

## *Journal of Issues in* **Intercollegiate Athletics**

### **Gender Role Stereotyping: A Qualitative Analysis of Senior Woman Administrators' Perceptions Regarding Financial Decision Making**

---

**Heidi Grappendorf**

*North Carolina State University*

**Andrea Pent**

*Neumann College*

**Laura Burton**

*University of Connecticut*

**Angela Henderson**

*University of Northern Colorado*

---

*This study examined the perceptions of Senior Woman Administrators' (SWA) involvement in financial decisions through the utilization of open-ended questions. Additionally, this research analyzed the actual versus desired level of participation in financial decision making areas by (SWA) utilizing gender role stereotyping as a framework. Prior studies have indicated the importance of experience with financial decisions and budgets for SWA to advance their intercollegiate athletics careers. The qualitative analysis of the perceptions of the SWA indicated partial support for the desire to have increased involvement in key financial decision making. Furthermore, the quantitative analysis revealed in each of the decision areas (operations, budgeting, capital outlay, salary considerations, media broadcast contracts, and sponsorship advertising), a significant main effect was found in which SWA indicated a desire for greater participation in decision making.*

**Keywords:** Gender Role Stereotyping, Senior Woman Administrator

**B**efore Title IX, men's and women's athletic programs were separate, with the men's programs typically having male athletic directors, and women's programs lead by female athletic directors. When Title IX was enacted in 1972, women were athletic directors at over 90% of

women's intercollegiate athletic programs. According to Acosta and Carpenter (2008) currently 21.3% of athletic directors are women. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) created the position of the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) in 1981 - originally termed the Primary Woman Administrator (PWA) - partly to ensure representation of women, and also to have a woman's voice within the administrative ranks of athletic departments (Hawes, 2002). However, as Sagas and Cunningham (2004) noted, though the creation of such a position appeared to be a positive and progressive move by the NCAA, there are some serious flaws that still exist with the initiative. One of these flaws is the SWA may have limited power and input within the athletic department (Raphaely, 2003; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). Often, the responsibilities of SWA may be restricted to compliance, academic advising, life skills, and sports information; these roles typically do not include financial management. Thus, SWA may be hindered from obtaining the necessary experiences to be promoted to higher administrative positions, as they may be isolated, or interactions with those actually making important decision may be limited (Gill-Fisher, 1998).

Previous research (Grappendorf, Lough, & Griffin, 2004; Tiell, 2004) reported experience with financial matters is important to career advancement for women in intercollegiate athletic administration. Because women in intercollegiate athletic administration are often found in support positions that do not include financial management as a regular activity, many female athletic administrators are not honing financial management skills that could assist with their career advancement (Raphaely, 2003; Suggs; 2005; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). Additionally, Pent, Grappendorf, and Henderson (2007) and Pent (1999) found that SWA reported not participating in financial decisions to the extent they desired.

Social role theory and role congruity theory provide appropriate theoretical frameworks to examine whether women are participating in financial decision making within intercollegiate athletic departments. Social role theory contends there are qualities and behavioral tendencies believed to be desirable for each sex, and also expectations regarding the roles men and women should occupy (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood, & Diekmann, 2000). Role congruity theory proposes that a prejudice exists against potential female leaders because leadership ability is more stereotypically attributed to men (agentic) than to women (communal) (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Communal characteristics include being affectionate, helpful, kind, sympathetic, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing, and gentle. Agentic characteristics include being aggressive, dominant, forceful, self-confident and self-sufficient (Eagly, 1987, Eagly, et al., 2000). Role congruity examines the congruence between the gender roles of women and their positions in management and leadership. Furthermore, Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare, and Hayden (2004) reported that managerial subroles were gender typed and men perceived the managerial subrole allocation of resources as a masculine managerial subrole. Since intercollegiate athletic administration is typically a male-dominated field and women's athletics has historically been marginalized (Coakley, 2004; Schell & Rodriguez, 2000), women in SWA positions may be perceived as only possessing the characteristics necessary to be successful in communal roles and may therefore be denied the opportunity to engage in financial decision making as that duty is perceived to be a masculine, agentic managerial subrole.

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of SWA regarding their participation in financial decision making within intercollegiate athletics. Additionally, it sought to determine SWA actual and preferred levels of participation regarding financial decision making in various areas. Through both quantitative and qualitative analysis, this study measured the discrepancy between actual and preferred participation in such decision making; also by gathering data concerning SWA reports of their experiences. This qualitative component was intended to provide a more in-depth understanding of SWA participation in financial decision making.

### *The Senior Woman Administrator*

Women continue to be under-represented in the upper ranks of intercollegiate athletic administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008). The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) created the Senior Woman Administrator position in 1981 to ensure the involvement of women in the decision making processes within intercollegiate athletic departments (Hawes, 2002; NCAA, 1991). The SWA position was intended to be a meaningful position (Claussen & Lehr, 2002), that would ensure women had a voice in the administering of NCAA intercollegiate athletics. However, over the years, it has become evident the creation and implementation of the SWA position has potential flaws.

