

EXAMINATION OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATION: APPLICATION OF GENDER TYPING OF MANAGERIAL SUBROLES

**LAURA BURTON, PHD, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
ERIN HAGAN, MBA, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT**

INTRODUCTION

There is continued evidence of a decline in women's roles within the administration of athletic programs at the intercollegiate level (Acosta & Carpenter, 2006). Women are most often an associate or assistant level administrator in intercollegiate athletic departments, working with a male senior level administrator and a male associate level administrator. In 2006, only 18.6% of universities had a female athletic director. At the Division I level, only 9.3% of the athletic programs were headed by women. Men have developed institutionalized control over the most senior levels of intercollegiate athletics and sport administration (Shaw & Slack, 2002; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). When women do have access to leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics, they are segregated into less powerful and less esteemed athletic director positions at Division II and Division III universities (Whisenant et al., 2002). In addition, current female athletic directors report negative stereotypes regarding their ability to lead as one of the most significant barriers they face in their careers (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006).

Gender role theory has been used as a framework to examine why women are underrepresented in senior management positions in business. This examination has included evaluation of gender stereotypes of managerial roles that can be divided into masculine, feminine or gender neutral subroles (Atwater, Brett, Waldman, DiMare, & Hayden, 2004). Managerial 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., 2004). Gender stereotyping of managerial subroles may act to constrain women from being perceived as competent for senior managerial positions. The purpose of this study was to evaluate job descriptions for senior level athletic administration positions to examine if the different types of job descriptions written for these positions use managerial subroles that are gender typed as more masculine, feminine, or gender neutral.

GENDER CONSTRAINTS IN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATION POSITIONS

The constraints women face in advancing to athletic director, or senior level administrative positions in intercollegiate athletics, begin early in their careers. Internships within sport organizations are considered crucial to the future career success of students in sport management (Moorman, 2004). As a result, the experiences students receive during the internship process have significant impact on their ability to advance in sport administration. However, male and female interns have not received the same types of experiences working in intercollegiate athletics. Cuneen and Sidwell (2007) reported that male interns were more often employed full-time, were more often mentored by male administrators, and received more work experience in communication and corporate sales. Female interns were more likely to work only part-time, were less likely to receive mentorship from male administrators, and most often worked in compliance departments. Most disturbing, female interns were more likely than male interns to be assigned clerical duties, and were more often asked to perform these duties by male administrators (Cuneen & Sidwell, 2007). This disparity in administrative duties continued into entry-level positions in intercollegiate athletics, as men were most often in positions in business affairs, fund raising and marketing, and women were relegated to

academic advising, compliance or life-skills coordinator positions (Suggs, 2005). The entry-level positions held by men provided them with the skills to move into athletic director positions, yet the jobs women held more often lead to assistant or associate level positions (Suggs, 2005).

At the senior administration level, women are underrepresented within intercollegiate athletics (Acosta & Carpenter, 2006). Women in leadership or administration positions reported significant constraints to success within these positions because of continued perceptions that women do not have the ability to lead athletic departments (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000). A majority of women working within intercollegiate athletic administration identified gender bias and discrimination as significant barriers to becoming athletic directors (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006). Female athletic directors reported being given unequal workloads when compared to their male colleagues, including having additional responsibilities over and above administrative functions, such as teaching and coaching (Inglis et al., 2002). In addition, female administrators reported being expected to deal with all gender related issues within their respective department, including committee work dealing with gender issues.

Perhaps one of the most significant constraints to women's advancement to athletic director was the development of the Senior Woman Administrator position, as this position consigned women to oversight and management of only women's sports and/or non-revenue producing men's sports (Whisenant et al., 2002). In addition, at the senior administrative levels, women reported having oversight of the 'cutesy' sports (e.g., gymnastics, tennis, golf) while men were responsible for revenue producing sports, including football and men's basketball (Inglis et al., 2000; Whisenant, et al., 2002).

There exists a perception that women do not have the knowledge or experience to oversee revenue producing sports which further impedes women's advancement to senior administration positions (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006). By maintaining oversight of revenue producing sports, male administrators have continued to control the most powerful administrative positions at both the institutional level and also at the governance level of intercollegiate athletics (i.e., NCAA) (Whisenant et al., 2002).

