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ABSTRACT

While sport is observed to possess many positive attributes, such as leadership development, team work, and self-discipline, it also is observed to possess many harmful ideological stances that influence the experiences of its members. Specifically, the current study examines how the organizational culture of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) perpetuates ideological structures based on gender and race, which leaves black women marginalized. In athletics, ideologies privilege a system based on meritocracy, competition, and domination afforded to and controlled by white men (Hylton, 2010). As such, the culture of intercollegiate athletics has been recognized to resemble hegemonic structures based on gender and race, conceptualized as hegemonic masculinity and whiteness.

The concept of whiteness concludes that racism is perpetuated by socially constructed hierarchical power systems privileging white identity and allowing for color blind-ness by those in power (McDonald, 2005). Similarly, the acceptance of men as sole participants and stakeholders reinforce the power structure to reflect the concept of hegemonic masculinity and whiteness (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Long, Robinson, Spracklen, 2005; McDonald, 2005; Whisenant, Pedersen & Obenour, 2002). Hegemonic masculinity is the privileging of masculinity, qualities most associated with men, over femininity, most associated with women. Men are considered superior athletes and leaders, thereby, forcing women and minorities into positions of inferiority and subordination (Whisenant, Miller & Pedersen, 2005).

Black women's positioning within these oppressive organizational structures, requires a relational understanding of the impact of their identity on experience that leaves them underrepresented for leadership opportunities and upward mobility in athletic administration. As such, the analytical framework of intersectionality, allows a confrontation of systematic structures that were previously left invisible and overlooked without a clear understanding of how. Intersectionality allows for a unique conceptual framework to examine the confluent nature of black women’s identity as it mediates their experiences. To explore the nuances of experiences for black women, the current study explored their perceptions of gender and race within the confines of ICA as executive sport leaders. Findings from the study support the use of intersectionality as a useful analytical framework in context of ICA for black women, but also highlight the necessity for counteracting hegemonic influences that continue to limit the advancement of women and racial minorities (Burton, 2014).
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Participation in collegiate athletics provides student-athletes with life skills needed for advancement in society (Danish, Petitpas, & Hale, 1993). Among its many developmental benefits, collegiate athletics have been shown to foster identity development, educational attainment, and increased self-esteem for its participants. Particularly, Lund (2013) observed that student-athletes actually possessed greater leadership qualities than non-student-athletes. Ideally, athletic competition allows student-athletes the ability to mature mentally and physically, in the hope of transferring those skills to future career and personal aspirations. Unfortunately, the benefits of athletics may be overshadowed by the “dark side” of sports, an expression of the activity that reflects several of society’s harmful ideological stances (Sage, 1990). Firmly established in collegiate athletics, these harmful ideological stances have promoted certain forms of discrimination and have particularly harmed the opportunities of women and minorities as student athletes and athletic administrators.

Case in point, athletics has traditionally fostered hegemonic masculinity, an ideological stance that privileges traditionally masculine traits such as aggression and physical violence, thereby forcing women and minorities into positions of inferiority and subordination (Whisenant, Miller & Pedersen, 2005). Similarly, collegiate athletics values an ideology of whiteness, which privileges white identities and allows “‘white’ bodies, with important consequences in regard to life, opportunity and psychic security” (McDonald, 2005, p. 250). The nature of sports empowers white men into leadership
positions, which maintain their power through an ideological value of “whiteness” (McDonald, 2005). In turn, individuals who benefit from both hegemonic masculinity and whiteness are able to shape and control the experiences of black athletes and employees within intercollegiate athletic (ICA) organizations. Specifically this study will examine African American women's "double jeopardy", being a woman and African American (King, 1988), in the context of intercollegiate athletics and more specifically in the context of intercollegiate athletic administration.

**Culture of Sport**

Intercollegiate athletics (ICA) is situated within the larger social institution of sport, an institution that mirrors many of society's power inequities (Frey & Eitzen, 1991). Sport is based on the generation of meaning by its participants and members of society, where values, social norms, and beliefs are created and re-created (Frey & Eitzen). Prominent values of sporting culture include self-discipline, teamwork, and stoicism. Similarly, honor, loyalty, and superiority are deeply enmeshed in the culture and are often principles embedded in sport participation. There is a distinction between play and sport, where play is recognized to be free-spirited, spontaneous, and self-selected; sport is controlled, formalized by rules, and mediated by success (winning) (Frey & Eitzen). According to McPherson, Curtis, and Loy (1989) sport is "(a) a form of involvement; (b) a ludic physical activity; (c) a social institution, and (d) a cultural product" (p. 10). Involvement includes the participant, the spectator, and competition that creates opposition between teams and fans, nationally and internationally. Inherent to sport, physical activity is admired and observed as a core component of participation and often encourages spectator physical activity (Richman & Schaffer, 2000). Sport’s culture
and accompanying values are able to peak a national and international interest that influences and reinforces social structures.

The social structure established by sport participation stems from its imposed masculine construction. According to Messner (1992), sport in America emerged in the 19th century as a means for the white, upper-middle class to build character and leadership skills that could transfer into the workplace. At this time, blue-collar workers and people of color were denied access, until the growth of the entrepreneurial industry and efforts to increase capitalism were observed. Sport participation was used as a justified adult activity where men could exert their discipline, work ethic, and “natural” physicality in a social arena that enabled power to the dominant (Messner & Sabo, 1990). Then, white elites sought sport participation for underprivileged social groups as a means to control their work and leisure schedules. Comparatively, with the increase in men’s entrepreneurial pursuits, sport became another social arena that bolstered the social privileges of men over women (Messner, 1992). The qualities that were enveloped and displayed through sport participation were deemed as good “manly” qualities, which resorted to its labeling as a gendered institution in favor of men’s participation for development and power (Messner & Sabo, 1990). For women, sport became a means for men to perpetuate women’s subordination as they were instead relegated to housework and childbearing (Messner, 1992).

