



Female Senior-Level Administrators Experiences of Gender Bias in Collegiate Athletics

Robin Hardin

University of Tennessee

Elizabeth A. Taylor

Temple University

Allison Smith

University of Massachusetts – Boston

Jessica Siegele

University of North Carolina – Pembroke

Gi Yong Koo

Troy University

Research has identified many barriers and challenges facing women in the male-dominated profession of collegiate athletic administration. Gender bias is a predominant factor in limiting the opportunities for women in leadership across a myriad of professions including sport. Gender bias itself is comprised of many facets, and not all women experience gender bias in the same way, as intersecting identities also impacts it. The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of gender bias among women who hold senior leadership positions in collegiate athletics utilizing the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders. The results of this study continue to support the notion that gender bias does exist in college athletics. The results provide an in-depth examination of the many dimensions that comprise gender bias as a construct. Collegiate athletic administrators as well as university administrators need to continue to work to help reduce or eliminate gender bias from the college athletic environment. Women are certainly capable as leaders and administrators and should be given the opportunity to be successful without having to negotiate the challenges presented by gender bias.

Keywords: Ecological-Intersectional Model, NCAA, Athletic Directors, Senior Women Administrators, Career Mobility University

When Candace Lee was named Vanderbilt's athletic director in May 2020, headlines touted the precedent-making promotion as the first female athletic director at Vanderbilt and the first Black female athletic director at a Southeastern Conference university. Her ascension to athletic director was newsworthy because the male-dominated college sport environment has hampered upward career mobility for women, specifically for women with other marginalized identities, for its entire history. Female administrators must first navigate the ranks of senior leadership within college athletics which are often rife with gender bias before ascending to the pinnacle position (athletic director) of leadership in a college athletic department (Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2018). In fact, gender biases impact women's ability to enter, remain, and ascend within collegiate athletic administration. It is not only an issue at senior-level positions but throughout all of college athletics from graduate assistants to early-career professionals to athletic directors (Hardin et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2017; Taylor & Hardin, 2016).

Women in leadership positions within athletic departments at National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions are largely underrepresented. The most recent data (2020) from the NCAA show that approximately 67% of leadership positions across all three NCAA divisions, excluding the Senior Women Administrator (SWA; i.e., director of athletics, assistant athletic director, and associate athletic director), are held by men (NCAA, 2021). This is even more evident at the athletic director position as only 24% of those positions are held by women, and that number drops to 15% at the Division I level (NCAA, 2021). Women's participation in college sports is at all-time high, but leadership positions are still overwhelmingly dominated by men (NCAA, 2021).

Research has identified many barriers and challenges facing women in male-dominated work environments (Burton, 2015; Grappendorf & Burton, 2017; Katz et al., 2018). Gender bias, both overt and subtle, has been identified as a predominant factor in limiting the opportunities for women in leadership across a myriad of professions including sport (Diehl et al., 2020). Not all women experience gender bias in the same way though. Intersecting identities of ethnicity, relationship status, parental status, and sexual orientation may influence the way women perceive and experience gender bias (Melton & Bryant, 2017). Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of gender bias among women who hold senior leadership positions in collegiate athletics. The study utilized the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders (GBSWL), and the results were situated within the Ecological-Intersection Model. The study also examined varying demographic factors that influence the ways in which women perceive and experience gender bias. Other studies have identified persistent evidence of gender bias in sport organizations, but this study is the first to implement the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders in the sport environment (Diehl et al., 2020).

Dimensions of Gender Bias

The experiences for women in male-dominated industries, like sport, are vastly different as they encounter gender bias in a wide array of forms and behaviors from their peers, superiors, and other colleagues as well as external stakeholders. Bias can be overt where the actions and behaviors are directly linked to discrimination and are conscious and unlawful in intent (Diehl et al., 2020), but subtle bias manifests through, "negative or ambivalent demeanor and/or treatment

enacted toward social minorities on the basis of their minority status membership that are not necessarily conscious and likely convey ambiguous intent” (Jones et al., 2016, p. 1591). This subtle bias serves as barriers and challenges for women and their opportunities in leadership as it serves to solidify, “workplace structures, practices, and patterns of interaction that inadvertently favor men” (Ely et al., 2011, p. 475). Gender bias both subtle and overt has been widely studied in relation to its effects on women in the workplace, but for the purposes of this manuscript, the focus is on the six areas identified by Diehl et al.’s (2020) seminal work as they relate to women working within collegiate athletics: male privilege, disproportionate constraints, devaluation, insufficient support, hostility, and acquiescence.

Male Privilege

Research in collegiate athletic administration has found that sport is a space privileged to men, and predominately White men (e.g., Burton, 2015; Burton et al., 2009; Siegele et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2017, 2019, 2020; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2017, 2018). For women working in collegiate athletic departments aspiring to reach the pinnacle leadership position (i.e., athletic director) there is a lack of women to specifically pinpoint and visualize in this role (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014; Lapchick, 2020, 2021; Taylor & Hardin, 2016). Collegiate athletics leadership is a “good ole boys club” that continues to perpetuate a masculine culture causing women to be deemed outsiders in this space (Bower & Hums, 2013; Taylor & Wells, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017; Walker & Satore-Baldwin, 2013).

This male culture is perpetuated due to homologous reproduction or the hiring practices of leaders employing those who look like them and or have similar backgrounds as them (Hultin, 2003). This male culture and homologous reproduction have led to many women with leadership goals being pigeon-holed into the SWA designation as this role is “perceived as the ceiling of career attainment for women in collegiate athletic administration” (Smith et al., 2020, p. 120). Female collegiate athletic administrators desire to have oversight responsibilities of revenue-generating sports, as well as financial matters impacting the athletic department, as these duties align with the deemed skills needed to ascend to senior level positions (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hancock & Hums, 2016; Smith et al., 2019, 2020; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2018; Tiell & Dixon, 2008; Tiell et al., 2012; Wells et al., 2021).

Disproportionate Constraints

Women also endure disproportionate constraints to their communication, career decisions, and experience unequal standards for their work. The constraints that women experience in these areas greater than those of men simply because of gender. This constraint to communication could be restricting when and how they are allowed to voice their opinions and ideas, being talked over in meetings or waiting to be acknowledged to contribute, or simply being ignored altogether (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Hindman & Walker, 2020; Siegele et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2020). Men are granted the space to be passionate, heated, and engage in loud arguments and dialogue in meetings, and these behaviors are viewed as inappropriate for women (Knoppers & Anthonissen, 2008). Women have an element of having to prove their worth and reaffirm their competence in sport spaces (Bower & Hums, 2013; Burton et al., 2012; Hardin & Whiteside, 2012; Walker & Satore-Baldwin, 2013). Women in leadership positions are many times negatively evaluated by their peers, colleagues, and supervisors (i.e., “dragon lady,”

“bitch”) creating an unequal standard for which their work is compared and assessed in comparison to male leaders and peers (Grappendorf et al., 2004; Shaw & Hoebner, 2003; Siegele et al., 2020).

Devaluation

Devaluation occurs as a gender bias both psychologically and monetarily as women can have their contributions diminished, dismissed, unnoticed, unsupported, and uncompensated (Smith et al., 2020; Wells et al., 2021). Women who do not conform to their expected gender roles (i.e., feminine, nurturing, caretakers) to pursue leadership positions are typically criticized more and viewed less positively than their male peers (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Ryan & Haslam, 2005) and encounter greater barriers and organizational power structures (Burton & LaVoi, 2016). Furthermore, this devaluation occurs not only through job responsibilities, but also the salary inequality that women experience. Individual university circumstances are certainly different, but women athletic directors tend to receive lower compensation than their male counterparts (Hardin et al., 2017; Lattinville & Denny, 2020; Sabo et al., 2016).

Insufficient Support

The support, professional guidance, advice, and feedback of a mentor can be invaluable to early-career professionals as they attempt to grow their network and create upward career mobility. Mentorship however is not enough though as early-career professionals require sponsorship as well or someone championing and advocating on their behalf (Hancock, 2012). Many women lack mentorship and role models needed for their career progression in collegiate athletics (Smith et al., 2016; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2017). This lack of mentorship could be explained by the lack of gender diversity within collegiate athletics, as well as the lack of extensive networks for women in senior-level positions (Bower & Hums, 2014; Hancock et al., 2018; Katz et al., 2018).

