Gender Typing in Management: Evaluation of Managerial Subroles for Sport

Dr. Laura Burton and Dr. Heidi Parker

Abstract

This research examined the gender typing of managerial subroles for entry, middle and senior-level positions to evaluate if gender typing serves as a barrier to women's advancement into senior level positions. Interscholastic athletic directors and managers in the sport industry (n = 167) evaluated the importance of 19 managerial subroles for entry, middle, and senior level managers. Results indicate feminine managerial subroles were more important for entry and middle level managers than masculine managerial subroles (p < .05). There was no significant difference between masculine and feminine subroles in senior level manager positions. Feminine subroles may be more important than masculine subroles for entry and middle level positions while both feminine and masculine subroles are important for senior level managers.

Keywords: gender, role congruity, stereotyping, sport management, athletic administration

Introduction

Despite significant increases in the number of girls and women participating in sports since the passage of Title IX, there is continued evidence of a decline in women's roles within the administration of athletic programs at the intercollegiate level (Acosta and Carpenter, 2008) as well as a continued overrepresentation of men within interscholastic athletic administration (Whisenant, 2003, 2008). At the professional sport level, women continue to be underrepresented in senior administrative positions (Lapchick, 2009). Despite the low representation of women in senor management positions within sport organizations, researchers have not specifically examined if senior level administrative positions are constructed in a manner that may be biased toward women. The purpose of the current study was to explore if the managerial roles of senior administrative positions in athletic administration and sport management preclude certain individuals, in particular women, from advancing into and holding such positions.

Under representation of women in senior executive positions in business management has been examined from the perspective of gender role theory, including examination of managerial roles being gendered as masculine roles, attitudes toward women as managers, and negative perceptions of women in managerial roles (Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare, & Hayden, 2004; Eagly & Karau, 2002; Powell, Butterfield, & Parent, 2002; Schein, 1975). Further, research has examined if managerial roles can be divided into subroles, and whether those subroles are gender-typed. Specifically, Atwater et al. examined if there were feminine and masculine subroles within the overarching management role. Findings indicated that managerial roles were in fact gender-typed. Subroles identified as masculine included allocating resources, delegating and punishing; feminine subroles included providing corrective feedback, planning and organizing, and supporting employees (Atwater et al.).

Given the findings presented by Atwater et al., the purpose of this research was to extend that work in the context of sport management and interscholastic athletic administration. In particular, researchers sought to examine the gender-typing of managerial subroles for entry, middle and senior-level positions within sport management organizations and interscholastic athletic departments. The following sections will elaborate on the underlying conceptual framework as well as advance specific hypotheses pertinent to this study.

Women's Experiences in Athletic Administration

The majority of the work identifying barriers women face within management has been within the field of intercollegiate athletics (Cuneen & Sidwell, 2007; Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000; Stahura, Greenwood, & Dobbs, 2004; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004). However, there has also been research examining women's under-representation in interscholastic athletics (Miller, Whisenant, & Pedersen, 2007; Mullane & Whisenant, 2007; Whisenant, 2003, 2008; Whisenant, Miller, & Pedersen, 2005). Barriers to women's advancement into senior administration include limited opportunities for female sport management interns while working in sport organizations (Cuneen & Sidwell, 2007), masculine hegemonic influence and sexism in sport organizations (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Whisenant, 2008; Whisenant, et al., 2005), the "old boys' network" and homologous reproduction (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004), relegation of women to less

important administrative positions (Inglis, et al., 2000), unfair hiring practices (Stahura, et al., 2004) and stereotypes regarding women's managerial and leadership abilities (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006).

Women may experience discrimination in sport organizations at the very onset of their careers. Cuneen and Sidwell (2007) identified differences in experiences of male and female sport management interns working in intercollegiate athletic departments. Their findings suggest that female interns were more likely to be only part-time staff, to be supervised by female administrators, and to be relegated to positions that included more clerical functions. In contrast, male interns more often worked full-time, were mentored by male and female administrators, and were provided work opportunities in communication and corporate sales (Cuneen & Sidwell). The experiences of student interns have significant impact on their immediate and long-term career development in sport, as the internship is considered one of the most important and valuable steps in the career path of a sport manager (Moorman, 2004).