The NCAA indicated the SWA designation must be held by “the highest ranking female administrator involved with the conduct of a member institutions intercollegiate athletic program” (NCAA, 2005, p. 37). However, the NCAA does not indicate that an institution has to have a position exclusively for the SWA; only that the highest ranking woman in administration be given the title. As a result, at many institutions, female members of the athletic department have been given this title without incurring any additional power as a senior level administrator (Claussen & Lehr, 1999; Raphaely, 2003). Specifically, a uniform definition for the SWA was accepted by all NCAA Divisions in 2006:

An institutional senior woman administrator is the highest ranking female involved with the management of the institution’s intercollegiate athletics program. An institution with a female athletic director of athletics may designate a different female involved with the management of the intercollegiate programs as a fifth representative to the NCAA governance system (NCAA, 2007, p. 20).

The NCAA created the Committee on Women’s Athletics in 1981 to assist NCAA member institutions in providing equitable opportunities through the development of programs and resources for all women involved in athletics. Furthermore, the creation of this committee was designed to insure colleges and universities promoted and expanded the likelihood that women would advance within intercollegiate athletics (NCAA, 2006). The NCAA Brochure (2006) named program supervision, budget management, and fund raising as the first three items on the list of typical job responsibilities of the SWA. However, it is possible that female coaches or lower-ranking staff members are being designated to the position of SWA. To avoid this, the NCAA could expand and provide a clear description of specific responsibilities and duties that

are essential for the success of the SWA. Additionally, a more detailed description would create a sense of responsibility (Gill-Fisher, 1998).

### *Finances and the Senior Woman Administrator*

Claussen and Lehr (1999) noted that even though SWA can be a voice for women's issues in an athletic department, they often do not enjoy the privilege of being involved with major decision making as they may be viewed as *tokens* who have very little power or authority. Suggs (2005) noted that women may be disadvantaged in forming contacts or developing networks with administrators in the decision making/power positions. For women to have an opportunity to advance within intercollegiate athletic administration, it is important for women to have connections to informal networks and supervisory support so they too may have access to information and have a role in key decision making (Allen, Seibert, & Rush, 1990; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004).

It is not uncommon for SWA to be left 'out of the loop' in senior administration, where valuable information is often shared (Gill-Fisher, 1998) According to Judd (1995), "...the new knowledge and levels of expertise in budget, finance, use of computers, collective bargaining, public relations, NCAA rules and regulations, [and] federal school laws (Title IX) now requires preparation in a myriad of competencies in order to be successful administrators" (p. 8). Kent and Chelladurai (2001) also noted that due to rising costs and the growing complexity of meeting financial demands, experience with business and financial matters will continue to grow in importance. As Quarterman, Dupree, and Willis (2006) found, budget and funding issues were the most prominent challenges confronting female intercollegiate athletic directors, and thus it will be crucial for women to obtain financial management skills if they wish to advance their careers. Additionally, Judd conducted a study where SWA and Directors of Athletics were asked to rank the most important to the least important management categories for SWA and Directors of Athletics. Judd found that 96% of the SWA indicated preparing an annual budget was the most important competency for SWA and Directors of Athletics. Further, 92% of the Directors of Athletics indicated administering a budget was the most important competency needed. Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) examined the work of Canadian athletic directors, and discovered that financial management was perceived as one of the important duties for an athletic director. However, a significant amount of research has indicated that SWA are not receiving administrative experience with financial matters (Lough & Grappendorf, 2006; Pent, 1999; Pent et. al, 2007). In fact, many women tend to be found in support positions, including life skills, compliance, academic advising, and daily operations (Lough & Grappendorf, 2006; Raphaely, 2003; Suggs, 2005; Whisenant et al., 2002).

If SWA hope to advance in their careers, it is important their responsibilities include all aspects of administration, including budget and finance experience; not just the oversight of women's sports (Judd, 1995). Osborne and Shields (2003) noted many SWA did not believe they were obtaining the necessary administrative skills that would assist them with career advancement. Furthermore, Tiell (2004) found many SWA did not feel empowered to make decisions within their athletic departments, and a discrepancy existed between what athletic directors and the SWA's perceptions of being a part of the senior management team were:

The limited available literature concerning SWA suggests that those serving in these positions may be seen as tokens with little power or prestige, are subject to a glass ceiling phenomena which may be truncating career advancement, and do not receive challenging and meaningful responsibilities in which they can build relevant career related experience and expertise (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004, p. 229)

Without meaningful experiences that include decision making power with key financial matters, women may be forced to take a position in athletic administration where they become locked into roles that do not include the necessary responsibilities for advancement (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Swearingen, 1999). Because of this, Whisenant et al. (2002) indicated the SWA position may actually restrict women's roles and responsibilities within athletic departments. Furthermore, men have been able to maintain control in the upper echelons of intercollegiate athletics by controlling the revenue producing sports (Whisenant et al.). Therefore, male administrators work with the largest budgets and get the most experience with major financial decisions by being in positions of authority. Thus, obtaining the financial decision making experience and the development of financial management skills can be a powerful tool for SWA (Grappendorf et al., 2004; Tiell, 2004).

### *Stereotyping of managerial roles*

Within management, there are several roles a manager must engage in to be successful (Yukl, 2002). To better understand the variety of roles in which managers engage to be effective, Yukl developed a taxonomy of managerial subroles. Using Yukl's subrole classification, Atwater et al. (2004) were able to examine if particular subroles were associated with stereotypical masculine or feminine behaviors. Atwater et al. identified 13 of 19 managerial subroles as either more masculine or more feminine. Managerial subroles considered by both men and women to be masculine included delegating, disciplining, strategic decision making, and punishing. In addition, men perceived allocating resources and problem solving as more masculine (Atwater et al.). Mentoring, recognizing and rewarding, communicating, planning and supporting were perceived by men and women to be primarily feminine managerial subroles (Atwater et al.). Given this stereotyping of subroles, men and women can potentially be perceived as acting outside of their appropriate gender roles when engaging in certain managerial activities (Atwater et al.).