The scarcity of senior female administrators and their limited professional networks also result in a lack of the crucial psychosocial benefits that have been found through same-gender mentorship (Smith et al., 2016). Women who have networking opportunities, participate in professional organizations, and feel supported and invested in by a mentor are able to advance further in their careers as well as enjoy more job success and satisfaction (Bower, 2008; Bower et al., 2019; Ruderman & Ohlott, 2004; Taylor et al., 2018). Women who have a chance to learn and develop through problem-solving, receive critical feedback to modify or adapt their behavior, and receive consistent support through mentorship and sponsorship have a higher likelihood of ascending to leadership positions (Machida-Kosuga et al., 2016).

Hostility

The male-dominated space of college athletics can create a ripe environment for hostility and workplace harassment (Burton, 2015; Dixon et al., 2008). Bullying and intimidation of women from male peers and superiors have been found to be commonplace (Smith et al., 2019). Often men believe that using sexist language and behavior is appropriate due to the masculine nature of sports further marginalizing and isolating women (Hindman & Walker, 2020; Walker & Satore-Baldwin, 2013). Women are often objectified for their bodies within male-dominated

spaces focusing on their physical appearance as well as inappropriate touching, which all lead to creating hostile environments (Hindman & Walker, 2020).

Women can also be some of the most powerful deterrents to one another as many feel the need to compete with one another rather than support and assist each other (Hancock, 2012; Taylor et al., 2018). Taylor et al. (2018) found that this behavior of “Queen Bee syndrome” is where a woman, rather than a man, becomes highly critical of another woman due to male dominance of the organization. For these “Queen Bees,” harassing and treating other women poorly is done to disassociate themselves from other women and gain entrance into the dominant group (e.g., men), and many times this dissociation occurs through bullying or creating hostile working conditions (Taylor et al., 2018).

Acquiescence

Women many times participate in the barrier of acquiescence where “a woman's apparent acceptance of her assigned place in the male environment, and encompasses self-silencing on gender issues and self-limited aspirations” (Diehl et al., 2020, p. 21). Women in collegiate athletics do participate in these acquiescent norms (Burton, 2015; Taylor & Wells, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017) that “may serve to inhibit women within sport organizations through internal identity comparison processes that may subsequently result in the unconscious manifestation of self-limiting behaviors (Satori & Cunningham, 2007, p. 259). Many women make concessions and change career paths due to the demands of collegiate athletics and the overall male dominance of the industry (Taylor et al., 2017). Women, despite their accolades, experience, and background, may be reluctant to pursue promotions and leadership opportunities due to internalized beliefs of “not being qualified” or concerns that their personal obligations (i.e., family and relationships) might interfere with their advancement goals (Diehl et al., 2020).

Ecological-Intersectional Model

It is also important to examine how the dimensions of gender bias are situated within the Ecological-Intersectional Model. Research has noted the plethora of challenges for women in the sport industry, especially those working in collegiate sport (see Derks et al., 2011; Kamphoff, 2010; Kilty, 2006; Messner, 2009; Siegele et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2017, 2019, 2020; Taylor et al., 2016, 2017, 2018). These challenges are not particular to one position (e.g., coaching or athletic administration), but rather systemic and can be found across the entire athletic department as noted by the similarity in experiences from women who are graduate assistants to athletic directors to conference commissioners. These women - no matter what position they hold - face complex barriers across multiple levels, which can be further impacted by intersecting identities (e.g., gender and ethnicity) leading to layered marginalization and oppression (LaVoi, 2016). The Ecological-Intersectional Model (LaVoi, 2016), which is based on the Ecological Systems Theory model (Brongerbrenner, 1977, 1979, 1993), was utilized for the conceptual foundation for this study. The Ecological Systems Theory model is comprised of four levels (i.e., socio-cultural, organizational, interpersonal, and individual) that simultaneously and uniquely influence experiences and behaviors (LaVoi, 2016). Intersectionality is an important component of the Ecological-Intersectional Model as it draws attention to overlapping systems of oppression for women with multiple marginalized identities (e.g., women of color). The Ecological-

Intersectional Model, similar to other multi-level models, stresses the importance of the interrelationships between a person and their setting (LaVoi, 2016).

The Ecological-Intersectional Model examines the existence of traditional gender norms or stereotypes and the role they play in the potential success of women in sport at the socio-cultural level. The model recognizes the societal-based construction of gender and how that can impact the experiences of women in a gendered institution, like sport (Burton, 2015). The organizational level of the Ecological-Intersectional Model can be influenced by access and treatment discrimination such as discriminatory hiring practices and organizational values, which can negatively impact women's ability to enter into or be successful in the sport industry.

At the interpersonal level is the presence of relationships with one's family, colleagues, and other social networks (Larson & Clayton, 2019). The nature of the relationship (i.e., positive or negative) will impact women in different ways (LaVoi & Dutove, 2012). Positive social relationships, like mentoring and sponsorship, can offer support to women in collegiate athletics whereas lack of support and limited social networks can lead to negative workplace experiences such as burnout and feelings of isolation (Larson & Clayton, 2019). Sport is also plagued with sexism, which may impact the relationships women are able to create (Clarkson et al., 2019; Ellemers et al., 2004; Siegele et al., 2020). The inclusion of intersectionality allows for the model to highlight the complexities associated with other identities that exist within a demographic like "women" (LaVoi, 2016; Messner, 2011). Thus, a woman's intersecting identities can influence individual level experiences, and how she makes sense of them. Illustrating the interrelatedness of each level within the Ecological-Intersectional Model, research has illustrated the influence that accepted norms and policies of an organization have on these feelings of guilt and anxiety based on constraints such as job pressure, work schedules, and associated stress (Burton, 2015; Dixon & Bruening, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The aforementioned gender biases affect women's ability to enter, retain, and ascend within collegiate athletic administration. However, women have illustrated practices that are more democratic, inclusive, interactive, innovative, and creative in terms of their leadership styles, policies, and practices of advocacy and positively enabling others around them (Burton, 2015; Campuzano, 2019; Hartzell & Dixon, 2019; Welty Peachey & Burton, 2011). Thus, research needs to continue to examine the current state of male-dominated organizations like collegiate athletics and continue to expose the biases and barriers that prohibit a more inclusive and diverse leadership and workforce. It is also important to examine how these biases are situated with the Ecological-Intersectional Model. These research questions guided the study:

RQ 1a: Do women in senior-level administrative positions in college athletics experience gender bias?

RQ 1b: What dimensions of gender bias are experienced?

RQ 2: How does intersectionality impact the experience of gender bias?

RQ 3: How are the dimensions of gender bias situated within the Ecological-Intersectional Model?

Method

Participants

The sample for this study was derived from senior-level female administrators in college athletics. Women who held the position of athletic director or the senior woman administrator designation were included in the population study. Participants were from all three divisions of the NCAA. Women held 247 athletic director positions in 2019, and 1,093 women held the senior woman administrator designation in 2019 (NCAA, 2020).

The respondents were equally spread across all three divisions of the NCAA (Division I - 30.6%, Division II - 30.5%, Division III 39.0%). They had worked in college athletics for an average of nearly 19 years and been in their current position an average of eight years. The majority of the participants (87.8%) identified as White and with sexual orientation of straight/heterosexual (74.8%). Nearly two-thirds (65.1%) of the respondents were married or in a long-term relationship, and more than half (52.8%) did not have any children (see Table 1).

Instrumentation

The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of gender bias among women who hold senior leadership positions in collegiate athletics. Thus, the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders was utilized as the basis of the questionnaire (Diehl et al., 2020). The questionnaire measured dimensions of gender bias (see Table 2). The dimensions are: (a) male privilege – men dominate the workforce, and a male culture is present; (b) disproportionate constraints – women are constrained in their career choices, behavior, and communication; (c) insufficient support – women lack the necessary support in the form of mentors, support of other women and their male colleagues; (d) devaluation – women's viewpoints are not fully valued and there is lack of financial equity, (e) hostility – hostile and unwelcoming professional environment created men as well as women, and (f) acquiescence – women assume their role based on gender hierarchy. Diehl et al. (2020) recommend using the scale in different areas of leadership and work environments to gain a deeper understanding of gender bias that women encounter. Thus, it is appropriate to utilize this scale in collegiate athletics.