Gender typing of work that is delegated to women in intercollegiate administration can act as an additional barrier to advancement to the most senior levels of athletic administration. Evaluation of the importance of managerial work in intercollegiate athletics has indicated that financial management, evaluation, 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, coordination and marketing. Women report inequities in distribution of administrative responsibilities in intercollegiate athletics, including being assigned 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). These inequities have also been noted during the internship experience for women in intercollegiate athletics (Cuneen & Sidwell, 2007). Women in administration also reported spending more of their time on managerial activities that did 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 in intercollegiate athletics (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004).

GENDER ROLE STEREOTYPING IN MANAGEMENT

Though there has been some evolution in perceptions of a manager to more fully encompass traits possessed by both men and women, overall the role of manager continues to be perceived as a masculine role (Atwater et al., 2004; Dueher & Bono, 2006; Schein, 2002; Willemsen,

2002). Role congruity theory explains that when women engage in masculine or male-dominated roles, such as those deemed necessary and desirable in leadership positions, they are evaluated less favorably than men because 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 highly redundant expectations for men and leaders, and contradictory expectations for women and leaders. In addition, when evaluated for leadership positions in industries that were not congruent with their gender role (i.e., male dominated industries), more prejudice was shown toward female candidates (Garcia-Retamero & López-Zafra, 2006).

However, the role of manager is not necessarily a universal role. There exists variation in the different types of managerial roles that can be used within management positions (Atwater et al., 2004; Eagly & Karau, 2002). Yukl (2002) developed a taxonomy of managerial subroles that can be used to better understand the variety of roles that managers engage in to be effective. Within Yukl's taxonomy, fourteen managerial roles were identified that were generic enough to explain the behaviors of many different types of managers, yet were also specific enough to address the unique situations confronted by individual managers. Using Yukl's subrole classification, Atwater et al. (2004) examined if particular managerial subroles were associated with stereotypical masculine or feminine behaviors.

Atwater et al. (2004) made changes to Yukl's (2002) original taxonomy combining recognizing and rewarding into one role, subdividing monitoring into evaluating employees and monitoring work activities, and adding providing corrective feedback, disciplining and punishing. A total of 19 managerial subroles were evaluated resulting in 13 of those 19 identified as either more masculine or more feminine. Providing corrective feedback, developing and mentoring, recognizing and rewarding, communicating and informing, 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.

STEREOTYPING OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS

Job descriptions are used to detail responsibilities, duties, working conditions and activities required of a position (Anthony, Kaemar, & Perrew, 2002, as cited in Whisenant et al., 2005). As with stereotyping of particular managerial roles, additional research involving evaluation of the job descriptions of interscholastic athletic directors uncovered systematic barriers in how job descriptions are written which prevent women from qualifying for those positions (Whisenant, Miller, & Pedersen, 2005). Women were negatively impacted by qualifications written into the job descriptions for 17% of interscholastic athletic director positions evaluated by Whisenant et al. (2005), as those job descriptions required applicants to serve as both head football coach and athletic director at the high school level.

In addition, as discussed previously, female administrators at the intercollegiate level continue to be directed to managerial roles and tasks considered more appropriate for women, including academic counseling, promotions and compliance (Inglis et al., 2000; Suggs, 2005). The job descriptions that are used to recruit and screen potential applicants for athletic administration positions may be written in a manner that includes roles, duties and responsibilities that are gender typed. If such job descriptions are written in a manner that highlights more masculine managerial subroles (Atwater et al., 2004), the job description itself may be an additional barrier for women seeking such positions. Administrators that use job descriptions to evaluate qualified applicants for such positions may inadvertently screen out particular applicants

because their gender is not congruent with the gendered subroles included in the job description (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

Therefore the purpose of this research was to evaluate if job descriptions for senior athletic administrator positions were written using more masculine, feminine or gender neutral managerial subroles. If job descriptions do contain more masculine managerial subroles (e.g., strategic decision making, allocating resources) these descriptions may constrain women from being perceived as qualified or capable of performing the roles necessary to be successful in such senior athletic director positions. In addition, because women in intercollegiate athletics report being relegated to more feminine appropriate roles within administration (e.g., compliance, academic counseling, promotions), the job descriptions for these positions may contain fewer masculine managerial subroles and a greater number of feminine or gender neutral subroles (e.g., providing corrective feedback, communicating, and informing).