Masculine Hegemony in Sport Administration

The influence of hegemonic masculinity in the domain of sport and its influence on keeping women on the margins of sport has been well established (Coakley, 2009). As women's sports gained status following the passage of Title IX, and the subsequent merging of men's and women's athletic departments at the intercollegiate level, there has been a continual decline in the number of women in positions of leadership in athletic administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008). Men have, and continue to maintain, institutionalized control over the most senior levels of both interscholastic and intercollegiate athletic administration (Mullane & Whisenant, 2007; Whisenant et al., 2005; Whisenant, 2003, 2008). The propensity of men in high ranking positions within an athletic department has effectively established an 'old boys' network to which women have been excluded or have had limited access. The importance of networking as a tool of advancement in athletic administration has been well established (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004). Networking can include interaction with individuals outside and inside the organization, including public relations, contact with significant stakeholders, internal socializing and politicking (Whisenant & Pedersen). However, if women do not have an adequate source of mentors or access to person's influence in which to create networking opportunities, their opportunities for advancement in athletic administration are hindered (Whisenant & Pedersen).

Homologous reproduction has also been discussed as a barrier to women's abilities to reach senior levels of administration. Homologous reproduction describes the propensity of individuals to hire others similar to them. Given that more men are in positions of power and are making final decisions regarding hiring practices in athletic administration, women are placed at a disadvantage when employment decisions are made (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Hovden, 2002; Whisenant et al., 2005).Women have also reported that when in administrative positions, the particular managerial task to which they are assigned also hindered their ability to advance into more senior levels. Evaluation of the importance of managerial work in intercollegiate athletics has indicated that financial management, performance assessment, and conflict resolution are some of the most important managerial tasks for athletic directors (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999). Tasks identified as more important at the assistant director level included information seeking, and coordination and marketing (Danylchuk & Chelladurai). Women reported inequities in distribution of administrative responsibilities in intercollegiate athletics,

including being relegated to compliance and academic counseling activities, activities that are not identified as important at the senior level of administration (Inglis et al., 2000; Suggs, 2005). Women in administration also reported spending more of their time on managerial activities that would not provide them opportunities for advancement, including spending more time on communication activities (e.g., processing paperwork and formal exchanges of information) and less time on networking, a powerful mechanism for advancement (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004).

Stereotypical perceptions regarding women's abilities in senior athletic administration have also constrained women's advancement. Women working in athletic administration have reported the continued perception that women do not have the ability to lead athletic departments (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Inglis et al., 2000). When asked about the most significant barriers to their advancement in athletic administration, women reported that within their roles as athletic administrators they have experienced negative perceptions about their knowledge of intercollegiate athletics, questions regarding their ability to be effective leaders, and lack of respect. These challenges influenced career advancement for women in athletic administration (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006).

Gender Role Stereotyping in Management

If female administrators have identified stereotypes regarding their leadership ability as significant constraints in their advancement to senior level positions, then use of theoretical frameworks that examine gender role stereotyping can assist in understanding why women experience such challenges. Role congruity theory explains that when women engage in masculine or male-dominated roles or behaviors (i.e., aggressive, ambitious, independent, self-confident), such as those necessary in leadership positions, they are evaluated less favorably than men because such management and leadership roles are more stereotypically associated with men (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Typically, people have congruent beliefs about men and leadership, but dissimilar beliefs about women and leadership. This creates similar expectations for male leaders, and contradictory expectations for female leaders. In addition, when engaging in the masculine roles necessary in those leadership positions, women are evaluated less favorably than men, because such behavior is perceived as less desirable in women than men (Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004). That is, women who behave in a confident, aggressive, independent manner are seen as behaving incongruous to their societal gender norm. This creates dissonance and less favorable impressions than their male counterparts given that gender norms suggest males *should* demonstrate aggressive, confident, and independent behavior.

