

BUSINESS 620

Allegheny College
Meadville, Pennsylvania 16335

Gender Discrimination in Sports Business



Kylie Kasavage
April 10, 2023

Gender Discrimination in Sports Business

by

Kylie Kasavage

Submitted to The Department of Business and Economics

Project Advisor: Russell Ormiston

Second Reader: Shiyi Chen

Date: April 10, 2023

I hereby recognize and pledge to fulfill my responsibilities as defined in the Honor Code and to maintain the integrity of both myself and the College as a whole.

Kylie Kasavage

Acknowledgements

This experience has been one I will never forget. Writing this thesis took a lot of time and energy, but it has given me some of the most valuable skills and memories I will forever be grateful for.

To my comp advisors, Russell Ormiston and Shiyi Chen: thank you for your time, tips, generosity and kindness throughout this process. Dr. Chen, being a visiting professor and given a comp in your first year is no easy task. You trusted me and I trusted you. I am and will always be grateful for your help on this project. Dr. Ormiston, for only meeting you in my junior year, you quickly became one of my favorite professors of my college career. I cannot thank you enough for the hours you spent supporting me and how far you went out of your way to help me succeed.

To my roommates, you truly turned college into something incredibly special for me. Your love came in so many ways and our memories this year are going to be what I think of when I'm missing Allegheny after graduation.

And of course, my family. Karl, thank you for stepping into our lives just when we needed you. Taylor, you will forever and always be my best friend. I'm still learning from you, and I'm glad we continue to walk through life together closer than ever. Mom, I would not be here without you. You made sacrifices to get me on this path and keep me on this path, and I will never be able to express how much I appreciate your support wherever I go. I love you all very much.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
List of Figures.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review & Theory.....	3
2.1: Introduction.....	3
2.2: Sports as a Gendered Institution.....	3
2.3: Women’s Representation in Sports.....	7
2.4: Perpetuating the Issue.....	10
2.5: Conclusion.....	12
Chapter 3: Empirical Analysis.....	13
3.1: Introduction.....	13
3.2: Method.....	13
3.3.1: Quantitative Analysis.....	14
3.3.2: Qualitative Analysis.....	27
3.4: Conclusion.....	33
Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	34
4.1: Limitations.....	34
4.2: Final Thoughts.....	34
References.....	36
About the Author.....	40

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Description of institution and career level.....	15
Table 3.2.1: Multiple choice - Culture.....	15
Table 3.2.2: Multiple choice - Discrimination.....	16
Table 3.2.3: Multiple choice - Recognition and Development.....	17
Table 3.2.4: Multiple choice - Organizational.....	19
Table 3.2.5: Multiple choice - Discrimination in Sports.....	21
Table 3.3.1: Likert scale - Personal.....	22
Table 3.3.2: Likert scale - Organizational.....	24

List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Recognition.....	18
Figure 3.2: Development.....	19
Figure 3.3: Discrimination.....	23
Figure 3.4: Work/life balance.....	26
Figure 3.5: Compensation.....	27
Figure 3.6: Competency and value.....	28
Figure 3.7: Perceived [lack of] ability.....	30
Figure 3.8: Discrimination based on other factors.....	30
Figure 3.9: Miscellaneous responses.....	31

ABSTRACT

The number of women working in sports is higher than ever. Women are still disproportionately underrepresented in the upper-level positions, resulting in a question of whether identifying as a woman affects career success of individuals working in athletics. This study aims to examine and understand the perception of gender discrimination in the sports industry and its potential correlation to lack of career success. Individuals who are female-identifying workers in sports at the intercollegiate and higher levels were issued a survey. After two weeks, with individuals given a reminder at the midway point, the final contributions totaled 138 for a response rate of 6.9%. Using multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended style questions, the individuals were asked a variety of questions about their encounters with gender discrimination in sports. About 60% of women reported either seeing or personally experiencing gender discrimination in their athletic work environments, and 53.7% had little to no change or no change at all in finding a resolution for any incidents they had encountered. When questioned if their experiences worsened when entering the sports field, over 40% of women answered that gender discrimination is worse in their athletics role than their positions in another industry.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Women have found themselves fighting the issue of being suppressed because of their gender for a long time. Politically, socially, and financially, women have been at a disadvantage. Moving through the decades these circumstances have immensely improved. However, systemic and institutional practices designed to work against women are still present in businesses today. With people becoming more aware and less hesitant about supporting change, people all over are helping women continue to break through barriers in all aspects of society. The aim of this study is to understand whether identifying as a woman affects career success of individuals working in sports business. This paper is choosing to focus on women as a whole, including cisgendered, transgender, or not fully gender conforming individuals that use the pronouns she and her. Additionally, the understanding of career success in this research is about development opportunities, representation, and potential sex discrimination in the sports industry.

The term “woman” has expanded its definition. It is no longer the antithesis of man, but the all encompassing division of gender that accepts those choosing to adhere to it. Gender being a spectrum is a newly visited topic, but some of the main argument is how gender is no longer to be considered a binary term for female and male. Women in sports, whether playing or working in a more traditional business setting, have not found equality in representation and fairness as they have historically not received the same resources. Since the implementation of the Title IX Act, more women have flooded into the industry, but not into its leadership roles (Burton et al., 2009). This paper looks to explore why there are less women in administrative and managerial positions when their numbers are higher than they have ever been in the general or support roles.

A study was conducted in an attempt to find a correlation between this and gender discrimination. Employees in intercollegiate and higher levels of athletics who identify as female were handed a survey. This took about 8 to 10 minutes, and 2,007 potential participants received it. The final contributions totaled 138 after two weeks, with participants receiving a reminder at the midway point, for a response rate of 6.9%. The respondents were questioned about their encounters with gender discrimination in sports using multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended questions. Questions covered topics including descriptions of their company and degree of employment, gendered workplace culture, workplace discrimination, recognition and development, and work-life balance, among others. Several sized public and commercial institutions, as well as organizations involved in professional sports, were chosen as participants. The findings were that 60% of women surveyed either noticed or experienced gender discrimination in their workplace, 53.7% had little or no change at all when finding a resolution for these occurrences, and 40% described their discrimination experience to be worse inside of the sports industry compared to their roles outside of sports.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW & THEORY

2.1 Introduction

It is no mystery that sports is a male dominated industry. While the number of women working in sports is higher than ever, they are still disproportionately underrepresented in the upper-level positions, resulting in a question of whether gender affects career success in sports business. The analysis of career success is in respect to sex discrimination, development opportunities and lack of representation in the business. This chapter will review the literature based on the subject of women in the sports industry and provide understanding of the issue.

2.2 Sports as a Gendered Institution

Professional and intercollegiate sports both have heavily masculine undertones. Women in leadership roles tend to be judged more harshly, especially in a male dominated industry (Burton, 2014; Taylor and Hardin, 2016). With this, men are typically more valued in this business because of systemic stereotypes held about women (Hancock & Hums, 2016). Additionally, institutional practices can play a role in supporting and reinforcing this discrimination, e.g. favoring male candidates over females and practicing an unfair selection process, are just two examples of this (Burton, 2014; Gray & Weese, 2021).