Diehl et al. (2020) also recommend taking into consideration demographic variables to better understand how specific characteristics can impact gender bias. This questionnaire also included several demographic questions. They included ethnicity, relationship status, parental status, sexual orientation, and NCAA division of current place of employment (Weight et al., 2021).

Data Collection

E-mail addresses were gathered from publicly available NCAA member institutions athletic department staff directories. The online staff directories were accessed and the e-mail addresses for female athletic directors and senior woman administrator designees were obtained. E-mail addresses were not available for all of the potential participants, and there were also generic e-mail addresses listed for some members of the population, i.e. athleticdirector@university.edu.

Table 1
Participant Demographics

Demographic	Percentage
NCAA Classification	30.6
Divisions I	9.2
Division I – FBS	12.9
Division I – FCS	8.5
Division I – No Football	30.5
Division II	39.0
Division III	
Relationship Status	26.1
Single, never married	7.7
Long-term relationship	57.4
Married or domestic partnership	0.7
Widowed	6.3
Divorced	0.4
Separated	1.5
Choose not to Answer	
Sexual Orientation	0.7
Asexual	1.5
Bisexual	3.0
Gay	74.8
Straight (heterosexual)	17.0
Lesbian	0.7
Queer	2.2
Choose not to Answer	
Children in the Household	53.3
No Children	13.1
Newborn to 5-years old	17.2
6-years old to 12-years old	12.8
13-years old to 18-years old	16.1
Older than 18-years old	
Children	52.8
0	10.9
1	26.6
2	7.1
3	1.5
4	1.1
5 or more	

Table 2
Dimensions of Gender Bias

Dimension	Mean	SD	Level Experience
Male Privilege	2.24	.72	Moderate
Disproportionate Constraints	2.80	.67	Moderate
Insufficient Support	2.83	.72	Moderate
Devaluation	3.15	.95	High
Hostility	2.49	1.01	Moderate
Acquiescence	2.16	.68	Moderate

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to data collection. An e-mail invitation was sent to the potential participants explaining the purpose of the study with a link to an online questionnaire. A follow-up e-mail was sent one week later, and a final reminder was sent one week after that. Data collection ceased one week following the third and final e-mail invitation. Not all e-mails were delivered as some of the e-mail addresses were no longer valid and filters also prevented some e-mails from being delivered. The final population was approximately 1,100 potential participants with 274 usable responses.

The online questionnaire also included an open-ended question, as open-ended questions are often used in quantitative research as a way to allow “participants to freely share their personal experiences, especially if the topic is sensitive or concerns personal matters” (Albudaiwi, 2017, p. 1716). Open-ended questions are seen as an advantage and benefit to traditional quantitative research (questionnaire or surveys) as they allow the participant to bring in their “sense of individuality” through allowing them to articulate their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes in their own words and with their own “uniqueness of expression about an issue” (Albudaiwi, 2017, p. 1716-1717). The open-ended question included with this questionnaire allowed the participants to further expand on issues related to gender bias and was simply: How has gender impacted your experience working in collegiate athletics? Specifically, this question was asked to expand, understand and answer RQ1a: “What dimensions of gender bias are experienced? and to give further explanation to how gender bias occurs within the Ecological-Intersectional Model addressing RQ3.

The open-ended question resulted in 28 pages of responses and these responses were organized and interpreted through a deductive data analysis process. The researchers read and re-read the data to become familiar with what was being discussed. Next, recurring concepts and messages were identified and labeled as significant if they matched and detailed the six higher-order factors provided by Diehl et al. (2019). A seventh code of “other” was provided for comments that did not fit in the six higher order factors or was considered outside the original intent of the open-ended question (i.e., “N/A”, “nothing”, etc.). Each member of the team coded the 28 pages separately and created a codebook where the responses were categorized under the

six higher order factors by Diehl et al. (2019) and the seventh code of “other.” The research team then discussed their individual codebooks, the most appropriate codes were agreed upon by the research team, as the researchers felt it was important to appropriately and comprehensively describe the data. Lastly, responses were pulled to reflect and represent the participants’ deeper discussion of the gender bias they experienced labeled within the six higher order factors outlined by Diehl et al. (2019).

Results and Findings

Psychometric Evaluation of the Measures

Psychometric evaluation of the measures was conducted to examine construct validity including convergent and discriminant validities (Hair et al., 2006). However, among 47 items from the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders, seven items were not considered for this evaluation due to low variance explained.

Evidence of convergent validity was found by calculating average variance extracted (AVE) of each latent construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair, et. al., 2006). As shown in Table 3, the AVE estimates for all latent constructs excluding the measure of disproportionate constraints 1 (AVE = .47), insufficient support 1 (AVE = .37), insufficient support 2 (AVE = .47), indicating that the measures were considered to exhibit satisfactory convergent validity. Also, comparing the AVE with the square of the correlation between the factor and each of the other constructs (Lichtenstein et al., 1990) indicated that the AVE for 12 latent constructs excluding the measure of male privilege 1, insufficient support 1, and devaluation 1 were greater than the squared phi correlations in the measurement model. These findings indicated that the measures possess an acceptable level of discriminant validity.

All fit indices for the measurement model met the recommended values specifying a good model fit to the data (Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kelloway, 1998) while the results of chi-square estimated that the hypothesis of exact fit was rejected ($\chi^2(780) = 4503.77, p \leq .001$). For example, the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR), one of the absolute fit indices, was .049 and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), one of the parsimonious fit indices, was .040, and finally the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), one of the incremental fit indices, was .935. These findings supported the use of the latent factors for the further analysis.

Descriptive Statistics of Higher-Order Structures

After examining construct validity, the 15 factors were re-coded in order to calculate a mean score for the six dimensions of gender bias. For example, male privilege consisted of the three factors of the glass cliff, male culture, and two-person career structure. The items for each lower-order factor were summed and divided by the total number of items to calculate the mean score for each one. The mean score for the gender bias dimensions was calculated by summing all of the items for the lower-order factors and dividing by the total number of items.

Diehl et al. (2020) does not offer guidance for interpreting the scores in regards to the level of gender bias experienced. Thus, these categories were developed for interpreting the results: 0-1 – negligible, 1-2 – low, 2-3 – moderate, 3-4 – high, 4-5 – prevalent. This is based on score interpretations of other studies classifying categorical scores (Maslach & Jackson, 1986; Singletary, 1994; Spector, 1994). Table 2 provides a summary of the mean score for each higher-