Within athletic administration, senior woman administrators may be experiencing gender-role stereotyping within the distribution of their job responsibilities, if they are not involved with financial decision making. If allocating resources is perceived to be a masculine managerial subrole, women in the position of Senior Woman Administrator may not be perceived by Athletic Directors (the vast majority of whom are men) as having the skills or attributes necessary to effectively execute this particular managerial role. As previously discussed, this appears to be occurring in other aspects of job functions for SWA, as they were more likely to be involved with academic advising and life skills (i.e., communal roles) while other male administrators were more likely to be involved with development (fund raising) and marketing (i.e., agentic roles) (Claussen & Lehr, 2002; Raphaely, 2003).

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to obtain the perceptions of the SWA regarding their participation in financial decision making, and to determine Senior Woman Administrators' actual and preferred levels of participation in these various areas.

## Method

This study utilized an online survey to examine Senior Woman Administrators' participation and perceptions regarding financial decision making within their intercollegiate athletic departments. Of the 1018 member institutions, a list of 744 SWA was compiled based on the names and email addresses that were included in the 2003-4 NCAA Directory. There were 744 usable listed emails, as some schools did not provide a name or an email address in the directory. After the initial mailing to 744 SWA, 103 were returned as invalid or incorrect addresses. Therefore, surveys (N = 641) were sent via email to SWA at their respective institutions. Each email sent had a link to the survey. The email included a brief statement about the purpose of the study. Follow-up emails were sent ten days after the initial inquiry to the entire sample. There were 264 responses which represented 25.7% of all NCAA member institutions and a return rate of 40.8% for the survey.

### *Research Questions*

The intent of the quantitative portion of the survey was to determine the actual and preferred levels of participation in financial decision making for various areas of intercollegiate athletics, as well as to obtain the perceptions of the SWA regarding the areas. The purpose of this paper was to attain the qualitative responses of the SWA in lieu of the findings of the quantitative analysis. The areas examined were 1) operations, 2) budgeting, 3) capital outlay, 4) salary considerations, 5) media/broadcast contracts, and, 6) sponsorship/advertising. For each decision area, participants were asked to indicate their actual and desired frequency of participation using a 4-point Likert scale (4 = always, 3 = often, 2 = sometimes, 1 = never, and not applicable). Furthermore, SWA were asked to indicate how important decision making influence in each area contributed to the overall influence at the institution utilizing a 4-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important; 4 = very important).

### *Qualitative*

The qualitative questions were included in the survey to provide depth and detail through direct quotation. The open ended questions provided a forum for the participants to convey their perceptions, feelings, emotions, explanations, meanings, and to elaborate on their thoughts regarding financial decision making, thus adding another dimension to the data. Additionally, the SWA personal words can contribute to the richness of the data (Patton, 1987). SWA were asked: 1) Do you feel as though you have the same amount of decision making in men's sports, as you do women's?, and 2) Do you have any further information or insight you would like to provide regarding financial decisions at your institution/school?

The survey items were designed to have face validity, which refers to, "the common-sense content of the assessment device" (Adams & Schvaneveldt, 1991, p. 96), or the extent to

which the questionnaire is measuring what it is intended to measure (Baumgartner & Strong, 1994). The questionnaire was developed by the researchers, and based upon the work of Pent (1999). A panel of experts, including three Senior Woman Administrators and three Sport Management professors, examined the questionnaire prior to distribution. Adjustments were made to the survey based upon the recommendations of the experts, thus providing content validity, which refers to the completeness and thoroughness of the instrument (Adams & Schvaneveldt, 1991; Babbie, 1995). A pilot test was utilized to ensure construct validity, which refers to the logical relationships within the questionnaire, and whether a particular measure relates to other measures consistent with the content being examined (Babbie). Pilot tests can assist in determining how well questions and instructions are understood, whether the sequence of questions is appropriate, and if the administrative procedures are suitable (Bourque & Fielder, 1995).

Content analysis of the qualitative responses was utilized to identify themes and patterns within the data. Responses were printed and then analyzed by the researchers. Quotes that had similar words with similar ideas or issues were categorized into “meaningful and manageable themes” (Patton, 1987, p. 150). To retain and reflect the accuracy of the messages provided by the respondent’s statements, the researchers utilized as much of the exact wording as possible (Berg, 1998). This approach followed a common methodology in analyzing qualitative data for content (Patton).

## Results

STATA statistical package, version 9.0 (StataCorp, 2006) was utilized for the analysis of the quantitative data. The analyses consisted of comparing actual and preferred participation in administrative decisions using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Table 1 includes a summary of all the demographic information for the study participants, while Table 2 describes the breakdown of SWA position by NCAA Division level. Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations for actual and preferred participation in decisions, as well as the means and standard deviations for the levels of importance of each decision. It is important to note this paper is focusing mainly on the qualitative aspect of this data. While the quantitative results have been presented in an earlier paper (Pent et al., 2007), they are useful to illustrate how the quantitative discrepancy is related to the qualitative perceptions of involvement in each area.

