizing, and supporting employees (Atwater et al. 2004). Given this stereotyping of subroles, men and women can be perceived as acting outside of their stereotypical gender roles when engaging in certain managerial roles (Atwater et al. 2004).

By examining subroles through the lens of gender stereotyping, researchers can explore if men and women are constrained from particular management positions which may contain gender typed managerial subroles identified as inappropriate for a particular gender. However, there has been a noted shift in perceptions of traits necessary to be successful managers and leaders. Duehr and Bono (2006) reported that current views of successful managers included more communal behaviors (i.e., feminine) and less agentic (i.e., masculine) behaviors when compared with earlier research regarding stereotypical characteristics of successful managers. In addition, Sczesny (2003) has reported development of a more androgynous view of managerial and leadership skills. Given the noted changes in perceptions of skills necessary to be successful managers, it may be necessary to reassess the gender stereotyping of managerial subroles as reported by Atwater et al. (2004).

The purpose of this research was to extend Atwater et al.'s (2004) work in the context of intercollegiate athletic administration. In particular, we sought to examine the gender typing of managerial subroles for three specific positions in intercollegiate athletics: athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator. Intercollegiate athletic administration offers an appropriate setting to study such phenomena as certain positions have been shown to be dominated by men (e.g., athletic director) or women (e.g. life skills coordinator) while some positions are spread nearly equally (e.g., compliance coordinator).

Given the aforementioned background, we propose the following hypotheses:

- Hypothesis 1: Masculine managerial subroles, relative to feminine subroles and gender neutral subroles, will be rated as most important for the athletic director position.
- Hypothesis 2: Feminine managerial subroles, relative to masculine subroles and gender neutral subroles will be rated as most important for the life skills coordinator position.
- Hypothesis 3: Gender neutral managerial subroles, relative to feminine and masculine subroles, will be rated as most important for the compliance coordinator position.

Men and women hold different perceptions of the importance of various managerial roles. For example, male managers, more often than females, perceive masculine

qualities as important to success in management and this has been consistently found in research from the 1970s through early 2000 (Schein 2007). These findings have also been consistent for male undergraduate and graduate students (Powell et al. 2002; Schein 2001). In contrast, female managers and students hold the perception that masculine and feminine characteristics are equally necessary to be successful managers (Schein 2001). However, a potential shift in views of successful managers may be occurring. Specifically, male managers' perceptions of women as successful managers has increased (Duehr and Bono 2006; Powell et al. 2002). Yet, this change in perceptions of women and managers has not been demonstrated in perceptions held by male college students; the stereotype of "think manager, think male" still exists in this population (Duehr and Bono 2006; Martell and Desmet 2001; Rudman and Kilianski 2000; Schein 2001). Given that male hegemony continues to exist within the sport setting (Fink 2008; Whisenant 2008), this world view may hold particularly true for male sport management students as part of the male college student subset and as they prepare to enter a male-dominated field. This leads to our last hypothesis:

- Hypothesis 4: Participant's gender will significantly influence the ratings of importance of managerial subroles. Females, compared to males, will rate feminine and gender neutral subroles as more important for all positions compared to males.

In summary, hypothesis 1 predicted that for the position of athletic director masculine managerial subroles, relative to feminine subroles and gender neutral subroles, would be rated as most important for the athletic director position. For hypothesis 2, feminine managerial subroles, relative to masculine subroles and gender neutral subroles would be rated as most important for the life skills coordinator position. Hypothesis 3 predicted that for the position of compliance coordinator gender neutral managerial subroles would be rated as most important when compared to feminine and masculine subroles. Finally, hypothesis 4 predicted female participants, compared to male participants, would rate feminine and gender neutral subroles as more important for all positions.