Greendorfer (1993) even observed differences in the activities selected for boys and girls at an early age, as boys were socialized towards activities that possessed stereotypically masculine qualities, such as dominance and aggression, and girl activities as nurturing, gentle and interpersonal (Eagly, 1987). In turn, sport initially served as the
antithesis to the socialization experiences afforded to girls. Participation builds character and positively influences personality traits most desirable to those in positions of power, due to its innate social structure (Fox, 1988; Greendorfer, 1978). It wasn’t until the enactment of Title IX, that girls and young women’s sport participation increased participation and allowed them to experience the same benefits of sport’s developmental abilities both physically and mentally (Snyder, 1993). As boys were able to demonstrate their strength, power, and domination through their athletic achievement, reflecting stereotypical male role expectations, girls were observed to increase self-esteem, leadership opportunities, and physical empowerment through participation, as they use(d) sport to debunk societal role expectations systematically imposed on them (Greendorfer, 1978).

Gender serves as one layer of hindrances in society, race is another. Due to the ideological hierarchy of race, dominant white culture enables individuals who identify as white to exert power and dominance over nonwhites. In turn, minority men and women recognize athletics as a vehicle for social change and racial uplift (Wiggins, 2014). Illustrating this trend, Frey and Eitzen (1991) asserted that blacks are overrepresented in athletics and comprise a great percentage of primary professional sports rosters, translating into high salaries. African American boys, more than girls, have been accepted as athletes, admired for their physical fitness and athletic ability; however, racism perpetuated in athletics has shown that they were initially marginalized from "white sports", such as baseball, rugby, and swimming (Edwards, 1969; Wiggins, 2014). Instead, black men were recognized to be ‘stacked’ into positions that are portrayed as being carnal and animal-like, while excluded from positions perceived to require
intellectual capability (Billings, 2004; Harrison & Lawrence, 2004). For example, in football, black athletes were ‘stacked’ into the running back and defensive lineman positions and disproportionately underrepresented in positions that require leadership and intelligence, such as the quarterback position (Billings, 2004). More currently, even with an increased presence of black quarterbacks, sport scholars have noted that journalists, among others, still frame black and white quarterbacks differently (Mercurio & Filak, 2010). In such cases, these negative stereotypical assumptions are then embraced by the general public and such qualities are highlighted to illustrate their relevance.

Comparatively, the experiences of African American women resemble those of African American men, as African American women are also deemed as one of the “most oppressed groups in America” (Smith, 1992, p. 235). Their voiced experiences have been less prominent leading to the invisible journey as sport participants (Bruening, Armstrong, & Pastore, 2005). As a woman, African American girls acquire many of the benefits of athletic participation, but gender and racial inequality are ever-present, influencing their experiences as student-athletes (Bruening, 2005), and as sport leaders in collegiate sport (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009).

**History of Collegiate Sports**

The history of collegiate sports shows that its emergence as an organized enterprise did not come without setbacks. Prior to its formalization in colleges and universities, collegiate students were initially the sole organizers of athletic events between rival schools. One of the first commercially sponsored athletic events was a regatta held between Harvard and Yale University in 1852 (Smith, 2011). The rowing event was held over the span of a week and attracted newspaper reporters and local
paying spectators (Barr, 2008). The surprising success of the event, regarding profits and attendance lead to the emergence of more athletic events and championships to emerge. While still run by students, as more athletic events sought to be organized and engaged for greater competition, a call for an overarching governing body was deemed necessary (Barr, 2008). Organized teams wanted to compete at a higher level and as more schools began to participate, a need for formalized rules was observed. Specifically, moving beyond the prevalence of rowing and tennis, college football became a unique attraction that drew large amounts of crowds. Edwards (1969) even noted that it was during this time that black athletes were intentionally recruited to play on football teams based on perceived assumptions of their superior athletic ability.

However, the lack of formal rules, the prevalence of deaths and injuries, and the presence of non-collegiate students on teams, generated the attention of then American President Theodore Roosevelt who organized a formal meeting composed of faculty and campus administrators to create rules and committees that could oversee these athletic contests (Smith, 1990). From this meeting, University presidents discussed rules and student-eligibility and formed the governing body Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) in 1905, which changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910 (Smith, 2011). Deemed as a necessary enterprise, the increased commercialization of sports has forced the NCAA to withstand large amounts of pressure centered on intercollegiate athletics’ exploitation, unequal resource allocations, and perpetuations of hegemonic social structures that contradict its presence in higher education (Beyer & Hannah, 2000).
Culture of Intercollegiate Athletics

At the collegiate and university level, organized sport participation is governed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, also known as the NCAA. The NCAA preserves the culture of sport in higher education by standardizing academic success and encouraging skill development useful “on the playing field, in the classroom, and throughout life” (http://www.ncaa.org/about/who-we-are). Values instilled from collegiate athletic participation help instill skills central for leadership and teamwork useful beyond athletic participation. However, intercollegiate athletics’ (ICA) existence as a prominent social institution merged with the culture of sport, forces ICA to confront social norms that influence its own structure and culture. Intercollegiate athletics’ increased visibility invokes criticism as a social institution, including issues surrounding sexism, racism, and economic inequality to be illuminated. As an important expression to the culture of sport, ICA must balance the ever-present demands from stakeholders for entertainment and commercialization against its presence as a cultural product that is recognized to address societal ideologies that marginalize its own student athletes and athletic administrators.

Intercollegiate athletic administrators reflect and reproduce values that underlie the culture of sport. Similar to sport, the culture of intercollegiate athletics values superiority, domination, and teamwork. As such, the culture of intercollegiate athletics is cultivated by its athletics administrators, many of whom are former collegiate athletes. The funneling of men and women from player to administrator is filtered by the patriarchal power structure provided by athletics, leaving women in a disadvantaged positioning for success (Whisenant, Miller, Pedersen; 2005; Cunningham & Sagas,
2005). In turn, white men are predominantly observed in the leadership positions of ICA. The culture of intercollegiate athletics perpetuates social inequality for minorities and women where opportunity is not always based on merit, but rather a social hierarchy of domination by men over women.