Table 3
AVE Estimates for Latent Constructs

Factors	Items	λ	AVE	ϕ^2
Male Privilege 1 (Glass Cliff)	I have been asked to do a job that everyone knew was likely to fail.	0.69	0.57	.00 - .60
	I have been held responsible for organizational problems outside of my control.	0.79		
	Women in my organization seem to be given leadership roles with a high risk of failure.	0.78		
Male Privilege 2 (Male Culture)	People in my organization assume that top leaders will be men.	0.78	0.61	.00 - .57
	The decisions in my organization are made by men.	0.74		
	The "boys' club" mentality is present in my workplace.	0.82		
Male Privilege 3 (Two-person Career Structure)	Even though my spouse/partner does not work for my organization, they are expected to host events.	0.67	0.55	.00 - .11
	My organization expects spouses/partners of senior leaders to contribute as unpaid volunteers.	0.95		
	My organization vets spouses/partners of senior leaders as part of the hiring process.	0.54		
Disproportionate Constraints 1 (Constrained Communication)	I wait to be acknowledged prior to speaking in a meeting	0.51	0.47	.00 - .36
	I am cautious when self-promoting at work.	0.84		
	I downplay my accomplishments when speaking to others.	0.66		
Disproportionate Constraints 2 (Constrained Career Choices)	I chose my field of study because it was considered suitable for women.	0.44	0.60	.00 - .05
	I would have chosen a different field of study but it was considered inappropriate for women.	1.00		
Disproportionate Constraints 3 (Unequal Standards)	My job performance has been scrutinized more closely than that of my male colleagues.	0.88	0.61	.02 - .60
	As a woman, I am expected to be nurturing at work.	0.67		
	I work harder than my male colleagues for the same credibility.	0.80		
Insufficient Support 1 (Exclusion)	I feel welcome while attending social events with my male colleagues.	0.54	0.37	.00 - .70
	I have been excluded from leadership events (e.g., off-sites, retreats) because of my gender.	0.72		
	Male colleagues socialize without me.	0.53		
Insufficient Support 2 (Lack of Mentoring)	I have received significant mentoring.	0.81	0.47	.00 - .22
	I have had a female mentor.	0.52		
	I have had to learn how to lead on my own.	0.68		
Insufficient Support 3 (Lack of Sponsorship)	Other leaders have recommended me for advancement opportunities.	0.93	0.633	.00 - .22
	I have had another leader sponsor me for promotion.	0.62		
Devaluation 1 (Lack of Acknowledgement)	At work, I am interrupted by men when I am speaking.	0.73	0.55	.00 - .76
	When I am the only woman in a meeting, I find it difficult to gain support for my ideas.	0.78		
	It is taken for granted when I help my male colleagues with their responsibilities.	0.73		

Devaluation 2 (Salary Inequality)	I have made less money than my male counterparts.	0.80	0.65	.00 - .34
	I have made less money than men who have held my position prior to me.	0.82		
Hostility 1 (Queen Bee Syndrome)	I have had opportunities blocked by other women at work.	0.82	0.72	.00 - .47
	Women in higher positions have made my job more difficult.	0.93		
	High-level women in my organization protect their turf.	0.80		
Hostility 2 (Workplace Harassment)	I have experienced verbal abuse at work.	0.82	0.54	.00 - .04
	The behavior of my male co-workers has sometimes made me feel uncomfortable.	0.75		
	I have been sexually harassed at work.	0.64		
Acquiescence 1 (Self-Limited Aspirations)	I have turned down a promotion because I felt unqualified.	1.00	0.54	.00 - .20
	My personal obligations have prevented me from pursuing opportunities for advancement at work.	0.29		
Acquiescence 2 (Self-Silencing)	I speak up about challenges women face at work.	0.84	0.68	.00 - .03
	I advocate for women's rights at work.	0.80		

order factor. Thus, the results demonstrated women do experience gender bias working in collegiate athletics. Five of the dimensions (male privilege, insufficient support, hostility, acquiesce, and unequal standards) showed the respondents experienced moderate levels of gender bias. Respondents experienced high levels of gender bias in regards to devaluation.

Demographic Comparisons

Selected demographic factors were used to determine if differences existed between or among groups. Comparisons among groups were also examined using the six dimensions. A comparison was conducted based on the NCAA division of the current institution of the respondents. This was conducted because women have obtained leadership positions at higher rates at Division II and Division III institutions than at Division I (Taylor & Hardin, 2016, Welch et al., 2021). Women hold 22% of athletic director positions at Division II institutions and 32% at the Division III level but only 15% at Division I. Women hold 32% of associate athletic director positions at Division I but hold 42% at Division II and 50% at Division III (NCAA, 2021). MANOVA results indicated that the effects of division of employment on the dimensions of gender bias were significant (Wilk's $\Lambda = .90$, $F(12, 526) = 2.36$, $p \leq .00$). A univariate F -test provided significant differences in male privilege, $F(1, 264) = 3.61$, $p \leq .028$. Multiple comparisons test provided additional support for the results of the F -test. The results showed significance differences in male privilege between Division I and Division III ($p \leq .02$) indicating Division I respondents experienced greater male privilege bias than Division III.

The sample was split into participants who had children (46.4%) and those who did not have children (53.4%) for comparison. Characteristics associated with motherhood (e.g., empathetic, nurturing) are not thought to be characteristics of leaders (Burton, 2015; Mazerolle et al., 2015). MANOVA results indicated that the effects of having children on the dimensions of

gender bias were significant (Wilk's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(6, 257) = 3.38$, $p \leq .003$). The following univariate F -tests provided the significant differences in male privilege, $F(1, 264) = 5.35$, $p \leq .021$; devaluation, $F(1, 264) = 6.43$, $p = .012$; hostility $F(1, 264) = 5.60$, $p \leq .019$; and acquiescence $F(1, 264) = 9.80$, $p \leq .002$ between participants who have children or do not have children.

The sample was also split into participants who were single, never married (28.6%), and those who were currently in a long-term relationship or married (71.4%). Weight et al. (2021) reported that senior-level positions in college athletics were more likely to be held by married men. Single women may also be hiding their sexual orientation and do not want to have their personal life scrutinized if they were in a senior-level position (Bass et al., 2015, Krane & Barber 2005; Norman, 2016). Findings from MANOVA indicated that the effects of relationship status on the dimensions of gender bias were significant (Wilk's $\Lambda = .93$, $F(6, 241) = 3.12$, $p \leq .00$). The following univariate F -tests provided the significant differences in male privilege, $F(1, 248) = 13.09$, $p \leq .001$; devaluation, $F(1, 248) = 6.53$, $p \leq .011$; and hostility $F(1, 248) = 4.76$, $p \leq .030$ between participants who have children or those who do not.

A comparison based on whether a person's sexual preference was straight/heterosexual or other sexual preference was also conducted. This was based on the notion that homophobia has been a barrier for women in collegiate athletics (Bass et al., 2015). Although MONOVA results were significant (Wilk's $\Lambda = .94$, $F(6, 257) = 2.55$, $p \leq .02$), there were no significant differences between the two groups for univariate follow-up tests. Findings indicate that overall variables may contribute to the differences among the groups, but independently the variables may not contribute to the differences.

Analysis based on ethnicity was not conducted due to the homologous nature of the sample. The sample identified overwhelming white at 87.8% with only 12.2% of the respondents identifying as ethnic minorities. This finding is not surprising as the most recent data from the NCAA (2019-20) shows that only 17% of Senior Woman Administrators identify as ethnic minorities and only 15% of female athletic directors identify as ethnic minorities (NCAA, 2021).

Qualitative Findings

The responses to the open-ended question of *How has gender impacted your experience working in collegiate athletics?* were coded based on Diehl et al.'s (2020) higher order factors resulting in 276 codes. Each comment was coded into one factor resulting in the following percentages: male privilege - 30%; devaluation - 16%; disproportionate constraints - 12%; hostility - 6%; insufficient support - 5%; and acquiescence - 5%. A category of "other" which included positive leadership comprised 22% of the responses. Quotes exemplifying these higher order themes are weaved into the following discussion to provide further depth and detail into how each of these higher order factors were experienced by the participants.

Male Privilege. Male privilege was the most cited higher order factor in the qualitative comments left by participants. The women discussed having to temper their tone and approach, but their male colleagues never had these same expectations. As one participant stated, "I am mindful of my approach with my colleagues because it can be perceived as aggressive...although I just respectfully speak my opinion. My male colleagues are given a 'pass' for behavior that is considered guys being guys and I am not given the same 'pass.'" Another participant echoed this frustration stating, "I have things man-splained at times. Also, always expected to smile, talk

nice and never be too 'bossy' or forward." Women talked adamantly about the existence and permanence of the "good ole' boys club" stating,

College athletics, like any major company, is overrun by White men and I have witnessed the "boys' club" mentality first hand. I don't believe that it is or has to be that way everywhere but I work for an athletic director that operates under this mentality. There are very few women in my department (and) even most women's sports are coached by men. It's insanely unfortunate.

Women also spoke about how this male privilege resulted in fewer opportunities for hiring and advancement as one participant said, "Men are always hired over very qualified women, even the SWA designation is belittled and men are hired to do the work and then a lower level ranking female is assigned the designation."