Method

Pre-test Evaluation of the Gender Typing of Managerial Subroles

As the work of Atwater et al. was nearly four years old at the time of the study, and tested a different population of

students (business versus sport management), we wanted to determine whether a current population of sport management students would similarly gender type the managerial subroles as identified by Atwater et al. (2004). As noted by Duehr and Bono (2006), the gender typing of leadership behaviors seemed to have shifted somewhat since Atwater's initial work. Thus, undergraduate students in sport management (males = 74, females = 33) were surveyed. These students were in a different section of the same class as the participants in the main study. In this "pre-test", we were only concerned with how the participants rated the different roles. No job descriptions were provided, nor were they asked the importance of these roles relative to different jobs as was undertaken in the main study described later. These participants rated to what extent they believed the various roles identified by Atwater et al. were more characteristically masculine, feminine, or gender neutral. Results were analyzed using nonparametric binomial tests with a significance level of $p < .05$ for comparison of masculine to feminine ratings, masculine to can't say (i.e. gender neutral) ratings, and feminine to can't say ratings (see Table 2).

When compared to the results reported from Atwater et al., this sample of undergraduate sport management students similarly classified 12 of 19 managerial subroles. Table 1 shows that eight masculine subroles, five feminine subroles, and six gender neutral subroles were identified as significantly different from each other ($p < .05$). Differences in ratings for managerial subroles comparing the current participants with the categorization reported by Atwater et al. are listed in Table 2.

Because the managerial subroles were classified differently by a population of sport management students, it was necessary to reconfirm the underlying factor structure for the managerial subroles (i.e., masculine, feminine, gender neutral) prior to analysis of the data to establish that the items best measured that particular subrole. Exploratory factor analysis using principal components analysis with varimax rotation was used to collapse the 19 managerial subroles identified by Atwater et al. (2004). As a result of the limited sample available for analysis, each managerial subrole factor was examined individually to assess the strength of each item's loading

Table 2 Proportion tests indicating the extent to which each subrole was rated as masculine, feminine, or can't say.

Proportion of respondents indicating gender of role ^a					
Managerial subrole	Masculine (A)	Feminine (B)	Can't say (C)	Comparison of proportions ^b	Similar classification to Atwater et al. (2004) ^c
Providing corrective feedback	.21 (23)	.35 (37)	.43 (42)	AB, AC	No
Allocating resources	.44 (47)	.21 (22)	.35 (38)	AB, BC	Yes
Planning and organizing	.21 (22)	.60 (64)	.19 (21)	AB, AC	Yes
Evaluating employees	.53 (57)	.13 (14)	.33 (35)	AB, AC, BC	No
Developing and mentoring personnel	.38 (41)	.31 (33)	.30 (32)		
Delegating	.58 (62)	.08 (9)	.33 (35)	AB, AC, BC	Yes
Managing conflict	.60 (64)	.19 (21)	.19 (21)	AB, AC	Yes
Recognizing and rewarding employees	.17 (18)	.45 (48)	.37 (40)	AB, AC	Yes
Disciplining	.86 (92)	.06 (6)	.08 (9)	AB, AC	Yes
Consulting others	.10 (11)	.72 (77)	.18 (19)	AB, BC	No
Motivating and inspiring	.42 (45)	.25 (27)	.33 (35)	AB	No
Strategic decision making	.47 (51)	.10 (11)	.41 (44)	AB, BC	Yes
Communicating and informing	.15 (16)	.50 (54)	.33 (35)	AB, AC	Yes
Problem solving	.31 (33)	.18 (19)	.51 (55)	AC, BC	No
Networking	.37 (39)	.23 (25)	.39 (42)	BC	Yes
Punishing	.87 (93)	.04 (4)	.07 (8)	AB, AC	Yes
Supporting	.07 (8)	.77 (82)	.15 (16)	AB, BC	Yes
Monitoring work activities	.41 (44)	.14 (15)	.44 (47)	AB, BC	Yes
Clarifying roles and objectives	.34 (36)	.21 (23)	.45 (48)	BC	No

z Tests for differences between proportions were performed for each response category

^a Frequencies are in parentheses

^b AB, AC, BC indicate that proportions in those columns differed significantly $p < .05$

^c Comparison of results from current study to results reported by Atwater et al. (2004). Yes indicates managerial subroles were similarly classified in both studies

on a single factor. The following factors were analyzed: masculine management subrole, feminine management subrole, and gender neutral management subrole. The analysis revealed four factors: masculine management subrole 1, masculine management subrole 2, feminine management subrole, and gender neutral management subrole. The masculine management subrole 1 included the following items from the scale: allocating resources, delegating, managing conflict, strategic decision making, and motivating and inspiring. The three items that loaded on a separate factor were punishing, evaluating employees, and disciplining, which were labeled as masculine management subrole 2. The items included in the feminine management subrole included planning and organizing, recognizing and rewarding employees, communicating and informing, consulting others, and supporting. For the gender neutral management subrole the following items were included: providing corrective feedback, developing and mentoring personnel, clarifying roles and objectives, problem solving, networking, and monitoring work activities. Results of the EFA are reported in Table 3.