### *Demographic Information*

A total of (n = 262) SWA responded to the survey. The data revealed the vast majority (92.4%; n = 244) of the SWA were Caucasian (see Table I). Seventy-five percent of the sample was between the ages of 25 and 54 years. Over 60% of the sample had been in the SWA position 10 years or less, and over half had worked in intercollegiate athletics over 10 years.

Table 1 - *Demographic data*

Variable	%	n
<b>Race</b>		
Caucasian	92.4%	242
African American	5.3%	14
Latino	1.1%	3
Asian	0.4%	1
Other	0.8%	2
Total	100%	262
<b>Age</b>		
18-24	9.1%	24
25-34	24.2%	64
35-44	27.7%	73
45-54	25.4%	67
55-64	12.5%	33
65-74	1.1%	3
Total	100%	264
<b>Years in current position</b>		
0-4	37.1%	98
5-10	33.7%	89
11-15	14.8%	39
16-20	4.5%	12
21-25	3.4%	9
26+	6.4%	17
Total	100%	264
<b>Years in athletics</b>		
0-4	16.3%	43
5-10	25.4%	67
11-15	19.7%	52
16-20	13.6%	36
21-25	12.1%	33
26+	12.9%	34
Total	100%	265

\*N's may vary due to number of participants who answered each question.



Of the sample (41.8%;  $n = 127$ ) were from NCAA Division III, and 29.5% ( $n = 78$ ) was from Division II. The data also revealed that 22% ( $n = 58$ ) of SWA were from Division I. At the time of data collection (2006) there were 1018 NCAA member institutions. NCAA Division III represented 41%, NCAA Division I representing 32%, and NCAA Division II representing 27% of all NCAA schools. Athletic Directors comprised 2.3% ( $n = 6$ ) of the sample, 6.4% ( $n = 17$ ) were Senior Associate Athletic Directors, 26.2% ( $n = 70$ ) were Associate Athletic Directors, 18.9% ( $n = 50$ ) were Assistant Athletic Directors, 25.0% ( $n = 66$ ) were Coaches, while 11.7% ( $n = 31$ ) were “other,” and 8.3% ( $n = 24$ ) did not indicate any position (see Table 2). Considering SWA do not have one designated job title, the highest ranking title in the athletic department was used in the analysis. Several different interaction effects were explored; including by position, NCAA division and years in athletics. However, no significant relationships were found.

Table 2 - SWA Position by NCAA Division I, II or III

Position	Total Sample (N=262*)	Division I (n=57)	Division II (n=78)	Division III (n=127)
SWA only	6.4%	7.0%	7.8%	5.5%
Athletic Director (AD)	2.3%	0	3.8%	2.4%
Senior Associate AD	6.4%	31.6%	9.0%	7.0%
Associate AD	26.2%	31.0%	21.7%	22.8%
Assistant AD	18.9%	2.0%	25.6%	18.9%
Coach	21.0%	3.0%	19.2%	30.0%
Professor	5.0%	2.0%	3.0%	7.0%
Other Campus Administrator	17.5%	30.0%	18.0%	11.8%

The means and standard deviations for the actual and preferred participation are presented in Table 3, while the actual and preferred participation in financial decision making is presented in Figure 1. On a scale of 1 - 4 (1 = never participate; 4 = always participate), SWA' participation in operations decisions was low ( $M = 2.14$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ). In contrast to how much they would like to participate in operations decisions ( $M = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ), a significant difference appeared. SWA revealed they want to be more involved in operations decisions than they actually are,  $F(1, 261) = 31.18$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Regarding the area of budgeting, SWA participation was also low ( $M = 2.17$ ,  $SD = 1.11$ ). When compared to how much they would like to participate in budget decisions ( $M = 3.05$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ), there was a significant difference. SWA again denoted they want to be more involved in budget decisions than they actually are,  $F(1, 263) = 32.07$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Table 3 - Analysis of variance between actual and preferred participation in decision making (N=264)

Area	Actual Participation	Preferred Participation	Importance of Decision
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
Operations	2.15 (1.03)	2.97 (0.92)***	3.22 (0.84)
Budget	2.18 (1.11)	3.05 (0.92)***	3.19 (0.93)
Capital Outlay	1.78 (0.93)	2.49 (0.97)***	3.02 (0.97)
Salary Decisions	1.71 (0.99)	2.55 (1.08)***	3.03 (0.98)
Media Broadcast Contracts	1.40 (0.80)	1.84 (0.95) ***	2.11 (1.02)
Sponsorship/Advertising	1.56 (0.87)	1.98 (0.95)***	2.23 (1.02)

\*\*\*p<.001

With regards to capital outlay, SWA' participation was low (M=1.78, SD=0.93). When compared to how much they would like to participate in capital outlay decisions (M = 2.50, SD = 0.97), there was a significant difference. SWA indicated they want to be more involved in capital outlay decisions than they actually are,  $F(1, 258) = 21.47, p < .001$ .

Regarding salary considerations, SWA' participation was low (M = 1.71, SD = 0.99). When compared to how much they would like to participate in salary consideration decisions (M = 2.56, SD = 1.08), there was a significant difference as SWA indicated they want to be more involved in salary consideration decisions than they actually are,  $F(4, 260) = 26.94, p < .001$ .