Devaluation. The respondents specifically commented with a lack of acknowledgement for the women's work and the pay gap disparities between their male colleagues. As one participant stated, "The financial pay gap (especially over the course of my career in college athletics) has definitely impacted me. In my experience, women work much harder and have more expected of them, while being paid less than our male counterparts." Other women mirrored the aforementioned sentiment, "I also notice the women are paid less," "Obviously the pay discrepancy is significant amongst men and women in athletics," and "the expectation that women should do more, receive less pay and recognition, and should not ask for raises." Additionally, women felt their contributions and work were devalued leaving them to watch their male colleagues receive promotions quicker "Males were elevated to my level much quicker than me" or not receiving the promotion at all "I have been overlooked for leadership opportunities and monetary compensation."

Disproportionate Constraints. Participants left comments related this higher-order factor as being talked over in meetings or having their communication completely ignored, as one participant stated, "I often feel as though I have to repeat myself multiple times when speaking because the male coaches and staff in my office are not listening." This was echoed by many of the women, as one woman wrote, "It is often hard to feel heard in a room of all men." Other women contributed that they experienced constraints by having their competency challenged, "I feel like I have always had to prove my competencies. In my first position, the men were resistant to accepting my ideas" or women are expected to manage a higher workload, "In my experience, I think that gender roles and expectations have forced me to work harder in the male-dominated collegiate athletics field."

Hostility. Women shared that they received hostility from their male colleagues in the form of sexual, physical, and verbal harassment, "There are times I've been verbally, sexually harassed by co-workers, fans, coaches, officials, etc.," "I've had a male co-worker physically threaten me," and "the sexist behavior goes unnoticed." In other cases, women discussed the presence of the Queen Bee syndrome, where women worked against one another in pursuit of power. As one woman detailed,

We do not have a culture of women supporting women, and in fact, we have a very divisive culture where only one woman can feel welcomed to the table, but she must keep her family out of it, come to work with the men during a pandemic, insert herself and take over other women's roles when they are not there.

Insufficient Support. The comments left by participants in regards to insufficient support focused on navigating their roles at work while also simultaneously meeting the demands of motherhood and lacking opportunities for mentorship which is crucial for advancement into leadership positions. In relation to the demands and stress of navigating work and motherhood, participants stated, “We see a decline in women in coaching and a lot has to do with a balance between those two areas I mentioned. We need more environments that support women and children,” and “As a mother, I do not feel like I can even attempt an AD position until my kids are grown and out of the house. We are set up to fail as mothers if we want to advance in athletic administration.” One participant specifically pointed to her lack of children currently, but detailed that she felt her desire to have children would cause her to exit collegiate athletics, “I worry that I will not last in collegiate athletics once I start having children. The expectation of work seems too large to be able to maintain a healthy balance between personal obligations.” Other women cited the lack of support related to mentorship and growth as specific issues they faced as women, “I often do not feel supported, mentored or invested in” and “I think that my gender has scripted my upward movement in some ways in collegiate athletics. I don't think I have been exposed to different areas of athletics because of my gender.”

Acquiescence. Women in the comments also pointed to the intentional decisions they have made to continue to work and stay in collegiate athletics--many times participating in self-limiting behavior. For example, one participant wrote that staying in a single location had hurt her upward mobility stating, “I feel if I had searched to advance my career I would have been able to increase my income. Staying in one place for so long at the collegiate level does not always allow for the growth in income as one would expect or hope.” Other women cited gender bias as the reason they did not pursue an athletic director role, “It is this reason, I have not sought advancement to the AD chair.” and “For personal reasons, I don't want to continue climbing the career ladder to the same extent that I did when I was younger.”

Other. This category of themes from the comments related to other or outside the higher order factors outlined by Diehl et al. (2020). The majority of these comments resulted in women describing that they feel supported by their peers and administrators or that they felt they had not experienced gender bias. For the comments related to support, many were focused on how their experience was outside the norm, “Currently, I work at a large public university that embraces diversity, equity, and inclusion as does our leadership. I feel really fortunate as I know my current experience is not the norm in collegiate athletics,” “I am grateful that my institution does not have that attitude and I feel supported,” and “I feel lucky to say that there has not been a negative impact on my career because of my gender.” Other responses from the women particularly pointed to having a female leader as to why they had not encountered gender bias and that their athletic department had a positive culture. Several women commented stating, “Not so much so far, but they may have to do with the fact that I'm in charge of finances and I report to a female Athletic Director.” Another participant stated,

My current AD is a woman and my experience has been amazing. She empowers me, sees me as an equal, encourages me to speak at leadership meetings, values my opinion, etc. In turn, we both empower our female staff members and coaches, as well as female student-athletes.

Lastly, many of the women listed that they themselves were leaders and advocates for more positive cultures. As one participant wrote,

My early experiences have definitely impacted how I work as a department leader, even as I fight to gain an appropriate title and salary for my current work. I try very hard to make sure that the women in our department feel seen and valued, and that equity is seen as a shared responsibility.

Discussion

Gender bias in the workplace exists across industries when the culture is male-dominated. The results and findings from this study build upon the work of Diehl et al. (2020), which confirm that women experience the same types of gender bias across different industries and organizational settings. The college athletics work environment is similar to other male-dominated work environments where the gendered nature of the organization negatively impacts women in all aspects of their careers.

Gender bias has been experienced by women holding senior-level administration positions collegiate athletic administration. Applying the Ecological Intersectional Model to the quantitative and qualitative findings provides a framework to demonstrate how gender bias has been experienced and is still present among female senior-level administrations in collegiate athletic administration.

Socio-Cultural

Male privilege is certainly embedded in the culture of college athletics (e.g., Burton, 2015; Burton et al., 2009; Siegele et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2017, 2019, 2020; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2017, 2018). Gender bias was experienced at moderate levels in the dimension of male privilege. Many of the open-ended comments also referenced the masculine culture of collegiate athletics and the unwelcoming environment that is created due to this. A masculine culture is ever-present in college athletics thus women are often viewed as outsiders and even as invaders into this space (Bower & Hums, 2013; Taylor & Wells, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017; Walker & Satore-Baldwin, 2013). Homologous reproduction is perpetuated throughout college athletics (Hultin, 2003).

Homologous reproduction has led to women with leadership goals being pigeon-holed into the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) designation (Smith et al., 2020). Women are often assigned to oversee women's programs and positions in marketing, academics, and student life where there are limited decision-making opportunities (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Taylor & Hardin, 2016). It would be advantageous for women to be in positions to make decisions regarding the business human resource aspects of college athletics to assist them in preparing for senior-level positions (Lough & Grappendorf, 2007; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Tiell et al., 2012). The open-ended comments from the participants noted the differences in having women as

athletic directors in the culture of the department, and how the intentionally advocate for other women.

Marginalized groups often find themselves in a token role within the organization. Gender bias was present at a moderate level in the dimension of insufficient support (exclusion, lack of mentoring, and lack of sponsorship) demonstrating that women do not feel welcomed in this environment and are not provided the necessary support to succeed. The male dominance of the athletic departments results in the women having trouble behaving naturally, fitting in, and gaining peer acceptance (Kanter, 1993). Some participants in this study commented that as the only woman in a senior leadership position they perceived that their work was more scrutinized than their male colleagues- a common outcome of tokenism. Another negative consequence of tokenism is that the employee may experience diminished self-esteem as they question whether they have achieved their position due to their gender and not their merit. An employee may choose not to pursue upward career mobility or other positions because they may feel they are not qualified and only have their current position because of the organization's desire to have a particular demographic in that position. This could reduce confidence in their abilities and qualifications.

Women are often held to different standards than the male colleagues, and this has been prevalent throughout sports and the general business profession as a whole. Women are often judged more critically than men, and their contributions are often downplayed. The respondents acknowledged this in both their quantitative and qualitative responses. The respondents believed they had to accomplish more to receive the same recognition as their male colleagues as demonstrated the high levels of gender bias experienced in the lower-order factor unequal standards. Women in this study pointed to examples of pay differences, men receiving raises quicker or more frequently, and simply that athletics was and is a more difficult place for women to navigate.