Importance Evaluations of the Managerial Subroles for Athletic Administration Positions

Participants in the Main Study

The participants were students (separate from the sample used in the pre-test to classify the managerial subroles) enrolled in upper level management courses in sport management programs at two major Northeast universities ($N=248$). Fifty-nine women and 189 men completed the survey. The majority of the participants identified as White ($n=209$). The majority of participants (67.5%) were between the ages of 18 and 21.

Procedures

Participants were provided a letter of introduction and information regarding the research project at the beginning of their class from the instructors of record. The study received approval by the authors' university institutional review boards. Participants were informed that a research study was being conducted to determine

the importance of managerial subroles relative to certain positions within athletic departments. The surveys were distributed during the last ten minutes of class and students were informed that completion of the survey was voluntary. There were no incentives provided to participants for their participation.

The three athletic administration positions were chosen based on data obtained from the NCAA (DeHass 2007) that recorded the number of men and women in specific administration positions at the Division I level. Based on analysis of that data, men were significantly overrepresented in the position of athletic director and women were significantly overrepresented in the position of life skills coordinator. Men and women were equally represented in the position of compliance coordinator. Job descriptions were obtained from major Division I athletic departments for each of the three positions. From these, six job responsibilities that were identified as major components within each position announcement were included in the survey (see Appendix for the athletic director position as an example). To ensure that the selected job responsibilities accurately reflected the administration position listed, a panel of six experts (four graduate students in sport management who had work experience within athletic administration and two sport management faculty members) examined the job descriptions for face validity. Based on results of the expert panel, a brief job description comprised of the responsibilities for each position was provided on the survey. After reading the job description for each position, participants had to indicate on a five-point Likert type scale (5 = most important to 1 = least important) the level of importance of each managerial subrole for athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator.

Managerial Subrole Importance

The importance of managerial subroles for athletic director, compliance coordinator, and life skills coordinator were measured using items in Atwater et al. (2004) list of managerial subroles. A total of 19 managerial subroles were rated on a Likert type scale (5 = most important to 1 = least important) (see Table 1 for the list of managerial subroles).

Table 3 Exploratory factor analysis for managerial subroles.

Dimension	Eigenvalue	Variance explained by 1st principal component	Factor loadings (in order of items)
Masculine subrole 1	2.41	30.19	.802, .635, .634, .614
Masculine subrole 2	1.97	24.96	.834, .812, .455
Feminine subrole	1.73	34.60	.710, .578, .565, .554, .516
Gender neutral subrole	1.95	32.53	.730, .646, .580, .576, .421, .395

Results

Prior to analyzing the hypotheses, a mean score was calculated for each of the four gender managerial subroles. A score for a gender managerial subrole was calculated by summing the individual scores for each item in the subrole and calculating the mean for that subrole. As an example, for masculine 2 subrole, a mean was computed from the item scores for punishing, evaluating employees, and disciplining. Cronbach's alpha scores were derived for the four gender managerial subroles; for masculine subrole 1, $\alpha=.78$, for masculine subrole 2, $\alpha=.75$, for feminine subrole, $\alpha=.73$, and for gender neutral subrole, $\alpha=.75$. Means and standard deviations of the subroles across all position descriptions are listed in Table 4.

To evaluate the hypotheses, a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The within subjects factor was position description and consisted of three levels (athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator). The between subjects variable was sex of evaluator. The dependent variables were importance ratings on the four gender managerial subroles, masculine subrole 1, masculine subrole 2, feminine subrole, and gender neutral subrole.