**Demographics of Intercollegiate Athletic Administration**

Women inherit a unique position in athletics, as the athletic arena has historically been dominated by men. It was not until the establishment of Title IX of Education Amendments in 1972 that women and minorities found an opportunity that allowed for equal acceptance into athletics to that of men. Title IX prohibits discrimination based on sex in education programs that receive federal funding, including athletic programs. As a result of the exponential increase in educational opportunities, facilitated by Title IX, the demographic landscape of athletics was changed by allowing women to participate equally to men. According to Acosta and Carpenter (2014), prior to Title IX’s passage in 1970, there were as few as three women’s teams per college or university and approximately 16,000 total women participating in intercollegiate athletics. After Title IX, in 1977, the number of varsity sports increased to 5.6 per school and 7.71 in 1988. By 2014, collegiate institutions average nine women’s sports program and a total of 200,000 plus total women who participate in intercollegiate athletics—the highest in U.S. history (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). The increase in athletic participation by women has also been met with an increase in athletic participation by men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). However, the increased representation of women in athletics, does not translate to that of men in athletic administration, which favors men (Bower & Hums, 2013a).
Typically athletic administration consists of an Athletic Director (AD), who oversees the entire athletic department, followed by Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors. Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors (AAD) are the middle-level manager positions based on level of experience or seniority. The AAD reports to the AD as they oversee specific areas in the athletic department, such as marketing, finance, compliance, among others athletic departments. Essentially, they are the ‘behind the scene’ entities that enhance the visibility and maintenance of an athletic program. The marketing department centers on connecting with the community to increase participation with the university athletic initiatives; the finance department maintains the budget to ensure purchase of equipment, facilities, along with other expenses are accessible; and compliance makes sure that the athletic department follow rules and guidelines set forth by its governing body, the NCAA; and the academic department seeks to maintain the academic principles established by the host educational institution. The Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) was created by the NCAA in an effort to ensure the involvement of women in the decision making process observed in an intercollegiate athletic department (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Hawes, 2002). Even with a gender specific position created for women, black women are less commonly observed to possess this role.

African American Women in Athletic Administration

Despite efforts to address the lack of diversity in ICAs, dominant ideologies of sexism and racism persist. White men outnumber others as the AD of Division I athletic programs, followed by white women, black men and lastly, black women (NCAA, 2013). Fully 89 percent of AD positions are occupied by people who identify as white, while
blacks hold a mere 6.3 percent of AD positions. At the Associate and Assistant AD positions, whites comprise 87.5 percent of the position and blacks consist of 9.2 percent. And finally, the gender specific position, the SWA, is comprised primarily of white women at 98.3 percent in Division I athletics. Women are underrepresented in all of the athletic administration positions (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Schneider, Stier, Henry, & Wilding, 2010; Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012), but black women experience greater underrepresentation.

African American women, more so than white women, serve in athletic support positions, such as life skill coordinators and academic advisors (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). These supporting athletic administration positions are not a part of the executive athletic administration that shapes the culture of the organization and the entire world of sport. In turn, black women are less likely to be approached for advancement into the executive athletic administration. Quite simply, minorities are underrepresented among the administration due to a perpetuation of racial discrimination in athletics (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Hylton, 2010). The demographic landscape for minorities positioned in leadership within athletic administration has not matched the progression of athletic participation, especially for African American women (NCAA, 2013).

The ideological structure of society forces African American women into a marginalized position that enables individuals who identify as white to control the experiences of women and minorities, including their upward mobility in athletics. The barriers for women's leadership mobility stem from the 'good old boys network' which allows for the progression of men, and places limits on women due to perceptions of gender inequality. For women in the workplace, the concept of a “glass ceiling” has often
been used to describe this phenomenon (Kanter, 1977). The “glass ceiling” refers to the invisible barriers that prevent women from rising in the workplace (Ryan & Haslam, 2005). For black women, the ‘glass ceiling’ is harder to shatter as their identity serves as a source for multiple forms of oppression (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). The ‘glass ceiling’ is depicted as a ‘concrete ceiling’ for black women due to the gender and racial discrimination barriers observed in their quest for leadership mobility. When women are accepted for leadership, the position is precarious or the organization is often in crisis (Haslam & Ryan, 2008). Coming into leadership during risky times, creates conflict and potentially serves as a platform for failure. Specifically, dominant racial and gender ideologies leave black women overlooked for executive leadership positions and opportunities (Collins, 2000; Rosser-Mims, 2010).

**Conceptual Framework**

African American women deal with sexism from white and black men, as well as racism from white superiority deeply embedded in society as well as the athletic arena, resulting in experiences that differ from those of white women and black men (Abney & Richey, 1992). To understand the experience of African American women requires an in-depth analysis of identity’s social constructs. Intersectionality, a term coined by Crenshaw (1991), assists in this process as it allows the researcher to focus on various forms of identity, race, sex, sexuality, and religion, simultaneously, rather than each construct of identity separately. Ideologies based on race, gender, and class impose hierarchical structures that allow white identities to be superior to black identities, men superior to women, and rich superior to poor (Collins, 2000). As a result, black women's identity leaves their social positioning subjugated in society and the workplace. Dissecting the
influence of an intersectional identity for African American women provides insight to
the effects of gender’s and race's simultaneous, relational influence on black women's
experiences, as student-athletes and in the possibility of leadership mobility in athletics.