There is a question of what characteristics are required to fit a certain career and what the candidate looks like that can carry out a job more effectively. Several theories attempt to find out what these are and if they correlate to women's representation in business. Burton (et al., 2009) brings to light gender role theory in the argument of differences in characteristics between men and women. According to the theory, women are perceived to have softer attributes than men and

are matched to jobs that favor these characteristics more (Bower and Hums, 2013). This particular article recognized that managers may favor traits that are more commonly associated with men, such as leadership and assertiveness (Burton et al., 2009). Competitive sports are associated with certain types of masculinity that portray feminine related behaviors as the “other”, supporting the gender role theory with the continuing displays of explicit masculinity (Burton, 2014). Sexist stereotypes of women subconsciously bias individuals into believing women may not be fit for a particular job because of their gender (Burton, 2014). Women may be filtered into the ‘soft areas’ of administration to face issues that require more compassion than intensity, a characteristic more related to femininity (Hancock et al., 2018; Bower and Hums, 2013).

The gender role theory is not alone in hypothesizing why women are in leadership roles less than men, the sex-matching model follows the lead of the phrase “think manager, think male” first coined by Schein in 1975 (Burton et al., 2009). This model says that men and women are matched to jobs based on the ratio of that gender currently working in those positions (Burton et al., 2009). If either gender were to break this model, Burton argues that the response to such action would be different depending on the sex of the perpetrator. Therefore, if men are found in support roles, this situation would receive much less backlash than if a woman were to make it through to a leadership position (Burton et al., 2009).

Further, the role congruity theory is based on the perceptions of success in a particular job (Burton et al., 2009). Certain careers need characteristics associated with women, and the same for men, which would explain why more of that gender fills those positions. This theory has two mechanisms, both seemingly not in favor of women. The first is how women are found to be less favorable to leadership positions because of their natural perceived lack of leadership

qualities (Burton et al., 2009; Taylor and Hardin, 2016; Bower and Hums, 2013). This may contribute to why more people identifying as female are found in support roles. The second part of the role congruity theory deals with women who choose to engage in masculine behaviors and how they are evaluated less favorably than men (Burton et al., 2009; Claringbould & Knoppers, 2007). The theory explains that masculine behaviors are not the most attractive when portrayed by women. If women conform to the gender roles, perceptions of them may be less than and imply that they naturally are not fit for managerial positions. On the other hand, if they don't conform, evaluations are negative for violating gender roles. At face value, at least so far, men can do a woman's job without a difference in perception of his capabilities, but a woman attempting a man's job is evaluated less favorably for breaking the sex-matching model (Burton et al., 2009). Unfortunately for these individuals, there seems to be no way out. Conforming can feel like the better option to make things easier, but it depends on what the woman's personal goals are (Casad and Bryant, 2016). On a more positive note, the authors have noted a potential shift in characteristics needed for managerial positions, looking at traits that are more feminine and less masculine (Burton et al., 2009). Managerial roles may be becoming more androgynous.

Stereotypes are not the only underlying power here. There is debate that hegemonic masculinity is the foundation of the sports industry and is one of the main contributions to why women are so underrepresented in sports today (Burton, 2014; Grappendorf and Lough, 2006; Vicki Schull et al., 2013). This concept refers to the "acceptance of masculinity as the defining characteristic of Western society that places women in lower social positions" (Hancock et al., 2018, p. 2). Because of a perceived lower capability of women in management and leadership roles, individuals identifying as female may be more comfortable in the background space of

their work (Hancock & Hums, 2016; Taylor and Hardin, 2016; Veraldo and Ruibley, 2017). In support roles, visibility is low, and this can be both positive and negative. While there is less opportunity for development with low visibility, there is less chance for harsh judgment and constant devaluation (Hancock & Hums, 2016; Veraldo and Ruibley, 2017). Then these self-limiting thoughts and behaviors are created for women that have helped them to seem more content in non-leadership roles (Cosentino et al., 2021). Vocational personality, an individual's career-related needs, values and abilities, helps in determining how women respond to the aforementioned factors (Hancock & Hums, 2016; Hancock and Hums, 2015).

While Hancock and Hums are only hypothesizing hegemonic masculinity being the antecedent to the potential subconscious perception of women in sports, Burton (2014) argues the hegemonic masculine system operates to reinforce masculine dominance in the work environment and blur issues of sex discrimination. Women reported having to 'tone down feminism' in fear that it would hurt their future success in their particular job or organization (Burton, 2014). Power and status like this that men have in sports influences organizational operations in a variety of ways (Burton, 2014). There are social practices that structure tasks to favor men (Burton, 2014). If women are seen as compliant and men as powerful, then job descriptions can skew to one gender without explicitly labeling itself as biased (Burton, 2014). Power also influences the formation of gender identity within an organization (Burton, 2014). With fewer women at leadership levels, there is an unconscious belief that women cannot enter these positions of success due to reasons other than the institutional culture, as discussed in the previous section (Burton, 2014).

Stakeholder influence is another version of power placed among a company (Burton, 2014). A stakeholder in sports is an individual or multiple individuals that have indirect power to

a sports group and can influence the success of said group. This idea makes career success for women tricky because of its political affiliation. Money is a large portion of the power they have and companies allow these stakeholders to rule out of fear of losing funding or success. This fear falls all the way into the relatively smaller situations for an organization. For example, if a stakeholder favors one particular candidate over others, companies may campaign for or against certain candidates to keep the peace, which can take place if a man is chosen over a woman (Burton, 2014). These backers are sometimes all that keeps a company alive, and if they have to risk access to certain things to hire a particular candidate, a company is more likely to fall into the hands of the stakeholders (Burton, 2014).

2.3 Women's Representation in Sports

Women do not always have the easiest “in” when breaking into the industry. Access discrimination can be seen in an organization with limited candidate pools or few minority administration (Burton, 2014). This is normally an organizational structure issue that is embedded in the foundation of a company and its policies (Hancock et al., 2018; Veraldo and Ruibley, 2017). Access discrimination refers to certain individuals being prevented from entering a field, and this can contribute to the link between sports and the glass ceiling effect (Hancock et al., 2018; Berry and Franks, 2010; Lumpkin et al., 2014; Galloway, 2012).

The glass ceiling is an effect of institutional policies that forces women to have more obstacles to success than their male counterparts (Hancock et al., 2018; Berry and Franks, 2010; Lumpkin et al., 2014; Galloway, 2012). Hancock (et al., 2018) argues it is an artificial, unspoken barrier that prevents workers from advancing in their companies and that there are four aspects to this boundary: denial, resilience, acceptance and resignation. Denial references people that do not

necessarily believe that women encounter barriers, or if they did, they do not anymore. Resilience is the strongest of the four aspects in the belief that women are capable of overcoming the barriers to their development. Resignation and acceptance are similar; they both accept or distract from the issue and do nothing to change it. Acceptance insinuates that women prefer other life goals over advancing in their career, almost as if it is their nature to not favor work. Resignation is succumbing to the notion that women have it harder and that is just the way it is (Hancock et al., 2018). Access discrimination and the glass ceiling both make it a point to keep women out of the sports industry, and it has been successful thus far. Women are entering the field more than ever, but reaching the top positions or moving up the ladder are obstacles that women still deal with in the business today.

Research suggests that mentoring is also a large part of women's advancement in a company (Bower, 2009). Receiving a lack of support when looking to advance contributes to the lack of vertical movement in an organization (Gray & Weese, 2021). This support can be anything from childcare services, networking opportunities, role models, etc. (Burton, 2014; Gray & Weese, 2021; Taylor and Hardin, 2016). Because of the scarcity of representation of women in sports, and their few opportunities to move up the ranks, male mentors have been the most accessible form of support for workers (Burton, 2014).