Organizational

Gender bias at the organizational level manifests itself the most prominently in regards to the dimensions of hostility. Having hostility present in the work-environment is no surprise in the college athletic environment. College athletics has long been deemed a male-dominated space, and women who are seen as outsiders who are not necessarily welcome in the college athletics environment (Burton, 2015; Dixon et al., 2008). Sexist language and behavior are also accepted due to the masculine nature of sports and this form of hostility further marginalizes women (Hindman & Walker, 2020; Walker & Satore-Baldwin, 2013). A woman's physical appearance is often judged in the sports environment and her other qualifications are secondary to her appearance (Hindman & Walker, 2020).

The other issues that were prevalent at the organizational level in regards to gender bias was devaluation and male privilege. These women are working harder for the same recognition as their male colleagues and having to prove their competency within the field. For example, one participant commented about these unequal standards stating, "I feel like I have always had to prove my competencies. In my first position, the men were resistant to accepting my ideas." Pay inequities may exist for a number of reasons including a lack of negotiating power for women, higher rates of unpaid labor, and lower starting salaries due to entry-level positions held. These perceived discrepancies are important to note, as women across athletic departments are frequently paid less than their male counterparts and men at other institutions. This was exhibited

and discussed in detail by several comments by the participants; for example, “the expectation that women should do more, receive less pay and recognition, and should not ask for raises.” Pay discrepancies in college athletics have risen to the level of review by the U.S. Department of Labor, as the University of Connecticut was found to be significantly underpaying their women’s basketball coaching and administrative staff and were required to back pay those employees thousands of dollars (Associated Press, 2020).

Research has consistently shown women are not given the same respect in the college athletics work environment as their male colleagues. Women have reported having their contributions and accomplishments diminished and devalued along with a general disrespect at times (Smith et al., 2020; Wells et al., 2021). This was demonstrated from a quote by a participant directly highlighting how the designation of SWA is often accompanied with less respect, “Men are always hired over very qualified women, even the SWA designation is belittled and men are hired to do the work and then a lower level ranking female is assigned the designation.” These behaviors are problematic, as they work to silence women within the department and delegitimize the organizational power women in leadership positions possess. Further, these findings provide support for recent work from Smith and colleagues (2020) with respect to the Senior Woman Administrator position, and the problematic nature of the designation as it does not provide actual authority, but often rather serves as a check box for the athletic department.

Interpersonal

Gender bias was most prevalent at the interpersonal level in the notion of the male privilege as well as insufficient support. The two-person career structure which comprises a part of male privilege is the notion that a senior-level administrator has not only the support of their spouse or partner, but also that the spouse and partner will contribute to accomplishing the job responsibilities of the administrator. Items used to measure this concept included statements in regards to volunteering, hosting events, and actually being vetted during the hiring process. This would seem to put a woman at a disadvantage because men are not typically thought to be event hosts as those types of responsibilities are considered to be the role of a woman (Smith et al., 2020). More than a third of the respondents in this study identified as not being married or being in a long-term relationship which would also seem to put them at a disadvantage during the hiring process if having a spouse or partner is considered to be essential to holding a senior-level administrative position.

Early career professionals in the college sport industry have discussed challenges associated with pursuing a career in college sport long term as part of a two-income family (Hardin et al., 2017), and recent work by Weight and colleagues (2021) found entry-level positions were dominated by single women and senior-level positions were held primarily by married men. This suggests there is a point in the career of women who work in the intercollegiate athletics industry where they must decide if they want to continue to pursue a career in sport or if they want to pursue a family. Unfortunately, it seems that their male colleagues do not face this same challenge, and as such are able to ascend up the leadership ladder more freely. For example, a participant stated, “I worry that I will not last in collegiate athletics once I start having children. The expectation of work seems too large to be able to maintain a healthy balance between personal obligations.” Thus, in this study, several

participants highlighted how the current structure of athletics has hindered women and made them consider their longevity in the industry.

Insufficient support also appears to be a hindrance in regards to creating a positive work environment for the respondents. Lack of mentoring and exclusion comprise this dimension and were highlighted by the respondents as issues regarding gender bias. The women acknowledge that they were receiving insufficient mentoring, and good mentorship is vital for women in a male-dominated space like sports. This can be seen in quotes like this one from a participant noting her lack of mentorship, "I often do not feel supported, mentored or invested in." The finding is not surprising though as lack of mentorship has been identified as an issue for women working in collegiate sports (Smith et al., 2016; Taylor & Hardin, 2016; Taylor et al., 2017). These findings further solidify the existence and strength of the good ole boys' network in college sports described by Katz et al., (2018). The lack of mentorship for women could possibly be the result of the scarcity of women in senior-level positions as well as the notion of the Queen Bee syndrome. Darvin and colleagues (2020) suggested mentorship relationships are not sufficient for women to achieve success within the college sport industry, and women must begin to secure sponsors. Men have been engaging in these sponsorship relationships for many years - via the good ole boys' network - and women are lagging behind, which contributes to the lack of women in leadership positions and the ability for women in entry level positions to climb the leadership ladder.

Another aspect of insufficient support also appeared in the area of exclusion. Exclusion is oftentimes subtle and does not appear to be an issue except to the person being excluded. This exact sentiment was echoed by one of the participants, as she commented "I am the only female on the leadership team and the 'boys club' that did not exist prior to the recent administration is at times very limiting and exclusionary - but it is unclear if they'd recognize it themselves." This is particularly challenging for a woman in a male-dominated environment like sports. Men may plan golf outings without considering the idea of including women or plan other social events without considering the preferences of their female peers. Women may also be the minority at social gatherings and be timid about joining conversations or networking in the environment due to their minority status. Further, more than 10% of collegiate athletic departments do not have a woman in their administration structure (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014), so the perception of exclusion may be a harsh reality faced by many women working within college sport. This would be even more challenging for women who are not in long-term relationships as indicated by the high presence of gender bias in the lower-order factor of two-person career structure.

Individual

The intersectionality of participants is certainly present based on the parental and relationship status findings of the participants on an individual level. Significant differences were present in the dimensions of male privilege, devaluation, hostility, and acquiescence for respondents with children versus those without. These findings illustrate women who have children engage in more self-limiting behaviors than those without children. Although not surprising, this is problematic as research illustrates mothers within sport experience higher levels of work-family conflict than those without children (Dixon & Bruening, 2005, 2007). As such, if the sport industry wants to keep employees with children in the industry, they must offer adequate support for these employees. Employees with children must feel as though they can - at

times - put their family ahead of their work, a concept that is often foreign to those working in the sport industry (Taylor et al., 2021).

The other demographic variable which showed significant differences was relationship status. Respondents who were single experienced gender bias at higher levels in the dimensions of male privilege, devaluation, and hostility than those who were in long-term relationships. Research from industries outside of sport has found single women report more instances of workplace harassment than women in long-term relationships (Newman, 2003).

The respondents also reported problems in regard to self-silencing. This can range from not freely expressing their opinions and ideas during meetings to being selective in the language used when interacting with colleagues. Participants directly pointed to these issues with quotes like, "I often feel as though I have to repeat myself multiple times when speaking because the male coaches and staff in my office are not listening" and "It is often hard to feel heard in a room of all men." The perceptions of the communication styles vary greatly based on gender. A man who is direct is viewed as decisive and a good leader, whereas a woman who is direct can be viewed as malicious. Women are often wary of expressing their opinions because they will be dismissed or not taken seriously simply because of their gender.

Conclusion

Gender bias is experienced at moderate levels for five of the dimensions of gender bias and at a high level for the dimension of devaluation. Relationship status and parental status also are prevalent influencers on the how gender bias is experienced. Many studies have examined the challenges women encounter as college athletic administrators but this is the first study to utilize the Gender Bias Scale for Women Leaders in a collegiate athletic setting. This study is also one of the first to examine the specific dimensions of gender bias that are present. This study provides an in-depth examination of the specific dimensions that comprise gender bias as a construct. Gender bias and the components of it have been explored separately in various studies but the current study takes an in-depth examination of the higher order and lower order factors that comprise gender bias. The study also builds on the recommendation to examine the other identities of women (i.e., parental status, relationship status) and how gender bias may differ based on those characteristics. All athletic administrators as well as university administrators need to continue to work to help reduce or eliminate gender bias from the college athletic environment. Women are certainly capable as leaders and administrators and should be given the opportunity to be successful without having to negotiate the challenges presented by gender bias.