The organizational culture of ICA perpetuates these ideological structures based
on gender and race, which leaves black women marginalized. In athletics, ideologies
privilege a system based on meritocracy, competition, and domination afforded to and
controlled by white men (Hylton, 2010). As such, the culture of intercollegiate athletics
has been recognized to resemble hegemonic structures based on gender and race,
conceptualized as hegemonic masculinity and whiteness. The concept of whiteness
concludes that racism is perpetuated by socially constructed hierarchical power systems
privileging white identity and allowing for color blind-ness by those in power
(McDonald, 2005). Similarly, the acceptance of men as sole participants and stakeholders
reinforce the power structure to reflect the concept of hegemonic masculinity and
whiteness (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Long, Robinson, Spracklen, 2005; McDonald,
2005; Whisenant, Pedersen & Obenour, 2002). Hegemonic masculinity is the privileging
of masculinity, qualities most associated with men, over femininity, most associated with
women. Men are considered superior athletes and leaders, thereby, forcing women and
minorities into positions of inferiority and subordination (Whisenant, Miller & Pedersen,
2005). Black women's positioning within these oppressive organizational structures,
requires a relational understanding of the impact of their identity on experience that
leaves them underrepresented for leadership opportunities and upward mobility in athletic
administration. Intersectionality allows a confrontation of systematic structures that were
previously left invisible and overlooked without a clear understanding of how.

**Methodology and Method**

My use of intersectionality as a guiding conceptual framework also influenced the methodology of my inquiry. The current research design centers on the oppressive functions of culture, which allows for an unjust systematic hierarchy of power. Consequently, my research approach allows the participants to offer perceptions of their experiences based on harmful cultural manifestations. The critical approach of inquiry attempts to understand and analyze unjust manifestations of culture that allow for hierarchical relationships, which are observed in ICA. My task was to interact, understand, and interpret the experiences of my participant's experiences. Greater detail of the current conceptual frameworks are provided in Chapter Two; however it is important to point out that my current analysis explores the way race and gender influence the experiences of black women in an organizational culture enmeshed with harmful ideological standings.

Due to the nuanced nature of experience, a qualitative research design was selected for its insightful qualities. Qualitative research designs are often employed when attempting to gain insight into the intersection of personal impressions and social phenomena, such as those influenced by the organizational culture of ICA. By conducting semi-structured interviews, the researcher has the ability to engage in face-to-face interaction with the participants and generate open-ended discussions centered on an experience or perspective about specific phenomena. As such, I believe this approach is best suited for the nature of the current research design.
To conduct my qualitative design, I interviewed ten black women who serve in an executive leadership position in ICA. I chose these black women in executive leadership positions, as they have the greatest ability to account for change in their athletic department due to their inferior social positioning. As such, I believe they have the greatest knowledge on what it is like to be a black woman in charge, which includes the good and the bad.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

Using the qualitative methodology described above, this study seeks to understand how black women in executive leadership positions understand and explain how their intersectionality influences their experiences within the organizational culture of ICA. The following research questions guide this study:

1. What cultural practices, based on dominant ideologies of race and gender, influence the experiences of black women in ICAs?
2. In what ways do black women make meaning of the oppressive organizational practices and culture practices observed with ICAs?
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Intercollegiate athletics (ICA) are a unique social phenomenon that reflects many of the cultural values inherent to sport participation and society. ICA is perceived to generate self-discipline, self-esteem, among other valuable skills for its participants, but its organizational structure and function in higher education has been a source of scrutiny. Specifically, several of society's harmful ideological stances are perpetuated by its organizational culture. As such, administrators in ICA must exert their influence to preserve the intended organizational culture of athletics and steer it away from many of society's harmful ideological stances (Schroeder, 2010).

Leaders in athletic administration are most commonly white men, and selection of new leaders in athletics reflects the influence of the ideological concepts of whiteness and hegemonic masculinity (McDonald, 2009; Whisenant, Pederson, & Obenour, 2002). Women, more specifically black women, are underrepresented in leadership roles in athletics, due to limitations and barriers provided by the social construction of their identity (Whisenant, Pederson, & Obenour, 2002). There is a dearth of research on black women's leadership (Abney & Richey, 1991), but an examination of the dynamics of black women's identity may provide insight into the necessity and value for their acceptance as leaders. To understand the influence that black women may contribute to maintaining the beneficial aspects of intercollegiate athletic culture, the current chapter will examine scholarship pertaining to a) the culture of sport, (b) organizational culture of ICA, (c) leadership in organizational culture, (d) hegemonic masculinity, and (e) whiteness.
Culture of Sport

Sport is a microcosm of society where value is placed upon competition, group processes, and social bonding (Frey & Eitzen, 1991). Athletes are able to acquire developmental skills that can be transferred to other areas of their lives. Discipline, positive self-esteem, and goal attainment, are often gained as a direct result of the competitive culture surrounding sport participation (McPherson, Curtis, & Loy, 1989). These attributes are especially observed in intercollegiate athletics where success is equated with victory, academically and athletically (Brand, 2006). Similarly, sport participation has the ability to promote positive social change due to its positioning within society (Kauffman & Wolf, 2010). For example, women use sport participation to debunk socially imposed gender roles (Krane, 2001) and black athletes have used sport to confront issues surrounding racism (Lapchick, 1999). As such, ideologies perpetuated within athletics have served as an area of great interest, due to its institutional structure. Among its many manifestations, sport is a masculine construct that has traditionally been used to socialize boys into men (Messner, 1989). Its patriarchal power structure, valuing aggression, dominance, and superiority reflects society's dominant ideological stance on gender, forcing women into positions of inferiority, and privileging masculinity (Frey & Eitzen, 1991). In turn, sport serves as a conspicuous site of a gender power struggle based on stereotypical gender differences (Messner, 1992). The benefit of sport is great, but the culture of sport imposes many limitations and barriers on women’s and minorities' experiences. Even so, the culture of sport is embraced by intercollegiate athletics, where participants are afforded educational advancement and potential career opportunities.
Organizational Culture of Intercollegiate Athletics

In the early 20th century, sport merged with the educational system intertwining sport culture with an established academic culture (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). The academic culture centers on academic excellence, and the athletic culture, initially, served as its subculture (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). Subcultures serve as an extension of the dominant culture, but express their influence differently (Colyer, 2000). For example, in athletics, Brand (2002) asserts that ICA adheres to the mission and culture of higher education, as student-athletes generate the same cognitive capabilities, as if they were in a classroom lecture, through sport participation. Mental skills, such as problem solving and critical thinking, are afforded to participants through competition and practice, which are expected skills of non-athletes in higher education. However, ICA’s initial positioning in higher education changed due to the growth and autonomy provided to ICA programs. ICA would reside as a subculture of higher education, but operate independently from higher education, as they attain resources and funding on their own. As a result, athletics enveloped a culture independent from the culture established by higher education and establishing its own organizational culture and subcultures to meet there needs (Hannah & Beyer, 2000; Schroeder, 2010).