Dominance of power over women is a common thread throughout research. With the stereotypes and discriminatory policies discussed thus far, Hancock (et al., 2018) believes men in management are less likely to give leadership roles to women, especially if those women are content in their lower level positions. Supportive mentors and supervisors helped with job satisfaction as women typically value interpersonal relationships (Hancock & Hums, 2016; Hancock and Hums, 2015). However, there are supervisors that may recognize the power they

hold over their subordinates and use it to keep their employees in a “soft area” of administration to maintain dominance (Hancock & Hums, 2016).

Bower (2009) notes four key elements to mentoring. The relationship begins on compatibility and whether the mentor and protege characteristics meld well. Individuals may be more attracted to others they perceive to be more like themselves. Once a mentorship is established, mentors can help their partners in several ways: sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, challenging assignments, etc. As noted previously, visibility can be an issue in sports for women. Therefore, established workers in a business positively contributing to a woman’s exposure could improve job satisfaction among women. Psychosocial functions is the third and possibly trickiest aspect of mentoring. Social capital is an important step in advancing in any business, but there has been some evidence to show that men benefit from a greater social capital more than women do (Burton et al., 2009). Looking specifically at mentorships, though, Bower (2009) believes that women can advance in sports by creating friendships, social networking, and building an identity by observing a mentor. The final aspect is looking at the outcomes of a mentoring relationship. When following a role model, there is a possibility of career benefits, such as increased salary, promotions or job satisfaction (Taylor and Hardin, 2016). Again, there are barriers to mentoring that are crucial to exploring. There are believed to be many factors influencing the creation of a mentor-protege relationship (i.e. shortage of mentors, willingness to mentor, apprehension in initiation, support or misperception of the mentorship) and this may be harmful to the career success of women in sports (Bower, 2009; Hancock & Hums, 2016). On one level, mentors instilled confidence into their workers, though, the usage of this confidence as leverage to cap the professional growth of workers is what is helping filter women out of industries such as sports (Hancock & Hums, 2016).

2.4 Perpetuating the Issue

Liminality and passivity perpetuate the issue of sex discrimination in sports (Claringbould & Knoppers, 2007). Liminal awareness allows people to act as they please without being concerned of the effect on others (Claringbould & Knoppers, 2007). Inequality being accepted as normal, recognizing the struggle and doing nothing to address it, not questioning underlying assumptions, these are all examples of what it is like to have power influence and not use it for better. The responsibility of change does not just lie on the shoulders of an organization, either. Individual accountability and action are needed to spark progression (Burton, 2014).

Access discrimination was discussed as creating a barrier to entry for women, but treatment discrimination is what continues the spiral after minority groups gain access. Treatment discrimination is when certain groups do not receive support or resources they are entitled to (Burton, 2014). Being denied access to rewards, resources and opportunities is not a new concept for women. Gray and Weese (2021) find women are typically more affected by the struggle of balancing career and personal life compared to men. Therefore, if support, like childcare services, is not given to women in a business, they may have to sacrifice their career for their families. Treatment discrimination tends to be justified in organizational policies, funding issues, etc. No matter the case, women being disproportionately denied support in a corporate setting and being at the expense of their male counterparts has not lost relevance as years have passed.

Many growing companies will base their systems on an established firm. Institutions will adopt similar practices to one another, resembling a look-a-like system, forcing those practices to

become unquestioned and resistant to change (Cunningham, 2007). This is a process called institutional isomorphism, and while businesses are valuing a desired end state while growing, institutional practices can become looked over and deeper ingrained within a company (Cunningham, 2007).

In light of this look-a-like system, homologous reproduction is another system Burton (2014) believes persists throughout the high ranks in corporate business. Supervisors are more likely to share power with and hire individuals that they can relate to, or that they find familiarity in (Hancock et al., 2018; Grappendorf and Lough, 2006; Vicki Schull et al., 2013). This keeps the ratios where a company wants them. Unfortunately, a narrow pipeline filters out the diversification of ideas and backgrounds, but keeping the power in the hands of similar people may allow for better conflict resolution in business (Hancock et al., 2018). Then it is the company's choice of what they want more: conflict resolution or diversity. Much of this can be improved by having a commitment to change, but thus far many companies have exhibited an aversion to that (Inglis, 1998; Williams and Miller, 1983).

Aicher and Sagas (2013) completed a study on 197 women's team head coaches to determine if homologous reproduction resulted from inherent sexism. They conducted their study with a survey based on their definition of ambivalent sexism, the idea that sexist men have positive feelings about women yet maintain negative attitudes toward them. Hostile sexism, women perceived to be seeking control of men, and benevolent sexism, having attitudes toward women that are stereotypical or place them in restricted roles, were the two forms of ambivalent sexism being tested. What Aicher and Sagas (2013) found was that there was no correlation between either of these and homologous reproduction. What this could mean is that this system, while not harmless, may be the result of something other than subconscious biases against the

opposite sex. An interesting note was that homologous reproduction was actually not found among the men, but among the women head coaches. The limiting part of this study, though, was knowing whether the head coaches hired their assistant coaches, or if their opinion had anything to do with the hiring of the assistant coaches.

2.5 Conclusion

Women are not equally represented in sports business and this chapter presents several theories as to why this could be. The gender role theory, role congruity theory, sex-matching model, glass ceiling, hegemonic masculinity and homologous reproduction look to be some of the most researched and agreed upon theories for the cause of this. Title IX may have put gender equality in motion for intercollegiate institutions, but these organizations have surely not found a complete solution to gender discrimination in athletics thus far. To support these theories in finding a cause, the next chapter focuses on a survey conducted on 138 women working in intercollegiate athletics departments across the United States.

CHAPTER 3: EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

3.1 Introduction

With previous research suggesting the possibility of gender discrimination in sports business, this study is meant to analyze that potential and understand the subjective reality of identifying as a woman in athletics. A new study was conducted with this goal in mind, using a group of individuals identifying as female and working in athletics.

3.2 Method

A survey was sent to female-identifying workers in athletics at the intercollegiate and higher levels. This took approximately 8-10 minutes and was sent out to a total of 2,007 potential participants. After two weeks, with individuals given a reminder at the halfway mark, the final submissions totaled to 138 for a response rate of 6.9%. Using multiple choice, Likert scale, and open-ended style questions, the individuals were asked questions about their experiences with gender discrimination in sports. Questions included: descriptions about their organization and career level, gendered culture, discrimination in the workplace, recognition and development, and work/life balance, among others. Participants were chosen among different sizes of public and private institutions, as well as professional sports organizations. Names and contact information for potential respondents were collected from publicly available sources on the staff directory pages from college/university athletics departments' websites or individuals' personal websites. The form was open for two weeks to give participants optimal time to provide the best answers possible. No questions were required and all had an option to opt out of answering. The form was finalized with an open ended question allowing participants to include any further

insight related to the study. The Google Form data is password-protected, despite participants remaining anonymous. After this study was completed and the data was used for this research, it was destroyed.