In the area of media broadcast contracts, SWA' participation was actually the lowest of all six categories (M = 1.39, SD = 0.79). There was a significant difference (M = 1.84, SD = 0.95), as SWA indicated they want to be more involved in media contract decisions than they actually are,  $F(1, 233) = 46.46, p < .001$ .

SWA' participation in sponsorship and advertising was among the lowest of the six categories (M = 1.56, SD = 0.87). When compared to how much they would like to participate in sponsorship and advertising (M = 1.98, SD = 0.95), there was a significant difference. Yet again, SWA indicated they want to be more involved in salary consideration decisions than they actually are,  $F(1, 249) = 49.42, p < .001$ .

SWA were asked to rank the importance of each of the decision making areas. They reported that operations was the most important (M = 3.22, SD = 0.84), followed by budgeting (M = 3.19, SD = 0.93), salary (M = 3.03, SD = 0.97), capital outlay (M = 3.02, SD = 0.97), sponsorship and advertising (M = 2.23, SD = 1.02), and media/broadcast contracts (M = 2.11, SD = 1.02).

Lastly, various interaction effects were explored; including by position title, NCAA division, and years in position. However, no significant relationships were found. Additionally, region was also examined, but there was not enough statistical power to conduct a separate analysis.

### Qualitative Responses

The open-ended questions were coded and analyzed using Atlas/ti 5 (Atlas/ti, 2007) and then categorized as the SWA' perceptions of either (1) mostly involved, (2) limited decision making, or (3) excluded from decision making (see Table 4). The first open-ended question asked whether or not SWA feel they have the same amount of decision making in men's sports as in women's sports. Of the total responses (N = 135), 20% (n = 27) were from NCAA Division I institutions; 23% (n = 31) were from NCAA Division II, and 57% (n = 77) were from NCAA Division III (see Table 5).

Table 4 - *Qualitative Responses*

Question	%	n
<hr/>		
Question 1: Do you feel as though you have the same amount of decision making in men's sports as you do women's?		
Mostly involved	48.9%	66
Excluded from decisions	28.9%	39
Limited decision making	14.1%	19
Other	8.1%	11
Total	100%	135
Question 2: Is there any further information or insight you would like to provide regarding financial decisions at your institution?		
SWA in name only	57.3%	43
Have financial input	22.7%	17
Other	20.0%	15
Total	100%	75
<hr/>		

Table 5 - *Qualitative Responses by Division*

Question	%	n
<hr/>		
Question 1: Do you feel as though you have the same amount of decision making in men's sports as you do women's?		
Mostly Involved	48.9%	
Division I	22.7%	
Division II	24.3%	
Division III	53.0%	
Excluded from Decisions	28.9%	
Division I	15.4%	
Division II	20.5%	
Division III	64.1%	
Limited Decision Making	14.1%	
Division I	31.5%	
Division II	31.5%	
Division III	37.0%	
Other	8.1%	
Division I	0.0%	
Division II	63.6%	
Division III	36.4%	
Total	100%	

Of the total SWA responses, 49% (n = 66) indicated they felt they were mostly involved in decision-making processes for both men's and women's sports. Of the NCAA Division I SWA who claimed they were mostly involved in decision making processes, 23% (n = 15) were from Division I, 25% (n = 16) were from Division II, and 52% (n = 35) were from Division III institutions. One Division I SWA said, "As a senior associate athletic director you are involved in the decision making process (for almost everything) because of my expertise." Division II SWA attitudes who are mostly involved in decision-making are reflected in statements such as, "My AD always includes me (when I wish to be) in decisions we make in our department. He supports the role of the SWA completely," and "I have gained total support and confidence in my AD." Examples from Division III institutions include, "I am well respected by both men and women in our department and my suggestions are taken seriously regardless of the team," and "Not only am I the SWA but I am the assistant Men's basketball coach, so my many hats allows

me to have input for both men and women's sports." Lastly an NCAA Division III SWA commented that: "I am involved in all our sports, men and women, from travel arrangements to budgeting and expenditures."

While 49% (n = 66) of SWA claimed they have decision-making responsibilities, 28.9% (n = 39) of SWA indicated they were excluded or had very minimal input, particularly with men's/revenue sports. Of these 39, 15% (n = 6) were from Division I, 21% (n=8) were from Division II, and 64% (n = 25) were from Division III institutions. There were several examples in the data that were categorized as having no inclusion in decision-making. Examples from Division I institutions are: 1) "Decisions happen all the time that I'm completely excluded from, even if they are in areas that directly affect my job," 2) "I feel that the athletic director does not feel that my position is important. Therefore, I am left out of the loop when a lot of the decisions (regarding male and female sports) are being made." The exclusion from decision-making theme is also reflected through Division II responses: 1) "I feel equally left out of financial decision making whether the sports is for men or for women," 2) "As SWA I have had no input in this area (men). As an advocate for student-athletes, I feel I should have a voice," and 3) "Administration sees my role as more important for women's sports, I especially don't have input into men's basketball."