Entering into an ICA department, one of the first sights is a glass trophy case, which reminds employees and student-athletes of former success of the program. The aesthetics are meant to remind athletes that they are now a part of a legacy, one which can inspire them, and the future of which they must fulfill. Similarly, athletic administrators fill with pride, due to the visible acknowledgement of their ‘behind the scenes’ contributions of their teams’ ‘on-field’ achievement. Former success can lead to
future success if organizational culture is maintained. The sight of a trophy case initiates different emotions and meanings for its members, but is a material representation of its organizational culture.

Organizational culture is referenced as the way we do things around here (MacIntosh & Doherty, 2007). Competition, determination, and triumph over adversity are common attributes of its culture, observed in every sport, in every competition. It is a "feel" that mediates interaction, energy, and cohesion by any insider and outsider of an organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Even so, there is difficulty in creating a unifying definition of culture (Martin, 2002). Schein (1992) offers a definition of organizational culture which combines ideational and materialistic components of culture to better assist understanding of the element's differentiation:

[Organizational culture is] a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation of internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems. (p. 12)

Based on his example, basic assumptions, a form ideational culture, is the use of ascribed beliefs to solve problems; and materialistic culture, which are consistently observed and taught to future members, are the external manifestations of those beliefs. For example, in ICA, teams often embrace a motto such as “win from within”. The phrase resonates with athletic teams and is even embraced by students on a college campus. It means, when you are tired, dig deeper from within to finish the game, studying, or preparing for another job interview. The motto is passed down to those who follow, and materializes through effort, over and over again. The motto is a part of the culture in athletics and the campus.
As such, an *ideational* definition emphasizes the 'meanings' and 'understandings' of and underlying values and beliefs of culture, which are usually displayed as an organization’s motto, mission statement or staffing policies (Frontiera, 2010). Forms of materialistic culture focus on material manifestations of ideations, which includes dress code, hierarchy, and job descriptions (Frontiera, 2010). For example, entering into the gymnasium for competition, the team is not dressed for creative, personal expression. Instead, each teammate is wearing a black blazer and khaki slacks, to show that they mean business and are unified as a team. Jermier, Slocum, Fry, & Gaines (1991) assert that these components of organizational culture are necessary to consider the underlying patterns of organizational culture’s positive and negative manifestations, also observed in its subcultures.

*Culture and Subcultures in Intercollegiate Athletics*

Among other ventures, higher education values academic success, but heavily relies on external forces for structure and cultural standards, such as marketing and fundraising (Schroeder, 2010). In turn, the culture of athletics creates great tension from that of higher education's institutional culture, due to its resemblance of a big business, driven by the commercialization of college sports (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). Flowers (2009) asserts the infrastructure of ICA actually damages the institutional culture of higher education, with high coaching salaries, elaborate training facilities, and programs centered on winning at all costs, as components of an ICA’s program (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). Similarly, marketing efforts to enhance funding and visibility of the program are central to its function. Even though high salaries, elaborate training facility, and a winning program are signs of successful program, they too can be
damaging to an institution. Athletes are exploited as the face of a program, but receive little of the revenue produced from their efforts, and athletic resources are provided for extending the program's financial reach instead of funneling resources back into its educational system (Flowers, 2009). Successful athletic programs generate resources which are poured back into its athletic organization at the expense of its institution’s educational focus. As a result, higher education's educational focus is sidelined to enhance the visibility of its athletic program, which privileges ICA's athletic benefits over its educational mission.

The organizational culture of ICA values superiority, wealth and power, achieved by success in athletic competition to maintain its survival in higher education and society (Flowers, 2009). As such, the culture of ICA is embedded in the variety of subcultures in ICA. The subcultures are observed as the different sports programs and athletic administration departments, such as marketing, compliance, or the football program. Each subculture is situated within the host culture, which is the intercollegiate athletic administration, for understanding and meanings (Meyerson & Martin, 1987; Schein, 1992, 2010; Trice & Beyer, 1993), or create their own due to their specializations (Meyerson & Martin, 1987). In the subcultures, a consensus on meanings is based on internal and external forces that allow the establishment of ideologies (Trice & Beyer, 1993), and are reinforced through the behaviors of organizational members (Jaffe, 2001). Ideologies are formed from the meanings of symbols, special language, stories, and ceremonies in a specific organizational culture (Trice & Beyer, 1987). The shared consensus can be beneficial to members in the organization as they lead to promotions and an increased understanding of mission and values, but they can also create tensions in
social interactions among its members and allow for unjust social hierarchies. For example, in order to continue attracting attention to its athletic programs, a football program may hold monthly meet and greets within the community. During this time, the coaching staff are able to discuss the progress and success of the program, and ask for additional resources and support for their program. Program dominance is to be achieved by ensuring that sports have the resources needed to increase visibility, even at the expense of their academic endeavors (Flowers, 2009). An ideological positioning of football detracts attention away from other programs and its overarching educational mission at an institution.