However, managerial roles are not universally considered masculine; there exists variation in understanding of the different types of managerial roles (Atwater et al., 2004; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Yukl (2002) developed a taxomony of managerial subroles that can be used to better understand the variety of roles that managers engage in to be effective within management. Using Yukl's (2002) subrole classification, Atwater et al. were able to examine if particular subroles are associated with stereotypical masculine or feminine behaviors. By examining subroles through the lens of gender stereotyping, researchers can explore if men and women are constrained from particular management positions which may contain gender typed managerial subroles identified as inappropriate for a particular gender. Atwater et al. (2004) identified 13 of 19 managerial subroles as either more masculine or more feminine (Table 1). Providing corrective feedback, developing and mentoring, recognizing and rewarding,

communicating and informing, motivating and inspiring, planning and organizing, and supporting were identified as more feminine managerial subroles. Punishing, problem solving, disciplining, delegating, strategic decision making, and allocating resources were identified as more masculine (Atwater et al.). Given this stereotyping of subroles, men and women can be perceived as acting outside of their appropriate gender roles when engaging in certain managerial roles (Atwater et al.).

Table 1

Managerial Subroles as More Masculine and More Feminine (Atwater et al., 2004)

Managerial Subrole	
Feminine	Masculine
Developing and mentoring	Problem solving
Recognizing and rewarding	Disciplining
Communicating and informing	Delegating
Motivating and inspiring	Strategic decision making
Planning and organizing	Allocating resources
Supporting	Punishing
Providing corrective feedback	

The managerial subroles Atwater et al. (2004) identified as more masculine correspond with the characteristics and descriptions of senior level management positions. Thus, one could expect senior level administrators to rate masculine subroles as more important than the feminine subroles in successful senior level managers. Therefore, the first proposed hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Masculine managerial subroles, will be rated as more important than feminine and gender neutral subroles for senior level managerial positions.

Additionally, as the above literature has indicated, entry and middle level managers are often assigned tasks that center on traits or characteristics, which Atwater et al. (2004) identified as feminine. Thus, it would seem likely that gender neutral and feminine subroles would be more important in entry and middle level manager positions than masculine subroles. Given the previous findings noted, the following hypotheses were proposed:

Hypothesis 2: Feminine managerial subroles will be rated as more important than masculine subroles for entry level and middle level management positions.

Hypothesis 3: Gender neutral subroles will be rated as more important than masculine subroles for entry and middle level management positions.

Finally, given that sport leadership positions are dominated by men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008; Whisenant, 2008) and previous research that has reported men rate leaders as possessing more masculine characteristics (Powell et al., 2002; Schein, 2007), it seems likely that masculine subroles would be viewed as more important by men in senior leadership positions than by women in similar leadership positions. This leads to our final hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Participant's gender will significantly influence the ratings of importance of managerial subroles. Male sport managers/interscholastic athletic directors will rate masculine subroles as more important for senior level management positions than female sport managers/interscholastic athletic directors.

Method

This study was conducted using online survey research procedures. Participants were interscholastic athletic directors and individuals holding manager or director titles at various sport organizations. The interscholastic athletic directors were identified through an interscholastic athletic conference directory representing private schools in New England and through a random sampling procedure identifying managers or directors of sport organizations using a publicly available sport organization directory (Sports Marketplace Directory, 2007). All participants were sent an initial email letter of introduction and information regarding the research project as well as a link to the survey hosted by an online survey company (Survey Monkey), which they were asked to complete. A follow-up email was sent to non-responders two weeks after the initial introductory email was sent. A final email was sent to non-respondents four weeks after the initial introductory email was sent. The instructions to the survey asked participants to indicate on a five-point Likert type scale (5 = most important to 1 = least important) the importance of the managerial subroles used by Atwater et al. (2004) for three levels of manager: entry-level (athletic intern), middle-level (assistant athletic director), and senior-level (athletic director). The primary researcher consulted two faculty members in sport management and one interscholastic athletic director to establish that the management levels (entry, middle, senior) were appropriate for interscholastic athletic administration and sport management, and that the managerial roles provided by Atwater et al. were relevant to the work of interscholastic athletic administrators and sport managers.