As we progress as a society, individuals are becoming more conscious of their usage of personal pronouns. Much of what this research is analyzing is based in the theory of sex discrimination among people who are more feminine or female-passing. However, not everyone that identifies as a woman is feminine or female-passing. It was a conscious choice to include those that identify with pronouns separate from their cisgender, even though it may turn the data results into a different direction. This is what the research is about, though, to challenge what is previously known about something and further analyze its truth. While including individuals who may be transgender or non-feminine may cause the results to change, it is fortunate that the deeper truths are being pulled to the surface and the progression of society is being processed in real time.

3.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Two of the beginning questions asked were descriptions of the institutions and career levels the participants are associated with. This was to gain an understanding of what types of organizations these answers were coming from and what stage the individuals were at in their role with the organization. The institutional categories were grouped into public and private colleges/universities and whether they identified as small or large. The personal career categories included entry-level, mid-level, senior-level, graduate student, and other. Table 3.1 narrows the sample to only intercollegiate athletics departments, as there were no respondents who identified as working for a professional sports organization.

Table 3.1: Description of institution and career level

Personal institution descriptors	Response %	Personal career descriptors	Response %
Describe your organization.		Describe your current level in your career.	
Public college/university, large	31.2%	Entry-level	19.6%
Public college/university, small	2.2%	Mid-level	52.9%
Private college/university, large	25.4%	Senior-level	20.3%
Private college/university, small	41.3%	Graduate student	5.8%
Professional Sports Organization	0%	Other	1.4%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	0%	Unsure/Prefer not to answer	0%

Most of the sample comes from private colleges and universities, particularly small. This does not represent the majority of intercollegiate athletics departments as most public universities are naturally larger and have more workers in the field. However, 31% of the respondents did come from large public universities, helping to get a better representation of the whole. Additionally, more than half of the participants fell into the mid-level category of their careers, with entry-level and senior-level having around the same percentage. This may be due to mid-level having a larger range of interpretation, as some roles are not explicitly senior or entry-level. In total, the sample for this study consisted mostly of women in mid-level positions working at either small, private colleges/universities or large, public colleges/universities.

Table 3.2.1 illustrates the beginning questions in the multiple choice section. The two questions below ask whether the environment and culture of the departments skew toward one gender over another.

Table 3.2.1: Multiple Choice - Culture

Have you noticed if the majority of individuals in your department identify as one gender over another?	
Yes, female	8.7%
Yes, male	58.0%
No	26.1%

Unsure/Prefer not to answer	7.2%
Does your work culture favor one gendered behavior over another?	
Yes, masculine	56.5%
Yes, feminine	0%
No	38.4%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	5.1%

As described in chapter two, sports is found to be a male dominated industry. The sample confirmed this with more than half answering that the majority of individuals identified as male, and the same measurement applied to that of the work culture presenting more masculine. It is important to note the 26.1% of individuals mentioning no notice of inequity in gender representation. Reasoning for this is due to either an equal balance of differing workers, or the lack of conscious notice in gender representation.

Table 3.2.2: Multiple Choice - Discrimination

Have you noticed any gender discrimination in the workplace?	
Yes	60.9%
No	32.6%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	6.5%
Have you experienced any gender discrimination in the workplace?	
Yes	60.1%
No	34.8%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	5.1%
If you answered yes to the previous two questions, have there been efforts made to resolve these issues?	
Yes, significant change has occurred	9.6%
Yes, but little to no change	33.1%
No	20.6%
N/A	33.1%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	3.7%

Alongside noticing the disparity, the participants were also asked if they have experienced any gender discrimination. Both notice and experience had a response of between 60 and 61% for yes. This is the basis for the study and research as a whole. About 60% of women reported either seeing or personally experiencing gender discrimination in their athletic work

environments. Take into account the succeeding question about efforts made to resolve gender discrimination issues. A majority of the women that answered yes reported not finding any change to resolve the issue. This may suggest that gender discrimination may not be taken as seriously behind doors as it is advertised. Of these women were in an instance of sex discrimination, 20.6% had no change and 33.1% had little to no change. The 60% from above plus these values are why further research about gender discrimination in sports continues; these women are the foundation of why this issue does not seem to be dissipating with new resources and access being given to women.

An extending inquiry of whether the individuals were falsely stereotyped based on gender (in their current role) was made to broaden the understanding of how the discrimination could be taking place.

Table 3.2.3: Multiple Choice - Recognition and Development

Have you ever been falsely stereotyped based on your gender (in your current role)?	
Yes	56.9%
No	35.0%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	8.0%
Are women given recognition/credit the same as their male counterparts?	
Yes	38.7%
No	48.9%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	12.4%
Have you noticed that you or other women were overlooked for development opportunities based on gender?	
Yes	40.6%
No	44.2%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	15.2%

The survey broke discrimination into smaller fragments to evaluate recognition and development. The beginning question for this group asks if these women were falsely stereotyped based on their gender. Similar to the previous group of questions, individuals answering yes reached 56.9%. This could be a connection to how these women were

experiencing or noticing discrimination in their workplaces. The second and third questions address recognition and development directly. When asked if women are given the same recognition/credit as their male counterparts, 48.9% of respondents answered no. To strengthen this statistic, the figure below highlights several responses from the open-ended section.

Figure 3.1: Recognition

“It seems to always be the same issues: we are not listened to, we are not given the same opportunities, and we have far more doubt and backlash for our choices. I have to fight three times as hard for my ideas to be heard, but if a male coworker were to bring up my thoughts, he'd be heard instantly. It's not a crutch to fall upon, but it is a hindrance.”

“Most of these occurrences have happened to me in my previous role, not my current role, at another large university. They were a part of the reason that I found a new job. Most of them centered around being talked down to and treated as lesser than by a more senior male member of my department, who would only speak this way to the women and not our equivalent male counterparts. My boss at that point in time, a higher ranking female, never addressed the issue and continues to favor the males in that department.”

“Credit has often been shared between male and female counterparts. Sole credit is rarely afforded solely to a female in the workplace regardless of the contribution.”

“I work with the football team. I am routinely assumed to be a service assistant and coaches/staff generally direct questions to my male counterparts even though I am more knowledgeable in the subject or the question is in reference to my work responsibilities.”

“While out on maternity leave, changes were made to my job responsibilities which felt like a demotion to me. When they realized my male counterparts couldn't keep up with the responsibilities they gave them back to me with additional responsibilities without recognition or a pay increase.”

These women described not being given credit despite their contribution, being overlooked to report directly to the men, being given credit but having to share it with men, not being seen by upper management, and having to fight to have their voices heard over their male counterparts. The last question asked if they noticed women being overlooked for development opportunities based on gender, which received 40.6% of responses. Figure 3.2 includes specific comments made by these women about development opportunities in their workplace.

Figure 3.2: Development

“Not given opportunities”

“This past summer I was passed over for promotion to head coach by a male. He was a mediocre athlete. He has only coached at one place. He only has an irrelevant bachelor's degree, no masters, and no certifications. I have a bachelors and masters in my field. I have several certifications and have outperformed him in our time coaching together. I even got coach of the year for the athletic department (voted on by student athletes for my athletes success at the national level) as an assistant over him.

When he was given the head position over me I asked our AD why because I felt like I had a much stronger resume, better experience, and better education. He agreed but they said he has been there longer. I have been there 5 years and he has been there 8. That was their ONLY reason!”

“There is heightened bias in the athletics fundraising world, especially with regards to development officer-donor relationships. Donors (often men) seem more comfortable and confident in men in frontline fundraising positions, and look past women in those roles. It makes it difficult for women to get ahead in their careers or gain experience.”