METHOD

PROCEDURES

DEVELOPMENT OF JOB DESCRIPTION CODES

Prior to evaluation of athletic administrator job descriptions, an initial sample of job descriptions ($n = 10$) was reviewed in order to develop a list of five common phrases used in the job descriptions (Table 1). Job descriptions are not typically written with specific managerial subroles as described by Yukl (2002). Job descriptions usually do not contain specific subroles such as managing conflict, communicating and informing, providing corrective feedback. Therefore, following the development of a list of five commonly used phrases for job descriptions, a sample of interscholastic athletic directors ($n = 40$), representing small private boarding schools in the Northeast, were surveyed via an anonymous online survey to assess the five most important managerial subroles as classified by Yukl (2002) required for each common job description phrase. Based on the results reported from the interscholastic athletic directors, the five managerial subroles most frequently identified as important to each common job description phrase were selected to represent that job description phrase (Table 1). A common job description phrase was labeled as masculine if the phrase was identified to contain more masculine typed managerial subroles, feminine if the phrase was identified to contain more feminine typed managerial subroles, and gender neutral if the phrase was identified to contain more gender neutral managerial subroles (Atwater et al., 2004) (Table 1).

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF JOB POSITIONS POSTINGS

Content analysis procedures were used to evaluate the gender typing of job descriptions for intercollegiate athletic director positions (Neuendorf, 2002). Using the available search engines for positions in intercollegiate athletics (e.g., NCAA, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, NACDA) job position postings for Division I, II, and III athletic administration positions were collected from September, 2006 to April, 2007. To be included in the analysis, the position title had to include director of athletics, senior administrator of athletics, associate director, or assistant director of athletics. Division I, II and III athletic administration job descriptions announcements ($n = 171$) were collected for possible analysis. The majority of job descriptions were collected from Division I ($n = 135$), followed by Division II ($n = 25$), and then Division III ($n = 11$). Based on the administration positions that were posted during the year of data collection, the following positions were selected for analysis: athletic director, associate athletic director, compliance director, development director, marketing director, and operations director. Senior Woman Administrator positions were specifically excluded from the analyses, as these positions are designed for and filled by a female administrator in an intercollegiate athletic department. A systematic random sample of job descriptions was drawn for Division I in an effort to balance representation of job descriptions across all Divisions. The only exception was the inclusion of

all job description announcements for athletic director at the Division I level ($n = 5$). Also included in coding at the Division I level ($n = 30$) was associate athletic directors ($n = 5$), compliance director ($n = 5$), development director ($n = 5$), marketing director ($n = 5$), and operations director ($n = 5$). At the Division II level ($n = 20$) was athletic director ($n = 8$), associate athletic director ($n = 3$), compliance director ($n = 3$), development director ($n = 3$), marketing director ($n = 1$), and operations ($n = 1$). For the Division III level, the following job descriptions announcements were coded, athletic director ($n = 5$), associate athletic director ($n = 1$), development director ($n = 1$), and marketing director ($n = 1$).

The authors of this paper served as the primary coders for analysis of the job description announcements. Both coders (a sport management professor and a doctoral student in sport management) were involved in development and analysis of the online survey which was used to identify the five managerial subroles most frequently identified as important for each job description phrase. Based on this information each code was used as a guide for the common job description codes established in the first part of this project (Table 1). To maintain consistency in coding, each coder was instructed to review only the stated job duties or position responsibilities. Required qualifications or details regarding the universities were not included in the analysis of the job description announcements. The coders together reviewed one job description to establish a baseline regarding how to appropriately code the data. After that initial consultation, the job descriptions were independently coded by each researcher.

RESULTS

In order to establish credibility in the findings, coding analyses were compared between the two coders. Consistency in assignment of job position announcements to the five common job phrases by the two coders was evaluated using both percent agreement and intercoder reliability accounting for chance agreement using Cohen's kappa (Neuendorf, 2002). Codes were analyzed by examining whether each coder had coded at least one phrase in the job description into one of the five managerial subroles. Overall, percent agreement and Cohen's kappa were within acceptable levels as noted by Neuendorf, with the exception of "developing relationships with external stakeholders." Percent agreement for the code "leading a program" was 92% with an intercoder reliability $K = .62$. For the code "monitoring a program," the coders agreed on placement of the code into the appropriate job description announcement for 88% of the codes with an intercoder reliability of $K = .71$. Percent agreement for the code "developing relationships with external stakeholders" was 56% with intercoder reliability of $K = .25$. For the code, "serving as departmental liaison", the coders agreed on placement of the code into the appropriate job description for 98% of the codes with an intercoder reliability of $K = .92$. Finally, for the code "supervising staff", the coders agreed on placement of the code into the appropriate job description for 81% of the codes with an intercoder reliability of $K = .61$.