Participants were asked to indicate the level of importance of each subrole for each level of manager. The following managerial roles were listed on the survey instrument: providing corrective feedback, allocating resources, planning and organizing, evaluating employees, developing and mentoring personnel, delegating, managing conflict, recognizing and rewarding employees, disciplining, consulting others, motivating and inspiring, strategic decision making, communicating and informing, problem solving, networking, punishing, supporting, monitoring work activities, and clarifying roles and objectives. Participants also completed a series of demographic questions including information regarding age, gender, and number of years of work experience as mangers or administrators. Participants (n=167) included interscholastic athletic directors and sport organization managers of which 107 were male and 53 were female. Seven respondents did not indicate their sex on the survey. Participants indicated their years of

work experience in athletic administration or sport management ranged from one to five years (n = 63), five to ten years (n = 35), 11 to 15 years ($n = 20$), 16 to 20 ($n = 12$), 21 to 25 ($n = 26$), and 26 or more ($n = 3$). Prior to the primary analysis of the data, exploratory factor analysis using principal components analysis with varimax rotation was used to collapse the 19 managerial subroles into four gender role categories, two masculine role categories, one feminine roles category, and one gender-neutral roles category (Atwater et al., 2004). Items loading above |.60 | on only one factor were deemed acceptable (Stevens, 1996) and are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Varimax-Rotated Factor Pattern Matrix From Principal Component

Analysis of Managerial Subroles

Items	Masculine 1	Masculine 2	Feminine	Gender Neutral
Allocating resources	.61			
Delegating	.66			
Managing conflict	.66			
Strategic decision making	.84			
Problem solving	.80			
Punishing		.88		
Disciplining		.89		
Providing corrective feedback			.66	
Planning and organizing			.66	
Developing and mentoring personnel			.67	
Motivating and inspiring			.67	
Communicating and informing			.66	
Supporting			.74	
Evaluating				.69
Recognizing and rewarding employees				.76
Clarifying roles and objectives				.69
Consulting				.64
Networking				.71
Monitoring work activities				.61

The masculine management subrole 1 included the following items from the scale: allocating resources, delegating, managing conflict, strategic decision making, and problem solving, with an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 2.91$. The two items that loaded on a separate factor were punishing and disciplining, which were labeled as masculine subrole 2, with an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 1.27$. The items included in the feminine management subrole included providing corrective feedback, planning and organizing, developing and mentoring personnel, motivating and inspiring, communicating and informing, and supporting, with an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 2.57$. For the gender neutral management subrole the following items were included: evaluating employees, recognizing and rewarding employees, clarifying roles and objectives, consulting others, networking, and monitoring work activities, with an eigenvalue of $\lambda = 2.38$.

Analyses

Prior to analyzing the hypotheses, a mean score was calculated for each of the four gender managerial subroles. A score for a gender managerial subrole was calculated by summing the individual scores for each item in the subrole and then calculating the mean score for that subrole. For example, for masculine subrole 1, a mean was computed from the item scores for allocating resources, delegating, managing conflict, strategic decision making, and problem solving. Cronbach alpha reliabilities were calculated for the four gender managerial subroles; for masculine subrole 1, $\alpha = .81$, for masculine subrole 2 $\alpha = .73$, for feminine subrole, $\alpha = .84$, and for gender neutral subrole, $\alpha = .78$. Means and standard deviations of the subroles across all managerial position levels were obtained for the four subroles (Table 3).

Table 3

Means, standard deviations for managerial subroles scores for entry, middle and senior-level positions (n = 167) and gender typing of role (Feminine = F, Masculine = M, Gender Neutral = GN)