In a different study, it would be interesting to see how these numbers are broken down into smaller categories, e.g. institution size, institution type (public or private), career level, how many opportunities are available, seniority recognition among the organization, etc. The next three parts illustrate how the organization itself begins a relationship with someone identifying as female, and how they approach certain situations women can face in a job.

Table 3.2.4: Multiple Choice - Organizational

When interviewing for your position, were the questions gender based?	
Yes, most or all	0%
Yes, noticed some	10.2%
No, they were all neutral	81.0%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	8.8%
Does your organization offer awareness training to identify bias?	
Yes	67.4%
No	20.3%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	12.3%
Does your organization have many women in mentorship roles?	
Yes, there are plenty of women in leadership and mentoring roles	37.2%
Yes, there are women available, but not as many as there are men	47.4%
No, it is difficult to find a woman in a leadership role in my organization	10.9%
N/A	2.2%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	2.2%

While employers use interviews to get to know a potential employee, these applicants can also use interviews to gauge how a potential employer is going to treat them in their position. The first question is based on this concept to see if any of the respondents noticed any gender based questions in their interviews. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against employees based on sex and helped to remove any questionable wording from an organization's documents and activities, such as job descriptions and interviews ("Discrimination on the Basis on Sex", 2023). However, 10.2% of the sample reported noticing some gender based questions in their interview. This number suggests a portion of athletic departments are behaving in a way that goes directly against Title VII and could potentially be illegal. The survey also asked about whether their organizations conducted awareness training to help identify bias. It was startling that only 67.4% of women responded that their organizations do provide this training and 20.3% of these affiliated organizations do not. For institutions involved in Title IX implementation, it is assumed that more would have this training to educate their workers, or at least legally cover themselves if an incident were to ever occur.

The previous chapter noted that mentorship is a large part of perpetuating women's success in sports business, especially with it being a male dominated field. For the question regarding whether there were women in leadership roles, it was not surprising that 47.4% of participants submitted 'yes, there are women available, but not as many as there are men'. Fortunately, 'yes, there are plenty of women in leadership and mentoring roles' received 37.2% of the answers. The percentage for this and the 10.9% for 'no, it is difficult to find a woman in a leadership role in my organization' could be a consequence of women being accepted into sports business more now than ever before.

One of the stronger questions of the survey, and the one that separates this study from other gender discrimination studies, is the final one: “Is gender discrimination worse in the athletics role or in your roles outside of sports?”

Table 3.2.5: Multiple Choice - Discrimination in Sports

Is gender discrimination worse in the athletics role or in your roles outside of sports?	
It is worse inside of sports	40.6%
It was worse outside of sports	10.9%
It isn't an issue in either area	5.8%
It is the same issue in both	26.1%
N/A	6.5%
Unsure/Prefer not to answer	10.1%

This is why the study was completed—to give weight to the argument that women are receiving disproportionate treatment specifically in athletics departments. Over 40% of women answered that gender discrimination is worse in their athletics role than their positions in another industry. The women were not asked ahead of time if they had other roles, though they were given two choices to opt out of answering with either ‘N/A’ or ‘Unsure/Prefer not to answer’. With this in mind, the 40.6% has a strong enough foundation supporting the theory that women are in fact disproportionately affected by gender discrimination and discriminatory treatment in intercollegiate athletics departments.

After the multiple choice section, a small section of Likert scale type questions were asked. Those surveyed were given nine questions to answer on a scale of strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, and strongly agree.

Table 3.3.1: Likert scale - Personal

Likert scale	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I don't feel pressure to conform to stereotypes in the workplace.	5.8%	20.3%	24.6%	30.4%	18.8%
I believe I am able to apply my full ability and potential into my current role.	8.0%	17.4%	21.7%	30.4%	22.5%
I feel safe to express my concerns about issues in the workplace.	9.4%	22.5%	16.7%	31.9%	19.6%

Table 3.3.1 starts with asking the individuals about their personal perspectives about how their workplace makes them feel. Sometimes people conform to the stereotype placed upon them to ease any pressure or make the environment easier to work in (Casad and Bryant, 2016). Additionally, some people use stereotypes to their advantage, for example a woman using a masculine stereotype to present as more attractive for a particular role (Casad and Bryant, 2016). This question was asked to see if individuals felt any pressure to conform to stereotypes placed on them in the workplace. A majority of the responses fell between somewhat disagree, neutral, and somewhat agree, but skewing more toward 'agree' with a higher percentage of 30.4% over 20.3%. With this, it was interesting to see whether women felt they could fully apply their full potential and ability into their current athletic roles. The response percentages were about the same as the previous question; fortunately there was a higher percentage for 'strongly agree' here at 22.5%. A large part of any job is having concerns and expressing them to find solutions to improve the workplace. When asked if the women felt safe to express their concerns about issues they notice, 'somewhat agree' had the highest response for this with 31.9%. The last personal question is targeted away from the self and more toward coworkers. 'Somewhat disagree' took some of the respondents, but 'strongly agree' also came to a higher percentage. Figure 3.3 shows

several of the participants commenting with their thoughts and experiences on discrimination. Some felt their coworkers did not discriminate as much as outsiders of their department and others felt the opposite. This could help explain the results of this question.

Figure 3.3: Discrimination

“A colleague who I currently work alongside, who I graduated with from the same masters program, referred to me as an intern.”

“Discrepancies within male and female programs based on Title IX implications: opportunity, equality, available resources, time and urgency of helping or fixing a problem for female programs or female led issues”

“Often male stakeholders (e.g. donors, faculty, etc.) assume I am an administrative assistant or solely work with women's teams, even though I am a senior-ranking official in the department and work with all programs. Additionally, previous leadership slated me for a role that solely managed Title IX and diversity issues, which as a woman of color is a bad look at a predominately white institution and also diminishes my expertise and ability as a veteran college athletics administrator.”

“The discrimination typically comes from those outside of our staff who come into our workplace, i.e. non-athletics staff and contracted services like television production freelancers, in which it is also less common for it to be addressed.”

“Lack of support of female equality at prior institution, leading me to find another institution”

“I am the head athletic trainer for the sport of football. When I meet with officials prior to the games, they typically think my male student is in charge.”

“Was treated differently than the rest of my staff by my last employer. As well as having been told to “sit there and look pretty” by an employer.”

“Generally, in my experience, it is not the direct peers I work with that I receive discrimination from. It tends to be more common across departments with peers I do not work with on a regular basis. The most common discrimination I am subjected to is infantile language and being spoken down to. Too often, my knowledge is not seen as valid or is questioned but is regarded as correct when a male counterpart shares the same information.”

“My male counterparts routinely show up late or take off work due to parenting responsibilities and they are praised. When I do it I am treated differently.”

“People routinely immediately think that I do not know football or am just a secretary”

“I experienced gender discrimination at my previous institution, which was a large public university.”

“My male counterpart is constantly rewarded for speaking up and steamrolling me in meetings and/or relationships with campus partners (even when those partners continue to have negative experiences with him and come to me to work more cohesively). When sharing this experience with administration they continue to not believe me that it's an issue or affecting my ability to lead my team. A former oversight was actually let go after multiple female employees came forward about experiences of being singled out in front of co-workers and yelled at/chastised for their work. The first person who came forward, though in a leadership role, was told she just needed to work on her relationship with him and nothing was done (until others continued to come forward).”