Means and standard deviations were obtained for variables of interest by position description (Table 5). The results of the repeated measures MANOVA indicated that there were significant differences due to the within subjects factor of position on the dependent measures, Wilks $\Lambda=.47$ $F(8, 236) = 33.63$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.53$. The results for the between subjects factor of sex of evaluator (Wilks $\Lambda=.97$ $F(4, 240) = 1.30$, $p=.271$) and the sex by position interaction (Wilks $\Lambda=.99$ $F(8, 236) = .67$, $p=.719$) were not significant.

Follow-up ANOVAs on each dependent variable revealed that the ANOVA for the masculine subrole 1 subscale was significant, $F(2, 243) = 90.47$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.27$; the ANOVA for the masculine subrole 2 subscale was significant $F(2,$

243) = 25.97, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.10$; and the ANOVA for the feminine subrole subscale was significant $F(2, 243) = 13.54$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.05$. The ANOVA for the gender neutral subrole subscale was not significant ($F(2, 243) = .856$, $p=.425$).

Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate significant differences among these means. In support of hypothesis 1, that masculine managerial subroles, relative to feminine subroles and gender neutral subroles, would be rated as most important for the athletic director position, the importance rating for the masculine subrole 1 subscale ($M=4.27$, $SD=.035$) was highest for the athletic director position, and significantly higher than its rating in the life skills coordinator position ($M=3.69$, $SD=.045$), or for the compliance coordinator position ($M=3.73$, $SD=.048$) (Please refer to Table 5). The importance rating for the masculine subrole 2 subscale was highest for the athletic director position ($M=3.52$, $SD=.054$) and significantly higher than its rating for the life skills coordinator position ($M=3.01$, $SD=.065$), but not significantly different from the ratings on the scale for the compliance coordinator position ($M=3.46$, $SD=.070$), lending partial support for hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 predicted that feminine managerial subroles, relative to masculine subroles and gender neutral subroles would be rated as most important for the life skills coordinator position. The importance rating for the feminine subscale was highest for the life skills coordinator ($M=4.12$, $SD=.039$), and was significantly higher than its rating on the compliance coordinator position ($M=3.93$, $SD=.041$), yet not significantly different than its rating for the athletic director's position ($M=4.09$, $SD=.037$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was only partially supported.

There were no significant differences in ratings of the gender neutral subroles by position, thus hypothesis 3 which predicted that for the position of compliance coordinator gender neutral managerial subroles would be rated as most important when compared to feminine and masculine subroles, was not supported. And finally, hypothesis 4 predicted female participants, compared to

Table 4 Means, standard deviations, and individual items for each subrole.

Subrole	Masculine subrole 1	Masculine subrole 2	Feminine subrole	Gender neutral subrole
	allocating resources	punishing	planning and organizing	providing corrective feedback
	delegating	disciplining	consulting others	clarifying roles and objectives
	managing conflict	evaluating employees	recognizing and rewarding	developing and monitoring personnel
	strategic decision making		supporting	networking
	motivating and inspiring		communicating and informing	problem solving
				monitoring work activities
Mean	3.87	3.32	4.01	3.95
SD	.437	.604	.425	.427
Alpha	$\alpha=.78$	$\alpha=.75$	$\alpha=.73$	$\alpha=.75$

Scale range (5 = most important to 1 = least important)

Table 5 Means and Standard deviations on the subscales by position.

Subscale	Position	Mean	SD
Masculine subrole 1	Athletic Director (AD) (1)	4.27** ^a	.035
	Life Skills Coordinator (LFC)	3.69	.045
	Compliance Coordinator (CC)	3.73	.048
Masculine subrole 2	Athletic Director (AD) (2)	3.52** ^b	.054
	Life Skills Coordinator (LFC)	3.01	.065
	Compliance Coordinator (CC)	3.46	.070
Feminine subrole	Athletic Director (AD) (1)	4.09	.037
	Life Skills Coordinator (LFC) (3)	4.12* ^c	.039
	Compliance Coordinator (CC)	3.93	.041
Gender neutral subrole	Athletic Director (AD) (1)	4.00	.037
	Life Skills Coordinator (LFC)	3.95	.041
	Compliance Coordinator (CC)	3.97	.039

Scale range (5 = most important to 1 = least important)