Managerial subroles	Gender typing of role	Entry level manager	Middle level manager	Senior level manager
Providing corrective feedback	F	3.28(1.3)	4.11(.90)	4.64(.71)
Allocating resources	M	2.89(1.1)	3.83(.87)	4.73(.64)
Planning and organizing	F	3.89(1.0)	4.30(.82)	4.66(.73)
Evaluating employees	GN	2.72(1.2)	3.81(.90)	4.59(.68)
Developing and mentoring personnel	F	2.83(1.3)	3.86(.89)	4.55(.78)
Delegating	M	2.75(1.2)	3.71(.92)	4.68(.62)
Managing conflict	GN	3.36(1.2)	4.05(.90)	4.62(.72)
Recognizing and rewarding employees	F	2.94(1.3)	3.86(.95)	4.55(.71)
Disciplining	M	2.5(1.2)	3.39(1.0)	4.23(.96)
Consulting others	GN	3.84(1.1)	4.02(.79)	4.28(.89)
Motivating and inspiring	F	3.33(1.2)	4.05(.86)	4.68(.65)
Strategic decision making	M	2.99(1.2)	3.9(.89)	4.88(.42)
Communicating and informing	F	4.21(.98)	4.44(.77)	4.80(.47)
Networking	GN	3.77(1.0)	4.05(.82)	4.43(.92)
Problem solving	M	4.16(.92)	4.35(.80)	4.62(.71)
Punishing	M	1.88(1.0)	2.57(1.1)	3.37(1.3)
Supporting	F	3.89(.99)	4.33(.86)	4.56(.73)
Monitoring work activities	GN	3.32(1.1)	3.97(.82)	4.04(1.1)
Clarifying roles and objectives	GN	3.07(1.2)	4.03(.85)	4.62(.73)

Results

Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were obtained for each managerial subrole across the three management positions (Table 3). To evaluate the hypotheses a repeated measures MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) was conducted. The within subjects factor was position and consisted of three levels (entry-level manager, middle-level manager, senior-level manager). The between subjects factor was gender of evaluator. The dependent measures were the importance ratings on the four managerial subroles (masculine subrole 1, masculine subrole 2, feminine subrole, gender neutral subrole). The results of the repeated measures MANOVA indicated that there were significant differences due to the within subject factor of position on the dependent measures, Wilk's $\lambda = .285$, $F(8,151) = 47.36$, $p < .001$. The results for the between subjects factor of gender of evaluator (Wilk's $\lambda = .988$, $F(4,155) = .46$, $p = .765$) and the interaction of gender of evaluator by position were not significant (Wilk's $\lambda = .918$, $F(8, 151) = 1.68$, $p = .107$).

Follow up univariate ANOVAs on each dependent measure revealed that the ANOVA for masculine subrole 1 was significant $F(2,77) = 239.89$, $p < .001$; the ANOVA for masculine subrole 2 was significant $F(2,97) = 123.91$, $p < .001$; the ANOVA for feminine subrole was significant $F(2,49) = 141.16$, $p < .0001$; and the ANOVA for gender neutral subrole was significant $F(2,50) = 137.44$, $p < .0001$.

Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate significant differences among these mean scores. Hypothesis 1 stated, masculine managerial subroles would be rated as more important than feminine and gender neutral subroles for senior level managerial positions. Results show that the importance rating for masculine subrole 1 was highest for the senior level management position ($M = 4.70$, $SD = .42$), and significantly higher than the entry-level position ($M = 3.21$, $SD = .84$) and middle-level position ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .68$). In addition, masculine managerial subrole 2 was highest for the senior level management position ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.04$), and significantly higher than the entry-level position ($M = 2.15$, $SD = .99$) and middle-level position ($M = 2.96$, $SD = .94$). Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Hypothesis 2 posited that feminine managerial subroles would be rated as more important than masculine subroles for entry level and middle level management positions. Results show feminine managerial subroles were rated significantly higher for senior level management positions ($M = 4.64$, $SD = .46$), than for entry-level ($M = 3.54$, $SD = .81$) and middle-level management positions ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .65$). Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 stated gender neutral subroles would be rated as more important than masculine subroles for entry and middle level management positions. Analyses indicate gender neutral managerial subroles were rated significantly higher for senior level management positions ($M = 4.41$, $SD = .58$) than for entry-level ($M = 3.24$, $SD = .84$) and middle-level management positions ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .63$). Thus, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Finally, there was no support for Hypothesis 4 that participant's gender will significantly influence the ratings of importance of managerial subroles. There were no significant differences found between male and female participants on the ratings of importance of managerial subroles for each of the three employment level.