A limitation of this study is the inability to examine differences based on ethnic identity. The sample for this study overwhelmingly identified as White (87.8%) but this is also indicative of this population as a whole. The most recent data from the NCAA (2019-20) shows that only 17% of Senior Woman Administrators identify as ethnic minorities and only 15% of female athletic directors identify as ethnic minorities (NCAA, 2021). Welch et al. (2021) research on ethnic minority athletic directors also found that the women first had to negotiate the barriers faced by women in general. Those barriers were more prominent than the barriers due to their ethnic identity (Welch et al., 2021). Another limitation is the lack of awareness of when gender bias is occurring. Taylor et al. (2018) found that many women in leadership positions in collegiate athletics simply accepted the notion that they would be subjected to gender bias and sexism because that was simply a part of working in collegiate athletics. So, some of the participants may be experiencing gender bias but were dismissing the experience because that was an

expectation of working in collegiate athletics. Additionally, although surveys and open-ended questions allow for participants to indicate what is happening and express themselves, they also can be seen as a limitation as they do not allow for deeper discussion and explanation on the phenomenon occurring. Many times, participants completing the survey may have trouble interpreting the intent of open-ended questions, they can be unclear, or they can be too time consuming (Baillou, 2008). Thus, future studies related to gender bias in collegiate athletics should continue to explore this issue using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

References

- Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2014). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study, thirty-seven year update 1977–2014. <http://www.acostacarpenter.org>
- Albudaiwi, D. (2017). Survey: Open-ended questions. In M. Allen (Ed.), *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vol. 4, pp. 1716-1717). SAGE.
<https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n608>
- Associated Press. (2020, October 20). U.S. Labor Department finds women basketball coaches at UConn were underpaid. *Sports Illustrated*.
<https://www.si.com/college/2020/10/20/uconn-women-basketball-coaches-underpaid-geno-auriemma-staff>
- Baillou, J. (2008). Open-ended question. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (pp. 548–550). SAGE.
- Bass, J. R., Hardin, R., & Taylor, E. A. (2015). "The glass closet": Perceptions of homosexuality in intercollegiate sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 7(4), 1-31.
- Bergman, M., & Henning, J. (2008). Sex and ethnicity as moderators in the sexual harassment phenomenon: A revision and test of Fitzgerald et al. (1994). *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(2), 152-167
- Bower, G. G. (2008). Career paths and advice for women wanting to obtain a management position within the health and fitness industry. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 17, 29–37.
- Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2013). Career paths of women working in leadership positions within intercollegiate athletic administration. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 33, 1-14.
- Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2014). Examining the mentoring relationships of women working in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 22, 4–19.
- Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., & Williams, S. (2019). Mentoring characteristics and functions important to men and women within intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 12(1), 2-24.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist*, 32, 513–531.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1993). The ecology of cognitive development: Research models and fugitive findings. In R. H. Wozniak & K. Fischer (Eds.), *Scientific environments* (pp. 3-44). Erlbaum.

- Burton, L. (2015). Underrepresentation of women in sport leadership: A review of research. *Sport Management Review, 18*(2), 155-165.
- Burton, L., Barr, C. A., Fink, J. S., & Bruening, J. E. (2009). "Think athletic director, think masculine?": Examination of the gender typing of managerial subroles within athletic administration positions. *Sex Roles, 61*, 416-426.
- Burton, L. J., Borland, J., & Mazerolle, S.M. (2012). "They cannot seem to get past the gender issue": Experiences of young female athletic trainers in NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Management Review, 15*(3), 304-317.
- Burton, L., & LaVoi, N. M. (2016). An ecological/multisystem approach to understanding and examining women coaches. In N. LaVoi (Ed.), *Women in sports coaching* (pp. 49-62). Routledge.
- Campuzano, M. V. (2019). Force and inertia: A systematic review of women's leadership in male-dominated organizational cultures in the United States. *Human Resource Development Review, 18*(4), 437-469.
- Chao, G. T., Walz, P., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(3), 619-636.
- Clarkson, B. G., Cox, E., & Thelwell, R. C. (2019). Negotiating gender in the English football workplace: Composite vignettes of women head coaches' experiences. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 27*(2), 73-84.
- Coakley, J. (2017). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Cunningham, G.B. (2010). Understanding the under-representation of African American coaches: A multilevel perspective. *Sport Management Review, 13*(4), 395-406.
- Darvin, L., Taylor, E., & Wells, J. (2020). Get in the game through a sponsor: Initial career ambitions of former women assistant coaches. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 12*, 590-613.
- Derks, B., Ellemers, N., Van Laar, C., & De Groot, K. (2011). Do sexist organizational cultures create the Queen Bee?. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(3), 519-535.
- Diehl, A. B., Stephenson, A. L., Dzubinski, L. M., & Wang, D. C. (2020). Measuring the invisible: Development and multi-industry validation of the gender bias scale for women leaders. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 31*(3), 249-280.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21389>
- Dixon, M., & Bruening, J. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377-406.
- Dixon, M. A., Tiell, B., Lough, N., Sweeney, K., Osborne, B., & Bruening, J. (2008). The work/life interface in intercollegiate athletics: An examination of policies, programs, and institutional climate. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education, 2*(2), 137-160.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598.
- Ellemers, N., Van den Heuvel, H., De Gilder, D., Maass, A., & Bonvini, A. (2004). The underrepresentation of women in science: Differential commitment or the queen bee syndrome?. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 43*(3), 315-338.

- Ely, R. J., Ibarra, H., & Kolb, D. M. (2011). Taking gender into account: Theory and design for women's leadership development programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(3), 474–493.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>
- 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.
- Grappendorf, H., Pent, A., Burton, L., & Henderson, A. (2008). Gender role stereotyping: A qualitative analysis of senior woman administrators' perceptions regarding financial decision making. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 1*, 26–45.
- Greenhill, J., Auld, C., Cuskelly, G., & Hooper, S. (2009). The impact of organisational factors on career pathways for female coaches. *Sport Management Review, 12*(4), 229-240.
- Hair, J. E., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Prentice Hall.
- Hancock, M. G. (2012). *Women in intercollegiate athletics: An exploration of the career development of female senior administrators*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Louisville, Louisville, KY.
- Hancock, M. G., Cintron, A., & Darvin, L. (2018). Socialization to careers in intercollegiate athletics: A comparison of men and women. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 26*(1), 12–22.
- Hancock, M. G., & Hums, M.A. (2016). A “leaky pipeline”?: Factors affecting the career development of senior-level female administrators in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sport Management Review, 19*, 198–210.
- Hardin, M., & Whiteside, E. (2012). Consequences of being the “team mom”: Women in sports information and the friendliness trap. *Journal of Sport Management, 26*(4), 309–321.
- Hardin, R., Taylor, E., Smith, A. B., & Siegele, J. (2017). The glass door: Early-career women in collegiate athletics. In A. N. Milner & J. H. Braddock (Eds.), *Women in sports: Breaking barriers, facing obstacles* (pp. 243-262). ABC-CLIO-Praeger.
- Hartzell, A. C., & Dixon, M. A. (2019). A holistic perspective on women's career pathways in athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management, 33*, 79-92.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. Wiley.
- Hindman, L. C., & Walker, N. A. (2020). Sexism in professional sports: How women managers experience and survive sport organizational culture. *Journal of Sport Management, 34*, 64-76.
- Høigaard, R., & Mathisen, P. (2009). Benefits of formal mentoring for female leaders. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching & Mentoring, 7*(2), 64-70.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Hultin, M. (2003). Some take the glass escalator, some hit the glass ceiling? *Work & Occupations, 30*(1), 30-61.
- Kelloway, E. K. (1998). *Using LISREL for structural equation modeling: A researcher's guide*. Sage Publications, Inc.