**^a significant differences between mean score of AD and LFC, CC at $p < .001$;

**^b significant difference between mean score of AD and LFC at $p < .001$;

*^c significant difference between mean score of LFC and CC at $p < .01$

male participants, would rate feminine and gender neutral subroles as more important for all positions. No significant differences were revealed in ratings among males and females on the subscales failing to support hypothesis 4.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to examine the gender typing of managerial subroles for three specific positions in intercollegiate athletics, athletic director, compliance coordinator, and life skills coordinator. In response to hypothesis 1, gender role stereotyping of athletic administration positions, specifically for the position of athletic director, was mainly supported by the results of this research. Masculine subroles (i.e., allocating resources, delegating, managing conflict, strategic decision making, and motivating and inspiring) were considered significantly more important for the position of athletic director than for the other two positions. And, the masculine subrole 1 had the highest mean score on the importance ratings for the athletic director position ($M=4.27$). In addition, the masculine subrole 2 items showed a significant difference between level of importance for the athletic director position in comparison to the life skills coordinator, positions predominantly held by men and women respectively. These findings support previous research that indicated masculine characteristics are considered most important for the highest level of management (Atwater et al. 2004; Eagly and Karau 2002; Heilman 2001).

These results may indicate that women are at a disadvantage when trying to secure an athletic director position. Even though it is true that women can possess masculine characteristics and have the ability to carry out managerial roles that are defined as masculine (e.g., allocating resources, managing conflict), the tenets of gender role theory indicate that women are not perceived

as having the capability of engaging in those behaviors comparable to men. And women who engage in behaviors that are considered in violation of the prescriptive norms for the female gender role (i.e., how women 'should' behave) are likely to elicit negative evaluations for such behavior (Eagly and Karau 2002; Heilman 2001). Therefore, if the athletic director position is characterized as one in which masculine qualities are most important, female applicants may be perceived as less capable of caring out the tasks necessary to be successful in those positions, may not see these positions as a "good fit" for themselves, and could possibly be discouraged from applying to such positions (Eagly and Karau 2002; Sartore and Cunningham 2007).

However, while the importance of the feminine managerial subrole (i.e., planning and organizing, consulting others, recognizing and rewarding, communicating and informing, and supporting) received the highest mean score for the life skills coordinator position, this mean score was only significantly higher than the compliance coordinator position, not the athletic director position, providing only partial support for hypothesis 2. That is, feminine managerial skills also seem to be deemed important to the athletic director position. This is not completely surprising given that others have found that effective leaders were perceived to possess both masculine and feminine qualities (Duehr and Bono 2006; Eagly 2007).

However, it is of interest to note that there is no research available to support a negative evaluation of men if they engage in feminine managerial roles. Therefore, in contrast to women that adopt masculine managerial traits, men may not be at a disadvantage if they are required to exhibit both masculine and feminine managerial roles in the position of athletic director (Atwater et al. 2004). In fact, Bruening and Dixon found that coaches evaluated male athletic directors more highly when they demonstrated more communal (i.e., feminine) behaviors such as being flexible with scheduling, communicating well with their staffs, and being supportive

of work-life balance (Bruening and Dixon 2008, 2007). In addition, when evaluated for positions in industries incongruent with their gender roles, no differences in perceptions of success were attributed to men, however women were evaluated as less successful (Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra 2006).

Additionally, the findings revealed that gender neutral subroles were not found to be more important for the compliance coordinator position than the other positions, failing to provide support for hypothesis 3. Thus, these traits were not deemed any more important for a compliance coordinator than for an athletic director or life skills coordinator. Perhaps the identification of these managerial subroles as gender neutral coupled with the similarity of results in the ratings the importance of these subroles to the positions of athletic director, life skills coordinator, and compliance coordinator provide the needed explanation in the lack of significance found. The students could not say whether these subroles were masculine or feminine, and therefore one could suppose that these subroles would be evaluated to similar degrees in terms of importance (or lack thereof) among the positions investigated.