Finally, Division III SWA's have similar attitudes toward their lack of inclusion. For example, one Division III SWA said, "Not included in the discussions or asked for input and suggestions seem to be disregarded," while others claimed "I am the SWA in title only - I am not involved in issues unless they are specific to women." Further comments included: "My title as SWA is more of just a title because they needed somebody to fill the spot," and "I'm allowed to make recommendations equally for men's and women's sports, but only recommendations. In my eyes that means I have a title but not authority." Furthermore, 14.1 % (n = 19) of the SWA indicated their participation in the decision making of men's and women's sport was limited. Of these respondents, 32% (n=6) were from Division I, 32% (n = 6) were from Division II, and 36% (n=7) were from Division III. One Division I SWA said "I think it is not as much a question of the gender difference but a difference between high revenue (basketball) sports and non revenue sports. I have less decision making power with high revenue sports."

Division II SWAs continue this trend in limited decision-making when it comes to women's and men's sports. Statements from Division II SWA regarding this topic are as follows: 1) "Depends on what the issue concerns," 2) "My AD has the tendency to involve men in the decisions about softball and WBB (women's basketball). They both have women head coaches. All of the other coaches on our staff are men and I don't have much say in those sports (track and tennis)," and 3) "My input is considered when there is a Title IX issue." Similar feelings of being ostracized exist for Division III SWA. For example, a Division III SWA said, "Female coaches speak to me about budgets. Male coaches don't except those that coach women's teams," while another claimed "It depends on the area of decision making (education, programming, compliance)."

Additionally, SWA were asked if they wanted to provide any additional information about their participation in financial decision-making (see Table 4). Of the total responses (N = 73), 16.4% (n = 12) were from NCAA Division I; 23.3% (n = 17) were from NCAA Division II, while 60.3 % (n = 44) were from NCAA Division III (see Table 6). Of the SWA (56%, n = 41)

indicated they felt they were SWA in name only (fitting into the “no inclusion” category of our qualitative analysis). In NCAA Division I, 50 % (n = 6) indicated they felt they were SWA in name only, while at NCAA Division II, 64. 7% (n = 11) did.

Lastly, at NCAA Division III, 59 % (n = 26) cited they felt as though they were SWA in name only. Examples of these statements from NCAA Division I SWA include: 1) “I don’t think higher management cares about the professional development of women in athletic departments. They want them to do their current jobs and be happy doing that. Don’t cause any waves, take care of the busy work, keep the department out of trouble and be quiet,” 2) “In my situation, it is a control issue. The director of athletics does not want me involved in financial matters even though more than 75% of the staff reports directly to me. The AD knows I disagree with the process, but will not allow my involvement.” From NCAA Division II SWA statements include: 1) “Our institution still seems to believe in the “good ol’ Boys Club” mentality. Women do not seem to “fit in” to their conversations and are often not included in meetings and outings,” 2) “The athletic director makes all of the decisions with the Senior Associate AD whose office is adjacent. My office is not connected, so I am excluded. The AD just doesn’t think to ask me to join in decision-making because I am out of sight/out of mind. Any consideration I get in decision making, financial or otherwise is an after thought.” From an NCAA Division III SWA: 1) “I believe I am not more involved in the process because of the perceived power that goes with task of making financial decision, i.e., if I were more involved in such matters the AD would view this as a reduction of power and control,” 2) “My SWA role is used mainly as a person to receive mail for the SWA. I have no decision making role and I’m actually looked down upon by others in my department for having this title,” 3) “Men make justifications for spending on men’s sports behind closed doors that they know would get them in trouble if discussed openly. Men eat more and take up more bed space is the mindset that I have to fight every time.”

Of the SWA who responded, 23.4% (n = 17) indicated they have financial decision making input and involvement, though the reasons varied. The only Division I SWA who claimed she had financial decision-making input stated “I would like to address that our institution is probably an exception to the norm in that we have a female Director of Athletics and a female Associate AD for Finance. Five of our nine athletics administrators are women!” Similar to Division I, there was only one Division II SWA who stated she had financial decision input. She said, “I feel very grateful to have the opportunities I do. They were earned.” The Division III SWA represented 88% (n = 15) of the respondents who had involvement in financial decision-making. One Division III SWA argued that the reason she is involved in financial decisions is because her job as Assistant A.D. requires it. However, she was quick to point out that, “...it might be a different story if the person over the budget were a man.” Another SWA had a similar experience suggesting that because the chief financial advisor is a female, she is able to work “very closely with her in making sound decisions.” Another SWA realized how privileged she is in her fiscal responsibility stating, “I feel very fortunate to have the responsibility of budgeting. I hear so many colleagues at other institutions who have no decision-making responsibility when it comes to finance.” Finally, one SWA attributes her participation in financial decision making to the recent hiring of a female A.D.: “Since hiring a female Athletic Director, what once was very inequitable area for our department has become very equitable.”

## Discussion

The results from this study indicated many SWA wanted more participation in financial decision making within athletic administration. Both the quantitative and qualitative analyses indicated SWA wanted more opportunities to provide input in financial decision making. For the quantitative analysis, a significant main effect indicated SWA wanted to participate more than they actually were in operations, budgeting, capital outlay, salary-considerations, media broadcast-contracts, and sponsorship and advertising. The qualitative results partially supported the quantitative analysis, as nearly half (48.9%) of respondents believed they were mostly involved, while 43% believed they had limited or were excluded from decision making. Therefore, there is evidence provided of the SWA desires to participate further, which is substantiated by the qualitative results.