- Jones, K. P., Peddie, C. I., Gilrane, V. L., King, E. B., & Gray, A. L. (2016). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, 42(6), 1588–1613.
- Kamphoff, C. (2010). Bargaining with patriarchy: Former women coaches' experiences and their decision to leave collegiate coaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 81, 367-379.
- Kanter, R. (1993). Men and women of the corporation. Basic Books.
- Katz, M., Walker, N. A., & Hindman, L. C. (2018). Gendered leadership networks in the NCAA: Analyzing affiliation networks of senior woman administrators and athletic directors. *Journal of Sport Management*, 32(2), 135-149.
- Kilty, K. (2006). Women in coaching. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 222-234.
- Knoppers, A., & Anthonissen, A. (2008). Gendered managerial discourses in sport organizations: Multiplicity and complexity. *Sex Roles*, 58(1–2), 93–103.
- Krane, V., & Barber, H. (2005). Identity tensions in lesbian intercollegiate coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 76(1), 67-81.
- Lapchick, R. (2020). 2019 College sport racial and gender report card. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida, College of Business. https://43530132-36e9-4f52-811a-182c7a91933b.filesusr.com/ugd/7d86e5_d69e3801bb8146f2b08f6e619bcd22.pdf
- Lapchick, R. (2021). The 2020 DI FBS college sport racial and gender report card. Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida, College of Business. https://43530132-36e9-4f52-811a-182c7a91933b.filesusr.com/ugd/138a69_a7d5807e08804005960a584bb2fb261d.pdf
- Larson, L. K., & Clayton, C. J. (2019). Career pathways to NCAA Division I women's basketball head coach positions: Do race and gender matter? *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 27, 94-100.
- Lattinville, R., & Denny, R. (2020). 2020 FBS athletics directors' compensation survey. <https://www.athleticdirector.com/articles/2020-fbs-athletics-directors-compensation-survey/>
- LaVoi, N. M. (2016). A framework to understand experiences of women coaches around the globe: The Ecological-Intersectional Model. In N. M. LaVoi, (Ed.) *Women in sports coaching* (pp. 27-48). Routledge.
- LaVoi, N. M., & Dutove, J. K. (2012). Barriers and supports for female coaches: An ecological model. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1(1), 17–37.
- Lichtenstein, D. R., Netemeyer, R. G., & Burton, S. (1990). Distinguishing coupon proneness from value consciousness: An acquisition-transaction utility theory perspective. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 54-67.
- Machida-Kosuga, M., Schaubroeck, J., & Feltz, D. (2016). Leader self-efficacy of women intercollegiate athletic administrators: A look at barriers and developmental antecedents. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 9, 157-178.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. (1986). *Manual: Maslach Burnout Inventory: Second edition*. Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Mazerolle, S. M., Burton, L., & Cotrufo, R. J. (2015). The experiences of female athletic trainers in the role of the head athletic trainer. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 50(1), 71–81.
- Melton, E. N., & Bryant, M. J. (2017). Intersectionality: The impact of negotiating multiple identities for women in sport leadership. *Women in sport leadership: Research and practice for change*, 62-82.

- Messner, M. A. (2009). *It's all for the kids: Gender, families, and youth sports*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2020). *NCAA Demographics Database* [Data visualization dashboard] <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/ncaa-demographics-database>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2021). *NCAA Demographics Database* [Data visualization dashboard] <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/ncaa-demographics-database>
- Newman, M. A., Jackson, R. A., & Baker, D. D. (2003). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace. *Public Administration Review*, 63(4), 472-483.
- Norman, L. (2010). Feeling second best: Elite women coaches' experiences. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 27(1), 89-104.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Sage
- Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16, 81-90.
- Ruderman, M. N., & Ohlott, P. J. (2004). What women leaders want. *Leader to Leader*, 41-47.
- Sabo, D., Veliz, P., & Staurowsky, E. J. (2016). *Beyond X's & O's: Gender bias and coaches of women's college sports*. Women's Sports Foundation. <https://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Beyond-Xs-and-Os-Executive-Summary-Updated-format.pdf>
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling*. Erlbaum.
- Shaw, S., & Hoerber, L. (2003). "A strong man is direct and a direct woman is a bitch": Gendered discourses and their influence on employment roles in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(4), 347-375.
- Siegele, J. L., Hardin, R., & Taylor, E. A., Smith, A. B. (2020). "She is the Best Female Coach": NCAA Division I Female Swimming Coaches' Experiences of Sexism. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 13(1), 93-118.
- Singletary, M. (1994). *Mass Communication Research: Contemporary Methods and Applications*. Longman Publishing Group.
- Smith, A. B., Taylor, E. A., & Hardin, R. (2016). Women and mentoring in collegiate athletics. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24(5), 346-364.
- Smith, A. B., Taylor, E. A., & Hardin, R. (2017). Career entry and experiences of female graduate assistants in college athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 10, 234-260.
- Smith, A. B., & Taylor, E. A., Siegele, J. L., & Hardin, R. (2020). At the crossroads: The Senior Woman Administrator designation. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 13(1), 119-144.
- Smith, A. B., Taylor, E. A., Siegele, S., & Hardin, R. (2019). NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators' perceptions on barriers to career mobility. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 12, 479-504.
- Spector, P. (1994). Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS Page. <http://chuma.cas.usf.edu/~spector/scales/jsspag.html>.
- Staurowsky, E. J., & DiManno, J. (2002). Young women talking sports and careers: A glimpse at the next generation of women in sport media. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 11, 127-161.

- Taylor, E. A., & Hardin, R. (2016) Female NCAA Division I Athletic directors: Experiences and challenges. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 24, 14-25.
- Taylor, E. A., Hardin, R., Welch, N., & Smith, A. B. (2018). Incivility in the workplace: The experiences of female sport management faculty in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 33(2), 180-198.
- Taylor, E. A., Siegele, J. L., Smith A. B., & Hardin, R. (2018). Applying career construction theory to female NCAA Division I conference commissioners. *Journal of Sport Management*, 32(4), 321-333.
- Taylor, E. A., Smith, A. B., Graham, J. A., & Hardin, R. (2021). Adaptive lifestyles in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Sport*, 14, 304-324.
- Taylor, E. A., Smith, A., B., & Hardin, R. (2017). Experiences and challenges of women working in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 32, 144-184.
- Taylor, E. A., & Wells, J. E. (2017). Institutionalized barriers and supports of female athletic directors: A multilevel perspective. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 10, 157-183.
- Tiell, B., & Dixon, M. A. (2008). Roles and tasks of the senior woman administrator (SWA) in intercollegiate athletics: A role congruity perspective. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 2, 339–361.
- Tiell, B., Dixon, M., & Lin, Y. C. (2012). Roles and tasks of the senior woman administrator in Role Congruity Theory perspective: A longitudinal progress report. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 5, 247-268.
- Wells, J. E., Satore-Baldwin, M., Walker, N. A., & Gray, C. E. (2021). Stigma consciousness and work outcomes of senior woman administrators: The role of workplace incivility. *Journal of Sport Management*, 35(1), 69-80. Advance online publication.
- Welty Peachey, J., & Burton, L. J. (2011). Male or female athletic director? Exploring perceptions of leader effectiveness and a (potential) female leadership advantage with intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles*, 64, 416–425.
- Walker, N. A., & Bopp, T. (2010). The underrepresentation of women in the male-dominated sport workplace: Perspectives of female coaches. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, 15(1), 47-64.
- Walker, N. A., & Melton, E. N. (2015). The tipping point: The intersection of race, gender, and sexual orientation in intercollegiate sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29, 257-271.
- Walker, N., & Satore-Baldwin, M. (2013). Hegemonic masculinity and the institutional bias toward women in men's collegiate basketball: What do men think? *Journal of Sport Management*, 27, 303-315.
- Weight, E. A., Taylor, E. A., Huml, M. R., & Dixon, M. A. (2021). Working in the sport industry. A classification of human capital archetypes. *Journal of Sport Management*. Available ahead of print. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2020-0070>
- Welch, N. M., Siegele, J. L., & Hardin, R. (2021). Double punch to the glass ceiling: Career experiences and challenges of ethnic minority female athletic directors. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 29(1), 20-28.