“Personally, it has just been comments made by other staff members (for example, ‘Women don’t want this job.’ in reference to being a Head Coach. There are implications made about how women should be assistants.”

“Falsely assumed gender due to a gender neutral name many times, taken less seriously by contracted partners to name a few.”

There could be plenty of reasons for these answers that may more likely be on the psychological spectrum of research. This would be an instance of diving further into this question in a different study, as noted in the section with multiple choice. Moving onto the final five quantitative questions: the organizational category. These statements were made to gauge how the women feel about their organization’s behaviors and practices.

Table 3.3.2: Likert scale - Organizational

Likert scale	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
My peers do not treat me differently because of my gender.	4.3%	21.0%	15.9%	28.3%	30.4%
Administration/management is receptive and understanding to my concerns.	8.0%	19.0%	27.0%	28.5%	17.5%
My company’s practices are not discriminatory.	2.9%	15.9%	31.9%	28.3%	21.0%
Work/life balance is an important consideration for my organization.	15.3%	26.3%	22.6%	17.5%	18.2%
Salary increases in the organization are fair.	19.6%	21.0%	37.0%	18.1%	4.3%
Salary distributions overall in the organization are fair.	25.4%	20.3%	39.1%	10.9%	4.3%

The first, “my peers do not treat me differently because of my gender”, is a mixture of both personal feelings and institutional practices. While it is not completely an organizational statement, it is in this grouping because it is more connected to the institutional environment and

not as personal as Table 3.3.1. As mentioned previously, some of the respondents believed the discrimination they received was external rather than from their peers, which could help to explain the positively skewed results. The next statement, “administration/management is receptive and understanding to my concerns”, ‘neutral’ and ‘somewhat agree’ had the highest response rates with 27% and 28.5% respectively. This did not come as a surprise, as organizations cannot fully submit to an individual’s concerns, but they should not disregard them either. Without getting completely caught up in the labels, these results also skewed positively. The institutions affiliated with the participants seem to be hearing the concerns brought to them. However, this result can be seen as contradictory to the results of the final question in Table 3.2.2: “... have there been efforts made to resolve these issues?” Perhaps the issues and concerns participants recalled for Table 3.3.2 were related to discrimination but were not found a resolution, or the concerns were not related to discrimination at all.

The next question tackles the theories connecting discrimination to deeply rooted institutional practices. “My company’s practices are not discriminatory” fell heavily into the ‘neutral yet leaning positive’ zone. Many of the neutral responses could have been from the respondents not knowing whether their organization’s policies and practices were discriminatory and this was the closest they could get to responding ‘unsure/prefer not to answer’ like with the multiple choice section. Although, disregarding most of the responses pooling into ‘neutral’, these results also oriented positively. While 15.9% did answer with ‘somewhat disagree’, almost 50% of the responses for this statement veered into the affirmative. Fortunately, all results for this section look to be slanting toward the positive end of the spectrum. The final three questions are where the results start to find themselves sloping the other way addressing the topics of work/life balance and salary.

Work/life balance is a concern that many women face, alongside maternity leave or caring for others (children, elderly, etc.), refer to Figure 3.4.

Figure 3.4: Work/life balance

“Working mothers, especially in college athletics, require more support than is typically available. In order to continue to elevate women into senior leadership in athletics, we have to support employees who are caretakers.”

The literature in the last chapter suggested that organizations need to provide more resources for people to support a work/life balance. Looking at sports specifically, many jobs in the industry need people to be able to contribute their time at night and on the weekends, which are both times that plenty of people take away from work and put toward their personal lives. This question was made to address the extra time asked of athletics employees. The respondents in the Likert scale give the first sign of skewing toward ‘strongly disagree’. This is not surprising; many companies struggle with this, and it would not be apparent as to why sports would be much different. It is important to note that this reality is not gender-specific. Men also report leaving sports institutions because of poor work/life balance. This is also true for the final two statements; salary is not always gender specific. “Salary increases/salary distributions overall in the organization are fair” both heavily lean negatively. These numbers are more surprising in this research because the sample is made completely of colleges and universities, both places where salary is monitored more strictly. However, institutions have been struggling due to coronavirus and more people have been getting laid off. The reasoning for including these statements into the Likert scale table was women’s complaints about the wage gap. Women are paid disproportionately for performing the same responsibilities as men. Several comments were made about salary in the instance of a potential gender wage gap, refer to Figure 3.5.

Figure 3.5: Compensation

“It is all about the wage gap for me.”

“This is in regards to pay... I make 1/4 of what the male assistant coaches do but definitely do not do a fourth of the work, it is very disheartening”

“I personally experience a gender wage gap. Most of my greater department is balanced.”

“There is no open discussion at my employment regarding compensation/salary. There is no way of knowing if these [questions about salary distribution] are fair.”

“I feel that historically female roles are under-compensated (administrative support, stewardship, and events). The AD/CEO role should make 4-5x my salary, not 10x my salary, but that's a problem everywhere and not necessarily tied to gender.”

“Hiring a new position seems more like checking a box”

One comment in particular stuck out with the note that there is no open discussion about salary or compensation in the institutional setting. Salary also is not sports-specific, therefore, it is difficult to reveal whether there is a gap in wage because of gender, because of resume and work ethic, or if there is a disparity at all. Compensation, in the form of money or recognition, is something women have been fighting to be equal in for a long time, and these respondents' feedback suggest that maybe this is an issue not fully resolved yet.

3.3.2 Qualitative Analysis

Two open-ended questions were asked throughout the survey: “If you have ever been falsely stereotyped based on gender in your current role, provide any details of these occurrences.”, and “If you have anything you wish to share about your experiences with gender discrimination please include it here.” Throughout the responses to these prompts, there have been several themes discussed above: gender discrimination, recognition and development, work/life balance and compensation. Outside of these, the respondents talked about women’s

perceived competency and value, ability to perform certain responsibilities, discrimination relating to age or race, and some other miscellaneous comments. Figure 3.6 begins with discussing the first of these themes.

Figure 3.6: Competency and value

“I am a full-time employee, but because I am a young female, the amount of times it has been assumed that I am an intern is quite high. They will treat me as an intern and communicate to me as if I am one, even after me specifying otherwise. It's worse inside sports because it's easier to hide it behind small victories like Title IX advancements or broadcasting small wins like more women being hired to professional teams as full-timers. Is it to be celebrated if that should have been the standard all along?”

“You are emotional because you are female. You need to make cookies for the staff etc...”

“Unfair comments made during staff meetings relating to a woman's appearance and her subsequent value and performance. Essentially, if he didn't find her attractive, then she wasn't as valuable or good at her job.”

“I used to officiate and oftentimes my skill level / knowledge of the sport was questioned”

“My department employs 23 full time staff members. Of those full time staff members, 17 are female - but the two top level positions within our department are filled by men. Other men in the department will oftentimes go above the heads of the women who are actually in charge of daily operations/logistics of their program areas and speak directly to our top level supervisor (who again, is a man - and has no clue what the day-to-day operations look like) instead of approaching us.”

“Mansplaining”

“I work in college athletics so I experience gender stereotypes daily. Most are inconsequential but the message is that I'm not fully able to relate as a woman. I constantly have to mind how I dress, interact, and behave to be perceived as competent in my role.”