Most of the subcultures of ICA’s ideational culture are centered on competition, domination, and superiority, but are achieved through its materialistic manifestation, which perpetuate society's harmful gender and racial ideological stances (Nelson, 1994). For example, sports programs and athletic departments reinforce gender and racial ideologies, as men dominate the athletic arena and impose barriers on women’s upward mobility (Nelson, 1994). An ideational culture based on superiority and dominance centers on the superiority and dominance of men, not women. ICA's materialistic manifestation can be observed by the representative pictures posted along the walls in the weight room, as men pose to accentuate their strength, athletic capability, and aggression, while in uniform. Women, on the other hand, are observed daintily posing with a dumbbell weight in their hand, only wearing a sports bra and spanks. The visual representations of both athletes depict the male and female athlete in their element, the man displaying his athletic skill in the game, the woman reduced to her physical physique. In turn, the ideological manifestation of a gender hierarchy is preserved, men
competing, women on display. Men's athletic ability is showcased and praised, while women's sports are over-sexualized by their portrayal in the media or simply ignored (Cooky, Wachs, Messner, Dworkin, 2010).

Similarly, racial hierarchies are perpetuated through the selection of team positions in football (Billings, 2004). Black athletes are stacked into the physically demanding positions of running back and defensive lineman, and disproportionally underrepresented in positions that require leadership and intelligence, such as the quarterback position (Billings, 2004). However, the unjust social structure observed by the culture and subcultures of athletics are often overlooked to maintain a dominant status of the organizations structure, in relation to higher education, and society at large. Unless appropriately managed by the leader of the dominant organization these harmful ideological stances will be maintained in ICA's organization (Schein, 2010). Leadership in organizational culture sets the standard for social interactions and expectations for their employees as the leader has the ability to create, change, or eliminate cultural practices that can be detrimental to its culture. For example, sport serves as one area of contested terrain for equality where women are given the short end of the stick and not provided the same resources and opportunities that make men's presence so pleasurable and opportunistic (Messner, 1988). Strong leadership has the ability to overturn aspects of cultural practices that enable these unjust social structures from maintaining a hold in instances such as this one. However, in this case, leadership will have to recognize that these issues are in the shadow of win-loss records that mediate ICA's function, which favors winning at all costs.
Leadership in Organizational Culture

Schein (2010) developed a leader-centered model for examination of the dynamics of organizational culture, based on leadership influences. The leader centered model is a three tiered model based on artifacts, values, and basic assumptions. Artifacts are the materialistic manifestations of culture, comprised of the rituals, symbols, and uniforms. They are visible features of the organization, but their meaning is not always understood by fans or even the athletic administration. Values and basic assumptions are the ideational manifestations of culture. Values are the "sense of what ought to be, as distinct from what is" (Schein, 2010, p. 25), and can be observed through formal and informal behaviors (Trice & Beyer, 1984). For example, values are deeply embedded in the hiring process for an athletic administrator where a specific skill set is required. Lastly, basic assumptions are identified as the true basis for understanding organizational culture (Schroeder, 2010). Basic assumptions are the underlying features of decisions (Schein, 2010), which can lead to an unconscious perpetuation of social ideologies unless properly managed. For example, gender or racial ideations can offer potential biases or perceptions that may influence hiring decisions away from a woman or minority. Overall, each aspect of the model serves as a component of organizational culture by which the leader must recognize and manage.

To illustrate this relationship more clearly, Schroeder (2010) created a model to represent the variables considered in an intercollegiate athletic department culture, as observed in Table I on page 24.
Table 1. Interaction of elements of the model of intercollegiate athletic department cultures.

According to Schroeder (2010), an interaction of the variables as seen in Table 1, comprise the organizational culture of intercollegiate athletics. The institutional culture which creates academic standards for the athletic program and affects conference affiliation imposes parameters on ICA’s function. The internal environment, which is often based on history and praised artifacts, such as trophies and awards, can mediate subcultures of the organization that can "accept, enhance, or challenge the assumptions of the entire athletic department"(Schroeder, 2010, p. 105). The assumptions held by the departments and programs influence the stability and maintenance of the overall organization. Also, the external environment allows stakeholders outside of the organization to offer input concerning the direction of the organization. Overall, the leadership is in charge of maintaining, rejecting, or adopting new values that will direct the overall organization.
The formal leader of the athletic department is the Athletic Director, but informal leadership is often observed from coaches and university presidents (Cullen, Latessa, & Byrne, 1990; Schroeder, 2010). The power afforded to the leaders in ICA have the ability to create change and enhance constructive values that can steer the culture of ICA. For the purposes of the current examination of culture, leadership and power serve are an important focal point of inquiry. Schein (2004) asserted that "the only thing of real importance that leaders do is create and manage culture" (p.10). In athletics, Beyer and Hannah (2000) suggest that leadership is necessary for the needed culture change in ICA. As such, leadership and power afforded to ICA administrators is imperative to managing its evolving internal and external cultural values.

The organizational culture of ICA perpetuates dominance and superiority by privileging masculinity. The same privilege afforded to men as athletic participants is reflected by men serving as leaders in the administration. In turn, men perpetuate the standing of athletics as a male dominated environment, where women are subjected to a social hierarchy that leaves them subordinate and inferior. Leadership is not only male but primarily comprised of white administrators (Cunningham, 2010), which creates a paradoxical situation for women, specifically African American women, attempting to attain leadership positions in the athletic administration. To alleviate the cultural dysfunction, a culture change is necessary, but is difficult to alter in organizations (Kotter & Heskett, 1992). Kanter (2004) notes that leaders must address a situation that has previously been ignored or overlooked. In the case of ICA, the issues reside in its cultural perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity and a hierarchical racial order, recognized as
Hegemony

The concept of hegemony originated from Gramsci (1971) to describe the ideological forces that allow for a hierarchical organization of individual interactions and social practices. Power is established and maintained in a nonviolent, nonphysical manner, such that the ideas of a dominant class are exerted over subordinate groups by means of persuasion, consensus, and manipulation (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Hegemonic ideals are fully realized when they are finally accepted as normal reality by those who stand to lose the most from their existence. Gender and race serve as social constructs that are mediated by hegemonic ideals. Social inequities allow for a hierarchical social structure based on a gender and racial ideology and traditional understanding of masculinity and white privilege (Messener, 1989; King & Springwood, 2001). As such, masculinity, a quality most commonly ascribed to men, is privileged in relation to femininity, a quality most commonly ascribed to women. Masculinity and femininity are related as a continuum between men and women, but masculinity is preferred to femininity. Similarly, a racial ideology perpetuates the notion of a social hierarchy that leaves racial minorities subordinately positioned to whites.

Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity is situated as different from and superior to femininity, where attributes of femininity, most commonly ascribed as a characteristic of women, are viewed as inferior (Connell, 1995). Masculinity is privileged to all men, but varies when considering race and sexuality, and takes precedence over all women, regardless of race.
For example, a lack of exertion of masculine qualities, especially in sport, resorts to taunting chants reflecting their resemblance of women's ability (or lack thereof). A gay man is feminized for not being heterosexual, which places them at the bottom of the masculinity continuum, but still above women (Johnson & Samdahl, 2005). Similarly, a black man’s masculinity retreats to a white man’s masculinity, due to a racial hierarchy, but black men are able to exert their dominance over women, as men (Carrington, 1998). A gender continuum allows fluidity between masculinity and femininity for men and women, but there is a clear boundary that creates tension between the sexes when crossed (Connell, 1995).

Sage (1998) suggested that sport serves as one of most hegemonic institutions in society, due to its masculine structure. Sport has traditionally been a male preserve enabling boys to mature into men (Messener, 1989). At a young age, socialization of young boys surrounds knowledge of sport, "natural" physical superiority, and ascription of superior leadership abilities (Messener, 1992). The socialization process reinforces gendered roles that laud the benefits of athletic participation for men, but not women. As such, masculinity is reinforced by the aggressive nature of sport and creates criticism of female participant’s expression of masculine qualities and presence in sport (Messner, 1989). When women express masculine qualities, which are in contradiction to their associated feminine nature, they are labeled as tomboys, or ‘dykes’ (Adams, Schmitke, & Franklin, 2005). Men’s sports also experience a divide stemming from the attributes of masculinity, which are degrees of power, physical contact, and aggression. For example, football and basketball are the highest revenue producing sports on a college campus, and embody the masculine attributes most commonly lauded. However, physical size and
aggression are not valued in golf and baseball, but they are still considered a man's game, preserved for men (Messner, 1989).

Sport's hegemonic masculine structure creates barriers and limitations on the upward mobility of women in collegiate athletics (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). According to Acosta and Carpenter (2014) women account for 57 percent of the collegiate student body, but this is not reflected in the women's athletic participation or athletic administration. Female athletes playing college sports have increased from 16,000 in 1968 to over 200,000 in 2014. Even so, the increase in women's participation has also been met with an increase in men's participation, but women receive less funding for scholarships and budget (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). But the increase in athletic participation has not translated into the number of women serving in the athletic administration. Former female student athletes are less likely to be observed in leadership positions of ICA, in comparison to their male student-athlete counterparts (Bower & Hums, 2013). Prior to Title IX, women accounted for 90 percent of athletic directors overseeing women's sports. In 2014, women account for only 36.2 percent of the athletic administration staff and only 22.3 percent of athletic directors are women. Even worse, 11.3 percent of athletic administration departments have no woman serving in their athletic administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014).

Athletic administration executive leadership positions include the Director of Athletics (AD), followed by the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA), and the Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors. The AD oversees the entire athletic department by serving as the executive administrator of an athletic program requiring input from marketing, finance, compliance, and the SWA, among others. The only gender-specific
position in an athletic administration is the SWA, as the SWA was created by the NCAA in an effort to ensure the involvement of women in the decision making process observed in an intercollegiate athletic department (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Hawes, 2002). By definition, the SWA is “the highest ranking female involved with the management of an institution’s intercollegiate athletic program” (NCAA Division I Manual, 2013, p. 21). But the position is only a title and not a designated position enforced by every NCAA institution. As a result, the potential influence of women in the decision making process is further limited (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Schneider, Stier, Henry, & Wilding, 2010; Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012). The SWA serves under the Athletic Director and is not included in executive decisions for men’s sports or budgetary planning, which are deemed as masculine roles (Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012), and necessary skills for advancement to the AD position.

Whisenant, Pedersen and Obenour (2002) examined the rate of acceptance for men and women in the Athletic Director position, and found that more men were accepted into the position, and had higher rates of advancement than did women. As such, the influence of hegemonic masculinity preserves male leadership and limits acceptance of women into these powerful positions. Similarly, when examining the acceptance of a woman leading a men's basketball program, the current men serving as head coaches in collegiate men's basketball were observed to possess hegemonic masculine principles and were resistant to change (Walker & Sartore-Baldwin, 2013). A coach from their study stated “the thought of change cannot be fathomed” when reflecting on the idea of a woman head men's basketball coach (p. 306). This raises concern as more men are observed to serve as the head coach for men and women’s
athletic teams in ICA (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Hegemonic masculinity enmeshed in ICA's culture keeps women inferiorly positioned in athletics. As a result, the input that women could provide in the hiring process of future employees is hindered and maintained by men.

Women's inability to have a voice in the 'executive' leadership positions enables acceptance of a homologous reproduction (Whisenant, Miller, & Pedersen, 2005). Homologous reproduction describes the process by which the group in power recruits members into their circle that possess and influence characteristics similar to the group's characteristics (Kanter, 1977). In sport, the dominance of men creates a structure that maintains this privileging structure (Whisenant, Miller, & Pedersen, 2005). As such, Whisenant, Miller and Pedersen (2005) assert the exclusion of the inferior group, in this case, women, is solely due to social characteristics and not a lack in competencies. Judd (2005) found that both men and women learn new skills when entering into leadership positions, and both make mistakes, but men are still more likely to acquire the Athletic Director position. In turn, leadership in athletics is difficult to attain for women and allows men to hire more men, leaving women with less input in the hiring process of future employees. A continuous perpetuation of hegemonic masculine principles—with hints of homologous reproduction—embedded in the culture of ICA, is reflected by the leadership demographics in ICA (Harrison, Lapchick, & Janson, 2009; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002).