Findings failed to support hypothesis 4 which speculated that perceptions of managerial subroles for athletic administration positions were influenced by gender of the evaluator. Contrary to other research within business management, male and female evaluators did not differ on their perceptions of gender typing of athletic administration positions (Atwater et al. 2004; Powell et al. 2002; Schein 2001). This is an interesting finding as women have typically perceived managerial roles and the position of manager as more gender balanced (Atwater et al. 2004; Powell et al. 2002; Schein 2001). It also counters the findings of Ross and Parks (2008) who recently established that male sport management students hold less than positive attitudes toward women in the workplace. Perhaps this could be the result of regional differences in student attitudes towards women as Ross and Park's subject pool was derived in the Midwest. Twenge, in a meta-analysis, (1996) found that students in the North and South held different views of women. Further analysis would be needed to determine if regional differences do exist presently amongst sport management students relative to gender roles and biases. Such analysis is needed to better understand sport management students' perceptions of gender stereotypes as those perceptions could have an impact on future managerial decisions in athletic administration (Atwater et al. 2004).

Limitations

There are some limitations within the current study that should be noted. The managerial subroles included in the survey were not defined, so an assumption was made that participants

would understand the meaning of these subroles. All participants were enrolled in courses within sport management, so there should have been an understanding of the meaning of each subrole though this was not directly tested. In addition, a larger proportion of men completed both the initial evaluation of managerial subroles and the evaluation of managerial subroles for each athletic administration position. This was the result of the disproportionate number of men compared to women enrolled in the sport management programs from the schools used in the current study. Finally, use of students in the evaluation of appropriate management duties for each athletic administration position should be viewed with some caution, as students have not had extensive experience within athletic administration management. Future research should seek to evaluate how those currently working in athletic administration classify managerial subroles. Use of athletic administrators in evaluation of the appropriate managerial subroles for athletic administration positions will strengthen the findings from this initial study.

Conclusion

The results of the current study indicate that masculine managerial characteristics are most strongly associated with the role of athletic director. However, when evaluating the importance of feminine traits, there were no significant differences for the athletic director position and the life skills coordinator position. Given these findings, it appears that feminine traits are deemed important to the athletic director position. However, men continue to be over-represented in the position of athletic director. Because the domain of sport, including intercollegiate athletics, is considered as a place that perpetuates masculine hegemony (Fink 2008; Whisenant 2008), women may be evaluated as less capable leaders in athletic administration regardless of the characteristics identified as important to the leader (Eagly 2007). Therefore, even if feminine managerial roles are valued for the position of athletic director, women may still not be perceived as effective for this position as a result of the stereotypical masculine characterization of the domain of sport (Eagly 2007). However, further research would be needed to test this contention.

Concurrently, the position of life skills director also was perceived as requiring feminine managerial skills, yet not significantly more important than the managerial roles required for athletic director. Women are over-represented in the life skills director position and may be receiving an advantage in an area that may be considered more "female appropriate". In addition, the position of compliance coordinator is perceived as requiring masculine, feminine and gender neutral managerial roles; this position continues to be a position available to both men and women as demonstrated by the equal representation of both in that position.

A contribution of the current study to future research would be to further investigate the combination of agentic and communal managerial subroles for both men and women in athletic director positions. This research provides some support for work that indicates that more feminine managerial skills are valued in management and leadership positions (Duehr and Bono 2006; Eagly 2007) (e.g., athletic director). However, given the sparse number of women who are hired as athletic directors, it does not appear that these feminine managerial skills serve as an advantage in obtaining this position.

Appendix

Instructions: Please read the job description for Director of Athletics

- Responsible for the overall management of the inter-collegiate athletics program within the policies, procedures and guidelines established by the Board of Trustees of the University, the President of the University, the Conferences and the NCAA.
- Establishes and maintains an efficient organizational structure which has clearly-defined goals, responsibilities and lines of authority. Hold key administrators accountable for high standards of performance in their assigned duties.
- Selects personnel for key administrative positions which are the best available in terms of their education, work experience and record of accomplishment.
- Maintains fiscal control over revenues and expenditures to ensure that the Division of Athletics has adequate reserves to cover unforeseen contingencies. Works with the NCAA and Conference and the broadcast and television networks to ensure that the University receives maximum revenues and exposure from radio and television.
- Ensures that all financial transactions of the Division of Athletics are consistent with the policies and procedures of the University or special policies that apply to the Division.
- Maintains effective working relationships with the academic community of the University, to include the faculty, staff, students and administration, the Board of Trustees, alumni, representatives of the press and electronic media, high school coaches and administrators, General public; and represents the University on various committees within the Conferences and the NCAA.