“It is my belief that men and women can be treated similarly, it is my experience that women in sports are treated more fragile when it comes to mentality and it can be frustrating when coaching both genders as then I feel it sets up this unbalanced expectation from one to the other gender”

Competency and ability to efficiently fulfill a role's responsibilities was an issue routinely discussed in the open-ended section. As described in chapter two, women can be placed into support roles because of the belief they have 'softer' characteristics. Plenty of these women recognize being assumed as a secretary, assistant, or having their lower level male workers be in charge. Is this from the belief that women are better fit into support roles, or potentially that men are better fit into leadership roles? Perhaps both of these questions stem from the same issue of

internalized misogyny and unconscious sexism. One can notice the explicit effects being placed onto the participants of this study, and watch how they are being misjudged at face value. These women were assumed to have a lack of knowledge in their positions and were treated as such. The assumption may be from the unconscious bias that women are not as capable at fulfilling a predisposed “man’s role”. Being blindly accused as emotional, not as knowledgeable about a sport, seen as an intern despite continuously correcting people, or even having your value be based on what you wear or how well you can relate as a woman. All of these things women commented on fall into internalized misogyny among those they work around. This concept of internalized misogyny is not a rare phenomenon; it can fall upon anyone and the consequences can be that of which these women are experiencing.

Adding on to assumptions made about a woman’s value, two comments were made about the more tangible, physical tasks that women ‘cannot’ do, specifically relating to toughness. Women are not only sifted into the “softer” roles, as previously mentioned, they are also seen to not have the strength or toughness to perform a task that a man is typically expected to do. To make this more palatable, compare roles in a home, such as cleaning versus mowing the lawn. A woman may be expected to clean while a man could be expected to mow the lawn, assuming typical gender roles are followed. Mowing the lawn is seen as more difficult because it can be a more strenuous activity, and this is subconsciously related to masculinity. Femininity is more connected with fragility, and this follows into the business world as well. The two comments below, refer to Figure 3.7, are from women who are not seen as tough as men and are directed to ask their male cohort to do things they are well too capable of doing.

Figure 3.7: Perceived [lack of] ability

“I am often told to find a man to lift things or set up promotional items because they do not believe I can do so as a woman.”

“Women coaches aren't tougher than male coaches”

Another common theme that must be addressed when discussing gender discrimination is other possible factors that could be contributing to said discrimination. Some of the participants in the survey recognized being part of more than one minority group or being different from the rest of their institution in some way. Three of the big factors are age, race and sexuality. These cannot be completely separated from gender as they all make up an individual's identity and form how they view the world around them. Figure 3.8 shows the comments related to this theme.

Figure 3.8: Discrimination based on other factors

“Accused I must be gay because I am assertive and confident”

“I identify as a queer woman, and my physical/gender presentation falls on the more masculine side. The two other women who run my program area with me both present more feminine. Men will approach and speak to me in a different way than they would my feminine presenting, female colleagues - even though we do the same work. This will even happen in meetings where everyone is present at the same time.”

“Ageism also comes into play in my case.”

“Because I'm a grad student, the discrimination I feel is more based on age, probably because that's what's most salient to me at this time. I'm much younger than my colleagues and I feel like I'm often being performative on the academic side of my background to garner support, respect, etc. Coaching on a women's team, I do feel like my perspective is valued by our male head coach, knowing that he differs in that perspective from our players.”

“I think gender discrimination is very prevalent, but there are some instances when race affects me as well. So I am not sure if I'm experiencing discrimination because I'm a woman or because of my race.”

“While this study is focusing on gender discrimination, I feel it is important to note there is greater disparity when analyzing this topic with other variables such as race. As a woman of color, I cannot say with all certainty that the discrimination I have experienced in sport has solely been because I am a woman or solely because I am a person of color, but I would imagine the level of severity may be greater because I am both, given I am a member of two different minority groupings.”

A couple of women said they had assumptions of competency issues in their work, but that they felt it related to their age more than their gender. This connection is completely valid especially for industries that have many workers in a higher age bracket, i.e. coaches, administrative roles, Athletic Directors, etc. With this, this could support the idea that women are being judged at face value and are given an age assumption based on looks. A woman's looks can trickle into both race and sexuality as well. Some participants reported as presenting more masculine, but identifying as female, and one in particular was accused of having a sexuality other than theirs because of their behavior, e.g. being assertive and confident. Further, race was a variable that many of the respondents felt best to mention, as they believe it added to their experiences in sports. No matter what the individuals identified with, it is important to note how human behavior in these experiences may not be gender-specific and could fully be related to another variable of their identity.

The remaining comments fit best into a miscellaneous category, as they make excellent points but do not fit directly into any of the other groups.

Figure 3.9: Miscellaneous responses

“For what it’s worth, I feel there are as many benefits to being a woman in this space as there are challenges. If you can learn how to navigate the minefield you can also leverage what your minority identity allows you to do that others cannot.”

“Caveat to my answer about gendered questions during the interview for my current job. There were gendered questions, but they had more to do with how I would handle issues with male athletes since I am a woman. I work with equipment and my office shares a wall with the men's locker room so it was more geared toward my comfort and how I would handle it if I needed to go into the men's locker room. So it wasn't really a discriminatory question, but it was asked because of my gender. I'm confident that the men interviewing got the inverse question about the women's locker rooms.”

“In December I was passed over to go on a bowl game trip because I was the only female media member wanting to travel and ‘it was easier to say no and take a man in my place’ even though I had earned my spot.”

“We've recently had a change in athletics administration which has made a tremendous difference. In the first 20 years, however, gender discrimination and bias was rampant. It is still very much steeped into the system, too, with

football being the main focus and getting a majority of the resources. We're at a mid-major Division I school. So most of our funding comes from student fees. A majority of our students are women. However, a majority of the athletic budget, senior athletics staff attention and focus goes to football.”

The first two responses present a more positive connotation than has been seen throughout the study. The first states that yes being a woman in sports has its obstacles, but it also allows you to use your gender as leverage. In other words, being a woman can get you new opportunities or help you to move forward by being a part of a minority group, as such individuals are receiving better protection now. Following, a respondent was clarifying their response to the question about gender questions in interviews. She is saying that there were gender-specific questions, but nothing meant to be discriminatory. In her department, her office was going to be near the boys’ locker room and she was asked a question because of her gender. However, it was not to separate her, it was to make certain of her comfortability with the situation before proceeding with the interview. This response may be relatable to some of the other participants that answered that question, which would help to turn those results into a positive. Unfortunately, this is not certain and could be a unique experience.

The third and fourth comments come back to the upsetting narrative seen through the survey, that of discrimination and unfair institutional practices. One participant complained how she earned her spot on a trip with her organization but was replaced with a male strictly because she was a woman. Being the only female worker attending, the organization said that it was easier to take a man in her place despite her work to earn that spot. The frustration here is valid. No one would want a reward they earned to be taken away from them, especially if that reward was taken away for something out of the individual’s control and discriminatory behavior. The last question in Figure 3.9 is a woman talking about how gender discrimination in her institution

has gotten better in the culture and at surface level, but the practices are still implicitly unfair to women. The school this individual works for is a Division I school with a lot of attention to the football team. The team's funds come from the students' fees and tuition mostly, but most of the students attending are women. In short, the women are paying for the football team to get all of the attention. This may not be an issue directly bothering the student body, though it is not necessarily fair for the women to be contributing, without their knowledge, to a sport they do not play.