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that sport managers and interscholastic athletic directors perceive different levels of importance for managerial roles (i.e., masculine, feminine, or gender neutral) based on entry, middle and senior level management positions. Masculine managerial subroles 1 (allocating resources, delegating, managing conflict, strategic decision making, and problem solving) were rated as more important for senior level managers when compared to entry and middle level managers. Also, masculine managerial subroles 2 (punishing and disciplining) were rated as more important for senior level managers when compared to entry and middle level managers. In addition, feminine managerial subroles (providing corrective feedback, planning and organizing, developing and mentoring personnel, motivating and inspiring, communicating and informing, supporting) and gender neutral subroles (evaluating, recognizing and rewarding employees, clarifying roles and objectives, consulting) were also rated as most important for senior level managers when compared to entry-level and middle-level managers. Therefore, these findings only provide partial support for gender typing of managerial positions as described by Atwater et al. (2004).

Specifically, all four subroles increased in importance as the level of manager increased. Gender-neutral, feminine, and masculine subroles (1 and 2) were all most important in senior level management positions and least important in entry-level positions. Essentially the participants in the current study indicated that as the manager position increases so does the responsibility to fulfill a variety of managerial subroles.

In retrospect, this finding seems somewhat intuitive. Certainly organizations want their best employees in the top positions. However, given the disparity in numbers between men and women in upper level management positions within sport management and athletic administration, the question to be addressed is whether men are perceived as more capable of performing both masculine and feminine subrole duties, or are there additional prejudices against women to prevent them from having the opportunity to perform both masculine and feminine subroles as managers?

Role congruity theory indicates that women will not be perceived as competent in demonstrating masculine managerial roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002), however, there is no available research which has examined if men are perceived as not capable of performing feminine managerial roles (Atwater et al., 2004). Given the significant number of men in senior level administration positions in sport, it would appear that men are perceived as capable of performing the feminine and masculine managerial roles that are important in those senior level positions. Certainly this is an area in need of much further research.

The results from the current study indicate that there is a perception that managers need to perform successfully both masculine and feminine managerial subroles in senior level positions. As women's representation in senior level athletic administration positions continues to decline (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008) it appears that gender role stereotyping has had a detrimental impact on women, but not on men. Again, this research lends support to role congruity theory of prejudice against female leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Eagly (2007) discussed a potential double standard for women in senior leadership positions such that women who embrace the requisite masculine subroles are chastised for straying too far from their appropriate gender norms and thus 'acting like a man', while women who do not fully embrace masculine subroles are said to be 'too soft'. However, Eagly further noted that women who are able to walk the fine line between these two extremes often develop a leadership style more advantageous to fostering success within an organization. Based on the results of the current study, it would appear that women and men should be perceived as having the abilities to successfully perform in the position of senior level athletic administrator.

Limitations

This research was also subject to some notable limitations. First, the researchers did not specifically define the various management levels and instead chose to allow the respondents to interpret the titles entry, middle, and senior level management. While this was beneficial in some respects as those titles mean different things within different companies, for these very same reasons this could also have been problematic. With more specific descriptions of the various management levels, future research may find somewhat differing results. In addition, interscholastic athletic administrators may not be considered senior level administrators within a school system, as the superintendent would be considered the most senior level administrator. However, within an athletic program, the athletic director has control over budgeting, scheduling, and hiring of coaches, among other responsibilities, which are functions characteristic of a senior level position within athletic administration. Also, the sample of athletic administrators was limited to only interscholastic athletic administrators and did not include intercollegiate athletic administrators. Undoubtedly, differences exist between the varying types of organizations and future research should look specifically at gendered subroles within university athletic departments.

Conclusion and Future Recommendations

In sum, these results lend support to previous literature that has examined the existence of gendered subroles within management positions (Atwater et al, 2004). However, while previous research has focused on the senior level management position being a 'masculine' position, the results of this study suggest possessing *both* feminine and masculine subroles is important for senior level managers. It is also worthy to note that despite previous work that has suggested men rate leaders as possessing more masculine characteristics (Powell et al., 2002; Schein, 2007), the findings from the current study did not reveal differences in evaluation based on the gender of the respondents. This finding may support other research that has indicated there may be changing perceptions in the characteristics necessary to be successful in management and leadership (Dueher & Bono, 2006).