Results of analysis of the data from the current study indicated SWA were often not involved in various areas of financial decision making. These areas (budgeting, operations, etc.) are considered important managerial responsibilities for athletic administrators (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999; Grappendorf & Lough, 2006). Within this study, many SWA indicated a desire to be more involved in areas of financial decision making and they have been excluded from such involvement. This lack of participation in financial decision making can constrain SWA from making progress toward higher levels of athletic administration (e.g., Athletic Director).

As noted earlier, gender role stereotyping has been identified as a major barrier to women's progress within management positions (Schein, 2007). If SWA are not being provided with opportunities to engage in financial decision making, social role theory would explain that denial of such opportunities is the result of stereotyping of managerial roles deemed acceptable for women working in athletic administration. As explained earlier, social role theory describes categorization of men and women into gender appropriate roles (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, et al., 2000). Women are traditionally viewed as having more interpersonally oriented or communal traits, which are deemed appropriate for women. Men are traditionally viewed as possessing more task-oriented or agentic characteristics; traits deemed appropriate for men (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, et al., 2000). If these communal characteristics are being applied to SWA, then perceptions of their ability to engage in managerial roles that do not fit those interpersonally oriented or communal characteristics will result in SWA being provided fewer opportunities in more task-oriented roles, including financial decision making.

Additionally, managerial roles are also subject to gender stereotyping, Atwater et al. (2004) found men perceived allocating resources and problem solving as more masculine. Therefore, it is plausible to suggest gender role stereotyping of managerial subroles may be occurring within the management ranks of intercollegiate athletics. Resource allocation (financial decision making) has been stereotyped as a masculine managerial role, therefore SWA may be prohibited from participation in financial decision making because they are viewed as not having the stereotypical masculine characteristics perceived as necessary to successfully perform those functions. Role congruity theory may be used to explain that as a result of gender stereotyping of managerial roles in intercollegiate athletics SWA may be denied opportunities to make financial decisions (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In addition, role congruity theory would also help to explain

evaluation of SWA engaging in financial decision making. If SWA are provided such managerial experiences, these experiences would be considered outside of the ‘feminine’ appropriate roles in which SWA should engage, and their participation in such roles may be negatively evaluated (Eagly & Karau). This was not directly examined in the current study, but potential negative evaluation of SWA’ financial decision making would result in provision of fewer future opportunities. Research examining Athletic Directors’ evaluations of SWA’ performance in financial decision making would help to understand if the tenants of role congruity theory can explain why SWA are not provided more involvement in financial decision making. Regardless of the cause, SWA are often being denied opportunities to gain prerequisite experiences necessary for career progression in athletic administration.

The qualitative data gathered through the open-ended questions revealed SWA often felt left “out of the loop” regarding decision making. A substantial number of respondents indicated they had limited input or felt excluded from decision making or felt they were SWA in “name only.” Comments expressed by SWA that they felt their input was disregarded or were SWA ‘in title only’ highlights the serious need to specifically define the roles and responsibilities they fulfill. If the role of the SWA is not valued or is viewed as a “token” position by athletic directors, there is little chance female administrators are going to be included in key decisions. Again, this situation creates a dilemma for SWA as oversight of budgets, fund raising, development activities and decision making roles have been identified as key antecedents to career progression for athletic directors (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999; Grappendorf & Lough, 2006). If SWA continue to be excluded, or their participation is minimized, then it is clear further discussion and more aggressive action needs to be taken by the NCAA to better define the true roles and responsibilities of the SWA. If the roles and responsibilities of the SWA position are not more clearly defined, women will often continue to be systematically overlooked as candidates for athletic director positions.

On the other hand, it was interesting to note that 49% of the SWA’s responding to the open ended question regarding if they have equal input with both men’s and women’s sports indicated they did, while 28.9% felt excluded. This was somewhat surprising, as it may have been expected percentages would have been similar to financial decision making percentages. The finding 49% do feel like they are getting equal input in men’s and women’s sports may be indicating a step to inclusion in all financial decision making.

Another interesting finding from the current study involved the area of media broadcast contracts. SWA indicated they wanted more participation with media broadcast contracts, yet, broadcast contracts was the area with the least discrepancy of all the financial categories, and ranked the lowest in terms of overall influence. This was an unexpected finding. With the continued need for intercollegiate athletics to find alternative financing sources and the growth of media broadcast outlets, colleges and universities will continue to seek additional funding opportunities that involve broadcast media contracts. As the number of media outlets for intercollegiate athletics grows and opportunities for additional revenue from such contracts expand, women in athletic administration should gain more experience in media broadcast contract negotiations. Although broadcast media contract negotiation is likely an area for which athletic departments will use legal counsel, knowledge regarding these contracts will be a highly valuable asset to athletic administrators, specifically senior level athletic administrators.



### Limitations

This study was intended to explore the participation and perceptions of SWA in areas of financial decision making. Though the quantitative analysis examined results by title of job, division level, and years of experience, no significant interaction effects were found. The small size of some groups within the sample may not have provided sufficient size for observation. Future research could address this issue. This would help, if for example an SWA is also a head coach, she may not want more participation in certain areas of financial decision making because of the time commitment required for these additional responsibilities. In addition, SWA at the NCAA Division III level may not want greater participation in media/broadcast rights. Further, research with a larger sample from each division and position could examine the results by division and explore the possibility of progress at the division levels.