Frequencies and percentages of the results of the coding of common job description phrases are reported in Table 2. The codes were analyzed to evaluate if job descriptions for senior athletic administrator positions were written using more masculine, feminine or gender neutral managerial subroles. The most frequently occurring common job description code for the position of athletic director was leading a program at the levels of Division I (40%), Division II (35%) and Division III (34%). Leading a program was also the most frequently coded job description phrase for associate athletic director for Division I (36%) and marketing director for Division II (60%). At the associate athletic director position for Division II, monitoring a program was the most frequently coded job description phrase (58%). Serving as a departmental liaison was the most frequently coded job description phrase for associate athletic director at the Division III level (28%). Monitoring a program was the most frequently coded job description phrase for Division I (43%) and Division II (44%) compliance director (no job descriptions were evaluated for Division III Compliance director). Developing relationships with external stakeholders was the most frequently coded job description for Division I (51%),

Division II (77%) and Division III (41%) for development director. Developing relationships with external stakeholders was also the most frequently coded job description phrase for Division I (41%) and Division III (43%) marketing director. For the operations director position at the Division I (38%) and Division II (20%) levels, monitoring a program was the most frequently coded job description phrase.

DISCUSSION

This research examined job description position announcements to evaluate if job descriptions for senior athletic administrator positions were written using more masculine, feminine or gender neutral managerial subroles. Results of the analysis indicated that job descriptions for athletic director positions across all three divisions contained more phrases that were coded in the masculine job description phrase, leading a program, (i.e., planning and organizing, allocating resources, motivating and inspiring, strategic decision making, and clarifying roles and objectives) when compared to all other job description codes for the athletic director position. One aspect of role congruity theory indicates that women are not perceived as having the skills necessary to be successful leaders because women lack the masculine characteristics necessary in leadership positions (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women may not be perceived as capable of performing in the role of athletic director if the managerial requirements documented in the job description contain more masculine managerial skills (Eagly & Karau). The position of athletic director continues to be dominated by men, specifically at the Division I level (Acosta & Carpenter, 2006), and if job descriptions for athletic director contain more masculine job description phrases then those descriptions will continue to favor male applicants (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In addition, though not directly examined in this research project, if the athletic director position is perceived as requiring more masculine managerial skills, when women are in athletic director positions, they may be unfavorably evaluated for exhibiting the skills required to be successful in such positions (Eagly & Karau).

When evaluating other senior administrative positions, the job descriptions for compliance director contained more phrases that were coded in the feminine job description phrase, monitoring a program (i.e., providing corrective feedback, evaluating employees, supporting, monitoring work activities, developing and mentoring personnel). Supervising staff, also a feminine managerial subrole, was most frequently coded at the operations director position at the Division II level. Job descriptions for the position of compliance director may be written to benefit women, as those descriptions contain more feminine managerial skills. Indeed, women are more likely to be represented in compliance positions than in other positions in intercollegiate athletics as there is a relatively equal balance between men and women in compliance positions, yet the operations director position is most often held by men (NCAA, 2006). Only senior woman administrators and life-skills coordinator positions have greater representations of women in intercollegiate athletic administration (NCAA). There is no research to date that has examined if men are perceived negatively when engaging in more female typed managerial roles (Atwater et al., 2002). However, given the relatively equal balance between men and women in compliance positions and the greater representation of men in operations positions (NCAA), it does not appear that men are perceived to lack the requisite skills for those positions. It is of interest to note that compliance is one area of athletic administration that has not helped individuals move into positions of power, specifically to the athletic director position (Suggs, 2005). Therefore, the position of compliance director may serve to constrain women from moving into athletic director positions, as women are not perceived to have the masculine managerial skills that their male colleagues in compliance positions possess (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Whisenant et al., 2002).

The job description positions for development director across all three Divisions contained more phrases that were coded as the gender neutral job descriptions phrases, developing relationships with external stakeholders (i.e., consulting others, networking, communicating

and informing, strategic decision making, clarifying roles and objectives). However, it is important to note that results of the intercoder reliability analysis for this gender neutral job description phrase were below acceptable levels for content analysis research (Neuendorf, 2002). Therefore results reported for “developing relationships with external stakeholders” must be interpreted with caution.

The job descriptions for marketing director positions also contained more phrases that were coded as the gender neutral job descriptions phrase developing relationships with external stakeholders, at the Division I and III level. With job descriptions written using more gender neutral managerial roles, it would appear women and men would be perceived as capable of successfully performing in the roles of marketing director and development director. However, more men hold marketing director and development director positions across all Divisions of intercollegiate athletics (NCAA, 2006). As previously discussed, marketing is also considered a gateway position leading to the position of athletic director (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006).