The findings from the current study make a contribution to our understanding of perceptions of management roles within athletic administration. Our most significant recommendation to managers and administrators in sport is to be aware that *both* masculine and feminine managerial subroles are viewed as important for senior level managers. Managers and administrator should seek to employ, train, and promote those individuals who can fulfill all of these contrasting duties. Additional research is needed to better understand differences in perceptions by male and female managers and administrators in the sport industry regarding the

characteristics perceived necessary to be successful in management and leadership. Given the propensity of males in senior level management positions, future researchers should fully examine whether male administrators are competently performing both these masculine and feminine subroles. Finally, future research should continue to examine the barriers women face when trying to advance into senior level management positions as well as the difficulties male and female senior level managers face when trying to successfully fulfill both traditionally feminine and masculine managerial subroles.

References

Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L.J. (2008). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study thirty-one year update (1977–2006).* Retrieved April 16, 2009, from http://www.acostacarpenter.org/

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.

Coakley, J. (2009). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies* (10th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cuneen, J., & Sidwell, M. J. (2007). Differences on the job for female and male sport management interns, *Sport Management Education Journal, 1*, 1-17.

Danylchuk, K. E., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). The nature of managerial work in Canadian intercollegiate athletics, *Journal of Sport Management, 13*, 148-166.

Duehr, E. E., & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 815–846.

Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 1-12.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 573-598.

Grappendorf, H., & Lough, N. (2006). An endangered species: Characteristics and perspectives from female NCAA Division I athletic directors of both separate and merged athletic departments. *The Sport Management and Related Topics Journal, 2*(2), 6 – 20.

Heilman, M. E., Wallen, A. S., Fuchs, D., & Tamkins, M. M. (2004). Penalties for success: Reactions to women who succeed at male tasks. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 416-427.

Hovden, J. (2002). Gender and leadership selection processes in Norwegian sporting organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 35*, 75-82.

Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 9*, 1-19.

Lapchick, R. (2009). *The 2009 racial and gender report card.* Retrieved May 13, 2010, from University of Central Florida, The Institute for Diversity & Ethics in Sport Web site: http://web.bus.ucf.edu/sportbusiness/?page=1445

Miller, J., Whisenant, W. A., & Pedersen, P. M. (2007). The communication of opportunities and barriers to prospective applicants: An analysis of interscholastic athletic administrative job announcements. *Physical Educator, 64*, 73-80.

Mullane, S., & Whisenant, W. A. (2007). Florida ADs and homologous reproduction. *Public Organization Review, 7*, 261-267.

Moorman, A. M. (2004). Legal issues and the supervised internship relationship. Who is responsible for what? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 75*, 19-24.

Pedersen, P. M., & Whisenant, W. A. (2005). Successful when given the opportunity: Investigating gender representation and success rates of interscholastic athletic directors. *Physical Educator*, *62*, 178-186.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: have the times changed? *Journal of Management*, *28* (2), 177-193.

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.

Schein, V. E. (1975). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: Prior research and new directions. *Personnel Psychology*, *31*, 259-268.

Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review*, *22*, 6-18.

Sports Marketplace Directory (2007). Millerton, NY: Grey House Publishing.

Stahura, K. A., Greenwood, M., & Dobbs, M. E. (2004). Hiring patterns in intercollegiate athletics: An introductory investigation into the relationship between athletic directors and head coaches. *International Journal of Sport Management, 5*, 197-214.

Stevens, J. (1996) *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Suggs, W. (2005). Faces in a mostly white, male crowd. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(31), p. A34.

Whisenant, W. A. (2003). How women have fared as interscholastic athletic administrators since the passage of Title IX. *Sex Roles*, *49*, 179-184.

Whisenant, W. A. (2008). Sustaining male dominance in interscholastic athletics: A case of homologous reproduction…or not? *Sex Roles, 58*, 768-775.

Whisenant, W. A., Miller, J., & Pedersen, P. M. (2005). Systematic barriers in athletic administration: An analysis of job descriptions for interscholastic athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 53*, 911-918.

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.

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

Biography

Laura J. Burton is an Associate Professor of Sport Management at the University of Connecticut. Her research interests include stereotyping in leadership and management in sport. Heidi M. Parker is an Assistant Professor of Sport Management at the University of Southern Maine. Her research interests center on the areas of sport endorser effectiveness, issues surrounding women in sport, and sport fan behavior.