Another limitation of this study may be the randomness and representation of the population, as all SWA from all levels were included. Additionally, there are not an equal number of NCAA Division I, II, and III colleges and universities. Further, based upon the level, the SWA may hold different titles with some SWA being high ranking administrators, and some not involved in the athletic department at all. Therefore, SWA level of participation or their responses/perceptions may have varied by the NCAA Division level.

Future research should also include men in athletic administration and their perceptions regarding actual and desired participation in financial decision making.

This study indicated many SWA want more experience with financial matters. Further research is needed to examine the overall impact of gender role stereotyping on the progression of SWA in their careers.

### References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2008). *Women in intercollegiate sports: A longitudinal, national study twenty-nine year update, 1977-2006*. Retrieved January 10, 2008, from: <http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport/2008%20Summary%20Final.pdf>
- Adams, G. R., & Schvaneveldt, J. D. (1991). *Understanding research methods*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Allen, M. W., Seibert, J. H., & Rush, R. R. (1990). Gender differences in perceptions of work: Limited access to decision-making power and supervisory support. *Women's Studies in Communication, 13* (2), 1-20.
- 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.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Baumgartner, T. A., & Strong, C. H. (1994). *Conducting and reading research in health and human performance*. Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.
- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Bourque, L. B., & Fielder, E. P. (1995). *How to conduct self-administered and mail surveys*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Claussen, C. L. & Lehr, C. (1999). RACI chart descriptions of the authority of senior woman administrators (abstract). *Proceedings of the North American Society for Sport Management*, 14, 21-22.
- Claussen, C. L., & Lehr, C. (2002). Decision-making authority of senior woman administrators. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 3, 215-228.
- Coakley, J. (2004). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Danylchuk, K. E., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). The nature of managerial work in Canadian intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 148-166.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- 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. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The development of social psychology of gender* (pp. 123-174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gill-Fisher, P. (March 16, 1998). SWA position needs planning and support. *The NCAA News*. Retrieved April 21, 1998: <http://www.ncaa.org/news/19980316/comment.html>
- Grappendorf, H., Lough, N., & Griffin, J. (2004). Profiles and career patterns of female NCAA Division I athletic directors. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 5, 243-261.
- Hawes, K. (2002, January 7). NCAA senior woman administrator builds a new position. *The NCAA News*. Retrieved January 16, 2002: [http://www.nacwaa.org/images/pdf/AC\\_29YearStudy.pdf](http://www.nacwaa.org/images/pdf/AC_29YearStudy.pdf)<http://www.ncaa.org/news/2002/20020107/active/3901n02.html>
- Judd, M. (1995). A gender comparison of competencies important for the success in college athletic administration. *Physical Education*, 52 (1), 8-13.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 135-159.
- Lough, N. & Grappendorf, H. (2007). Senior Woman Administrators perspectives on professional advancement. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 193-209.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (1991). *Senior woman administrator*. [Brochure]. Overland Park, KS: NCAA.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2005). *2005-06 NCAA Division I Manual*. Indianapolis, IN.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2006). *Senior woman administrator: Involving your Senior Woman Administrator*. [Brochure]. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2007). *2006-07 NCAA Division I Manual*. Indianapolis, IN.

- Osborne, B. & Shields, E. (2003). *NCAA senior women administrators: Who are they?* Proceedings from the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. (abstract).
- Parks, J. B., Russell, R. L., Wood, P. H., Robertson, M. A. & Shewokis, P. A. (1995). The paradox of the contented working woman in intercollegiate athletics administration. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 73-79.
- Peitchinis, S. G. (1989). *Women at work: Discrimination and response*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Quarterman, J., Dupree, A. D., & Willis, K. P. (2006). Challenges confronting female intercollegiate athletic directors of NCAA member institutions by division. *College Student Journal*, 40, 528-545.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pent, A., Grappendorf, H., & Henderson, A. (2007). Do they want more? An analysis of NCAA Senior Woman Administrators participation in financial decision making. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 1 (2), 157-173.
- Pent, A. K. (1999). Decision making in intercollegiate athletics: An exploration of actual and ideal participation levels among NCAA Division I athletic administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
- Raphaely, D. (2003). An analysis of the senior woman administrator position within NCAA athletics departments. *Unpublished master's thesis*, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.
- 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.
- Schell, L. A., & Rodrigueez, S. (2000). Our sporting sisters: How male hegemony stratifies women in sport. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 9, 15-34.
- Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review*, 22, 6-18.
- StataCorp (2006). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 9.0*. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation.
- Suggs, W. (2005). Faces in a mostly white, male crowd. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51, A34-A36.
- Swearingen, T. (1999). Examination of the senior woman administrator role in college athletic department. *Masters Abstracts International*, 37(4), 1125. (UMI No. 1393726)
- Tiell, B. (2004). Career paths, roles, and tasks of Senior Woman Administrators in intercollegiate athletics. *Doctoral Dissertation*, United States Sports Academy, Daphne, AL.
- Whisenant, W. A., & Pedersen, P. M. (2004). The influence of managerial activities on the success of intercollegiate athletic directors. *American Business Review*, 22, 21 -26.

Whisenant, W. A., Pederson, P. M., & Obenour, B. L. (2002). Success and gender: Determining advancement in intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 47*, 485-491.

Yukl, G. A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.