3.4 Conclusion

The 138 women surveyed illustrated that they believe there is gender discrimination either in their work environment or institutionally embedded in the policies and practices. To recapitulate, 60% reported seeing or personally experiencing sex discrimination, 53.7% had little to no change or no change at all in finding a resolution for any incidents that had occurred, and 40% of women answered that this discrimination is worse inside of the sports industry. The literature speculated that this could be true, sex discrimination being worse inside of sports, and the survey conducted above helped to affirm this theory.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

4.1 Limitations

Gender discrimination is a prevalent issue with explicit consequences. However, not every consequence comes from gender alone. Individuals' behavior is not performed in a vacuum, and the contribution of other discriminatory factors must be considered. Many of the respondents reported not only being female, but also being a person of color or a different age from many in their institution. Both of these factors can play a role in how these individuals are treated, and separating them from the consequences may hinder the study more than it helps to understand strictly sex discrimination.

4.2 Final Thoughts

One comment in particular mentioned how “it is [her] belief that men and women can be treated similarly, [but] it is [her] experience that women in sports are treated more fragile when it comes to mentality”. Internalized misogyny, explicit sexism, organizational structures and policies, hegemonic masculinity, or homologous reproduction could explain any of the results from the survey. Looking at the same reasoning of the limitation for not including race or age into the study, it might never be known exactly what the reason is for gender discrimination in sports or why it has the potential to be worse than other industries. What is important is that these theories are recognized and efforts are being made to improve upon the issues discussed throughout this research: including more women in leadership roles in sports, making sure there is a better distribution of representation, implementing new resources to allow individuals to perform their work most efficiently, having training about bias and tackling complaints that are filed to have significant change, and many others.

Women are not being equally represented or treated the necessary way to promote equality in sports business. With this, there are more women working in sports than there ever were. To quote one of the respondents from the final free response, “is it to be celebrated if that should have been the standard all along?”

References

- Aicher, T., & Sagas, M. (2013, July 19). An Examination of Homologous Reproduction and the Effects of Sexism. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 3(3), 375-386. <https://doi.org/10.1179/ssa.2009.3.3.375>
- Berry, P., & Franks, T. J. (2010, February 1). Women In The World Of Corporate Business: Looking At The Glass Ceiling. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 3(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v3i2.171>
- Bower, G. G. (2009, May 8). Effective Mentoring Relationships with Women in Sport: Results of a Meta-Ethnography. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*, 29(3). <https://doi.org/10.21423/awlj-v29.a268>
- Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2013, July 28). Career Paths of Women Working in Leadership Positions within Intercollegiate Athletic Administration. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 33, 1-14. https://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/Vol33_2013/CAREERPATH.pdf
- Burton, L. J., Barr, C. A., Fink, J. S., Bruening, J. E. (2009, May 7). "Think Athletic Director, Think Masculine?": Examination of the Gender Typing of Managerial Subroles Within Athletic Administration Positions. *Sex Roles*, 61, 416-426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9632-6>
- Burton, L. J. (2014, March 13). Underrepresentation of women in sport leadership: A review of research. *Sport Management Review*, 18(2), 155-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.02.004>

- Casad, B. J., & Bryant, W. J. (2016, January 20). Addressing Stereotype Threat is Critical to Diversity and Inclusion in Organizational Psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00008>
- Claringbould, I., & Knoppers, A. (2007, October 30). Doing and Undoing Gender in Sport Governance. *Sex Roles*, 58, 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9351-9>
- Cosentino, A., Weese, W., Wells, J. E. (2021, September 13). Strategies to Advance Women: Career Insights From Senior Leadership Women in Professional Sport in Canada. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2021.716505>
- Cunningham, G. B. (2007, October 18). Creating and Sustaining Gender Diversity in Sport Organizations. *Sex Roles*, 58, 136-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9312-3>
- Discrimination on the Basis of Sex. (2023). *HHS.gov*. <https://www.hhs.gov/civil-rights/for-individuals/sex-discrimination/index.html>
- Galloway, B. J. (2012). The Glass Ceiling: Examining the Advancement of Women in the Domain of Athletic Administration. *McNair Scholars Research Journal*, 5(6), 51-62. <https://commons.emich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=mcnair>
- Grappendorf, H., & Lough, N. (2006). An Endangered Species: Characteristics and Perspectives from Female NCAA Division I Athletic Directors of Both Separate and Merged Athletic Departments. *The Sport Management and Related Topics Journal*, 2(2), 6-20. <http://www.thesmartjournal.com/endangered%20species.pdf>
- Gray, E., & Weese, W. J. (2021). Does the Next Generation of Sports Leaders Perceive the Presence of the Glass Ceiling and the Need to Shatter It? Insights of Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 18(4), 116-131.

<https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/does-next-generation-sports-leaders-perceive/docview/2582835513/se-2>

Hancock, M., Darvin, L., Walker, N. A. (2018, October). Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Sport Management Students' Perceptions of the Leadership Labyrinth. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 12(2). <http://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2017-0039>

Hancock, M. G., & Hums, M. A. (2015). Career Goals and Expectations of Female Intercollegiate Athletic Administrators. *Global Sport Business Journal*, 3(1), 21-42. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Meg-Hancock-2/publication/322399924_Career_goals_and_expectations_of_female_senior_level_administrators_in_NCAA_Division_I_athletic_departments/links/5accff1b45851

Hancock, M. G., & Hums, M. A. (2016, April). A “leaky pipeline”? Factors affecting the career development of senior-level female administrators in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sport Management Review*, 19(2), 198-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.04.004>

Inglis, S. E. (1998). The Representation of Women in University Athletic Programs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 2(1), 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2.1.14>

Lumpkin, A., Dodd, R. K., McPherson, L. (2014, February 22). Does a Glass Ceiling Persist in Intercollegiate Athletics? *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 8(1), 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1935739714Z.000000000017>

Schull, V., Shaw, S., Kihl, L. A. (2013, February). “If A Woman Came In...She Would Have Been Eaten Up Alive”: Analyzing Gendered Political Processes in the Search for an Athletic Director. *Gender & Society*, 27(1), 56-81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243212466289>

Smucker, M. K., Whisenant, W. A., Pedersen, P. M. (2003, October). An Investigation of Job Satisfaction and Female Sports Journalists. *Sex Roles*, 49(7/8).

<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1025120406343.pdf>

Taylor, E. A., & Hardin, R. (2016). Female NCAA Division I Athletic Directors: Experiences and Challenges. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 24(1), 14-25.

<https://doi.org/10.1123/wspaj.2014-0038>

Veraldo, C. M., & Ruibley, B. J. (2017, March 13). Theory of planned behavior and women in senior-level athletic administration. *Sport, Business and Management*, 7(1), 21-37.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/SBM-07-2015-0022>

Williams, J. M., & Miller, D. M. (2013, February 8). Intercollegiate Athletic Administration: Preparation Patterns. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 54(4), 398-406.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1983.10605325>

About the Author

Kylie is from New Kensington, PA and is a senior at Allegheny College with a major in Business and a minor in Studio Art. She worked at Allegheny's Wise Center for her last two years where she learned her passion was in sports. As a senior Kylie had an internship with the men's basketball team where she held the position of Social Media Intern. In this role, she promoted the team to the student body and prospective students and had the pleasure of accompanying them to the final championship game. Kylie will end her career at Allegheny with a 3.93/4.0 QPA and will graduate *summa cum laude*.