By checking the appropriate box, please identify how important each of the managerial roles is for the Director of Athletics position. (5) most important – (1) least important

Managerial role	5	4	3	2	1	Managerial role	5	4	3	2	1
Providing corrective feedback	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consulting others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Allocating resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Motivating and inspiring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning and organizing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strategic decision making	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evaluating employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Communicating and informing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing and mentoring personnel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Problem solving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delegating	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Networking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Managing conflict	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Punishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recognizing and rewarding employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supporting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disciplining	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Monitoring work activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarifying roles and objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2008). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study thirty-one year update (1977–2008)*. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from <http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport>.
- Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., Waldman, D., DiMare, L., & Hayden, M. V. (2004). Men's and women's perceptions of the gender typing of management subroles. *Sex Roles, 50*, 191–199.
- Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2007). The quest for work-family balance: managing role conflict. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377–406.
- Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2008). Situating work-family negotiations within a life course perspective: insights on the gendered experiences of NCAA Division I head coaching mothers. *Sex Roles, 58*, 10–23.
- Catalyst. (2009). *2009 Women in Europe*. Retrieved February 18, 2009 from <http://www.catalyst.org/publication/285/women-in-europe>.
- Cejka, M. A., & Eagly, A. H. (1999). Gender stereotypic images of occupations correspond to the sex segregation of employment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 413–423.
- DeHass, D. (2007). *Ethnicity and gender demographics of NCAA Member Institutions' Athletics Personnel (2005–2006)*. Retrieved July 23, 2008, from the National Collegiate Athletic Association Web site: <http://www.ncaapublications.com/ProductsDetailView.aspx?sku=DMIAPONLINE>.
- Duehr, E. E., & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 815–846.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 1–12.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. H. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 123–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fink, J. S. (2008). Gender and sex diversity in sport organizations. Concluding comments. *Sex Roles, 58*, 146–147.
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*, 51–61.
- Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 178–186.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: how gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 657–674.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 935–942.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 9*, 1–19.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kiesler, S. (1975). Actuarial prejudice toward women and its implications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5*, 201–216.
- Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. D. (1994). “Good old boys” and “Good old girls” clubs: myth or reality? *Journal of Sport Management, 8*, 27–35.
- Martell, R. F., & Desmet, A. L. (2001). A diagnostic-ration approach to measuring beliefs about the leadership abilities of male and female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1223–1231.
- Martell, R. F., Parker, C., Emrich, C. G., & Crawford, M. S. (1998). Sex stereotyping in the executive suite: “Much ado about something”. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 13*, 127–138.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28*(2), 177–193.
- Ross, S. R., & Parks, J. B. (2008). Sport management students' attitudes toward women: a challenge for educators. *Sport Management Education Journal, 2*, 1–18.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 743–762.
- Rudman, L. A., & Kilianski, S. E. (2000). Implicit and explicit attitudes toward female authority. *Personality and Social Psychology, 26*, 1315–1328.
- 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.
- Sartore, M. L., & Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Explaining the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions of sport organizations: a symbolic interactionist perspective. *Quest, 59*, 244–265.
- Schein, V. E. (1975). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: prior research and new directions. *Personnel Psychology, 31*, 259–268.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 675–688.
- Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review, 22*, 6–18.
- Sczesny, S. (2003). A closer look beneath the surface: various facets of the think-manager-think-male stereotype. *Sex Roles, 49*, 353–363.
- 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*, 47–60.
- Twenge, J. (1996). Attitudes towards women: 1970–1995. A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women, 21*, 35–51.
- Whisenant, W. A. (2008). Sustaining male dominance in interscholastic athletics: a case of homologous reproduction...or not? *Sex Roles, 58*, 768–775.
- Whisenant, W. A., & Mullane, S. P. (2007). Sports information directors and homologous reproduction. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 2*, 252–263.
- 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.
- Willemsen, T. M. (2002). Gender typing of the successful manager—A stereotype reconsidered. *Sex Roles, 46*, 385–391.
- Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Copyright of *Sex Roles* is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.