Researchers have examined how leaders are assigned based on type of task requiring leadership for either gender neutral (e.g., planting a garden), masculine (e.g., playing football), or feminine tasks (e.g., planning a wedding). Men were considered more appropriate or competent leaders for tasks considered masculine appropriate or gender neutral, yet women were only perceived as competent to lead tasks that were specifically designated as feminine (Ritter & Yodder, 2004). In addition, in environments that are considered male appropriate (e.g., athletics), men were consistently provided advantages in leadership positions deemed congruent with their gender role (Garcia-Retamaro & López-Zafra, 2006). The current research also supports these findings, as men are more likely to hold positions that list in the job description requirements more masculine managerial skills or more gender neutral managerial skills, and even for positions requiring more feminine managerial skills (i.e., operations director) (NCAA, 2006).

This research suggests that, as written, job descriptions for specific positions within athletic administration may be biased toward applicants. The job descriptions for the most powerful positions in intercollegiate athletics, the positions of athletic director, are written in a manner that favors male applicants. When trying to apply for positions at the level of athletic director, women may be perceived as not having the masculine managerial skills necessary to perform the managerial roles required in that position (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Women may also be at a disadvantage when applying for positions that require more gender neutral managerial skills (e.g., development director and marketing director), as those positions also will favor male applicants over female applicants (Ritter & Yodder, 2004). Though the job description is only one aspect of a multi-stage process toward evaluating potential candidates for positions, the gender-typed nature of written job descriptions could introduce an additional barrier that women must overcome when trying to reach the position of athletic director. The statistics regarding gender representation in athletic administration positions clearly support the notion that men continue to dominate the majority of those positions, including the athletic director position (Acosta & Carpenter, 2006).

It appears that other positions within athletic administration contain more feminine managerial skills and as such would be perceived as more appropriate for women. Again, statistics examining gender representation of positions in intercollegiate athletics support this notion for positions in compliance, academic advising and life-skills coordinator (NCAA, 2006). However, women tend to be over represented in those areas of administration that are perceived to be less powerful, and less likely to lead to advancement to athletic director positions (Suggs, 2005).

LIMITATIONS

The limitations to this study should be noted. First, in the initial stage of development of the coding categories for common job description phrases, interscholastic athletic directors were asked to identify the most important managerial subroles for each commonly used job description phrase. Athletic directors at the intercollegiate level may have identified different managerial subroles as appropriate for the job description phrases. Though this may be a potential limitation, athletic directors at the interscholastic level are aware of what is required in different managerial positions in athletic administration, even if the programs at the interscholastic level are much smaller when compared to the programs run by intercollegiate athletic directors.

Second, only those job announcements that were posted from September 2006 to April 2007 were evaluated in this research. Because there were no operations director positions posted at the Division III level, there was no way to code managerial subroles for those positions. An additional limitation was the lack of an adequate number of job announcements for academic advisor or academic support service personnel. These positions have been characterized as more appropriate for women (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Inglis et al., 2000) and are more often filled by women (NCAA, 2006).

In addition, there was a noted limitation in the use of only two content coders. Potential bias could have occurred as a result of using only two coders in the analyses of the job descriptions. The trustworthiness and credibility of findings could have improved with the use of additional coders, and having such coders review multiple job descriptions as a group, prior to individual coding. An additional limitation that must be addressed was the poor percent agreement and intercoder reliability rating for the common job phrase “developing relationships with external stakeholders.” This common job phrase, evaluated as a gender neutral job phrase, was most often coded into positions for development director and marketing director positions. These results must be interpreted with caution.

The decision to exclude job announcements for senior woman administrators could be considered an additional limitation. This position has been designed for and filled by women. However, the aim of this research was to evaluate positions that are considered available to both men and women; therefore use of job descriptions that are designed specifically for women would not have contributed to the questions posed in this project.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this research, the managerial responsibilities as written in job descriptions for specific positions in athletic departments appear to be gender biased, and most often favor male applicants, especially for those positions that are considered more powerful in athletic administration (e.g., athletic director). Written job descriptions for positions within athletic administration may be an additional factor contributing to the continual decline in the number of women in athletic director positions. Future research should continue to explore if job descriptions act to constrain women from more powerful positions in athletic administration, if there are perceptions regarding more gender appropriate positions within athletic administration, and if those perceptions influence how job descriptions are written. In addition, researchers should examine if job descriptions have an influence on the subsequent interview and selection of candidates for particular positions.

REFERENCES

Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2006). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study twenty-nine year update (1977-2006)*. Retrieved from <http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport>

- Anthony, W., Kaemar, K., & Perrewe, P. (2002). *Human resource management: A strategic approach* (4th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- 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.
- 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.
- Dueher, E. E., & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 815-846.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598.
- Garcia-Retamero, R. & López-Zafra, E. (2006). Prejudice against women in male-congenial environments: Perceptions of gender role congruity in leadership. *Sex Roles, 55*, 51-61.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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, 34.
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2006). *2005-06 Ethnicity and Gender Demographics of NCAA Member Institutions' Athletic Personnel*. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/library/research/race_demographics/2005-06/2005-06_ethnicity_gender_demographics.pdf
- Ritter, B. A., & Yoder, J. D. (2004). Gender differences in leader emergence persist even for dominant women: An updated confirmation of role congruity theory. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 187-193.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 675-688.
- Shaw, S., & Slack, T. (2002). 'It's been like that for Donkey's Years': The construction of gender relations and the cultures of sports organizations. *Culture, Sport, Society, 5*, 86-106.
- Suggs, W. (2005). Faces in a mostly white, male crowd. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(31), p. A34.

Willemsen, T. M. (2002). Gender typing of the successful manager – A stereotype reconsidered. *Sex Roles, 46*, 385-391.

Whisenant, W., Miller, J., & Pedersen, P. M. (2005). Systematic barriers for 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.

Whisenant, W. A., Pedersen, P. M., & Obenour, B. (2002). Success and gender: Determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 47*, 485-491.

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

TABLE 1

COMMON PHRASES IN JOB DESCRIPTION AND FIVE MOST IMPORTANT MANAGERIAL SUBROLES FOR THAT COMMON PHRASE

Job Description Phrase	Gender Subrole	Managerial Subroles				
Leading a Program	Masculine	Planning and organizing (Feminine)	Allocating resources (Masculine)	Motivating and inspiring (Gender Neutral)	Strategic decision making (Masculine)	Clarifying roles and objectives (Gender Neutral)
Monitoring a Program	Feminine	Providing corrective feedback (Feminine)	Evaluating employees (Gender Neutral)	Supporting (Feminine)	Monitoring work activities (Gender Neutral)	Developing and mentoring personnel (Feminine)
Developing Relationships External Stakeholders	Gender Neutral	Consulting others (Gender Neutral)	Networking (Gender Neutral)	Communicating and informing (Feminine)	Strategic decision making (Masculine)	Clarifying roles and objectives (Gender Neutral)
Serving as Departmental Liaison	Gender Neutral	Consulting others (Gender Neutral)	Providing Corrective feedback (Feminine)	Managing conflict (Masculine)	Supporting (Feminine)	Networking (Gender Neutral)
Supervising Staff	Feminine	Evaluating employees (Gender Neutral)	Providing corrective feedback (Feminine)	Developing and mentoring personnel (Feminine)	Motivating and inspiring (Gender Neutral)	Communicating and informing (Feminine)

TABLE 2

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENT FREQUENCIES OF CODING OF COMMON JOB DESCRIPTIONS BY POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

	Leading a Program (Masculine)	Developing Relationships with External Stakeholders (Neutral)	Serving as Departmental Liaison (Gender Neutral)	Supervising Staff (Feminine)
	<i>f</i> (%)			
Position				
Division I Athletic Director	17(40)	6(14)	5(12)	5(12)
Division II Athletic Director	22(35)	10(16)	3(4)	8(13)
Division III Athletic Director	12(34)	9(25)	1(3)	5(14)
Division I Associate Athletic Director	13(36)	10(27)	5(14)	3(8)
Division II Athletic Director	2(17)	0(0)	0(0)	3(25)
Division III Athletic Director	4(19)	3(14)	6(28)	3(14)
Division I Compliance Director	11(34)	0(0)	5(15)	2(6)
Division II Compliance Director	3(33)	1(11)	0(0)	1(11)
Division I Development Director	13(27)	24(51)	3(6)	2(4)
Division II Development Director	0(0)	17(77)	1(4)	1(4)
Division III Development Director	2(16)	5(41)	2(16)	0(0)
Division I Marketing Director	6(17)	14(41)	5(14)	1(3)
Division II Marketing Director	3(60)	1(20)	0(0)	0(0)
Division III Marketing Director	2(12)	7(43)	0(0)	2(12)
Division I Operations Director	7(22)	5(16)	4(13)	3(9)
Division II Operations Director	0(0)	1(20)	1(20)	2(40)