Specifically, the acceptance of a hegemonic masculine social structure creates limitations for women at every level in the athletic administration. A gender ideology negatively affects the experiences of women to that of men, but even more harmful is the
acceptance of a gender and racial ideology. There is a dearth of research that attempts to understand the influence of both gender and race in athletics (Burton, 2014). Specifically, black women comprise an identity that imposes a gender and racial ideology (Hooks, 1984). According to Hooks (1984):

> No other group in American has had their identity socialized out of existence as have black women. We are rarely recognized as a group of separate and distinct from Black men, or a part of the larger group ‘women’ in this culture…When Black people are talked about the focus tends to be on Black men and when women are talked about the focus tend to be on White women (p.7).

A hegemonic structure and culture mediated by gender and racial relations has left black women marginalized. Hegemonic masculinity and the perpetuation of 'whiteness' impose limitations on black women's acceptance into leadership positions, even in athletics.

'Whiteness'

Gender serves as one barrier for upward mobility, race is another. Race is a twofold construct as it lies between identity and social structure (Omi & Winant, 2004). As a construct of identity, race is observed based on differences between members of society enhance the labeling of 'us' and 'them', a racialized 'other', referenced from a white identity (Collins, 2000). The labeling of 'other' creates a dissonance between groups of people and allows for a systematic appropriation of a hierarchical social structure, centered on race (Omi & Winant). The social hierarchy allows white identity to be normal, standard, leaving nonwhites to be inferiorly positioned along a racialized continuum for power. There is value in skin color (Dixson & Rousseau, 2005). Situated further along a racialized continuum, based from a white identity, the greater the challenge to overcome the hierarchical power structure that leaves nonwhites inferiorly positioned.
According to Arai & Kivel (2009) dynamics of race are unseen by whites, whereas, white privilege is recognized by people of color (Long & Hylton, 2002). The concept of whiteness, centers on white identity and white privilege, has been identified as a valuable tool in examination of the hierarchical social structure centered on race (McDonald, 2005). Due to the dominant power afforded to its hierarchical social positioning, without examination, white identity is left unchallenged for its superior power hold and social order (McIntosh, 2012; Sullivan, 2006). To define whiteness, King and Springwood (2001) suggest:

Whiteness is simultaneously a practice, a social space, a subjectivity, a spectacle, an erasure, an epistemology, a strategy, an historical formation, a technology, and a tactic. Of course, it is not monolithic, but in all of its manifestations, it is unified through privilege and the power to name, to represent, and to create opportunity and deny access. (p. 160)

King and Springwood (2001) acknowledge that whiteness is a dynamic concept that helps unpack and challenge the construction of race. Instead of looking at nonwhites, focusing on whiteness allows an understanding of how hegemony surrounding race is based on white bodies (Sullivan, 2006). A hegemonic social structure exists in society where white bodies are positioned superiorly to nonwhites. The construction of nonwhites as ‘other’ allows whites to serve as normal—the measuring stick (McIntosh, 2012). As such, the color blind property afforded by ‘whiteness’ shifts attention to differences between the racialized "other" (McDonald, 2009) and privileges whiteness (Long & Hylton, 2002). Bonilla-Silva (2003) asserts that color blindness affords whites the possibility of not recognizing the social hierarchy and proclaiming society as race neutral meritocracy. In turn, a social structure—residing on the foundation of a racial hierarchy—remains intact, allowing for racism against nonwhites. McIntosh (1988) acknowledged that there is racial
privilege afforded to whites, but it often goes unnoticed due to its default acceptance of power by whites and nonwhites. As such, a focus on whiteness, examines how “white privilege operates unseen, invisible, even seemingly nonexistent” (Sullivan, 2006, p.6).

As a result, nonwhites sometimes borrow some of the privileges of 'whiteness' during circumstantial social interactions. The wealthy, well-educated Hispanic professional can borrow whiteness when dealing with the illegal Hispanic immigrant. Similarly, light-skinned black women are able to receive a 'pass' for their associated white identity and acquire some of the benefits associated with white privilege (Russell, Wilson & Hall, 1992). White privilege allows them to attain some of the power associated with white culture and not be marginalized like darker skinned blacks. The social positioning of light skin is comparable to that of gay men under the guise of hegemonic masculinity towards lesbians (Johnson & Samdahl, 2005). Even, black children have been recognized to associate success and achievement with 'acting white' due to its association with white culture, and white culture only (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). White culture inherits a privilege that has been deemed unproblematic, in turn, people of color struggle to claim a position of equal merit. Accounts of racial differences between whites and nonwhites are also perpetuated in the media and societal social institutions, including athletics.

A focus on race in academe has shifted great interest on racism in the athletic arena (King, 2005; McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). Sport is a unique social institution where whites and nonwhites are able to exert physicality and intellectual capabilities for dominance. As such, people of color often use sport for upward mobility and to challenge and resist society's racial ideology (Hartmann, 1996); however, the ever-
present privilege of whiteness hinders their efforts in attaining equality, (Long, Robinson, & Spracklen, 2005). For example, white men athletes comprise 61 percent while African American men athletes comprise 16 percent of the NCAA Division I, II, and III demographic (Lapchick, Agusta, Kinkopf, & McPhee, 2012). Comparatively, white women athletes comprise 76 percent of the student athlete demographic while Black women comprise 8 percent. The overall population of African American athletes is relatively low, but African-American athletes serve as the majority population in collegiate athletics revenue producing athletic programs. African Americans comprise a great percentage of athletic programs, especially football and basketball, which are prominent programs in college sports, but the numbers do not translate to the coaching staff or athletic administrations. Black men make up 3.2 percent of head football coaches and 12.8 percent of men’s basketball, and black women comprise 13.6 percent of head basketball coaches and 16.3 percent for track and cross country (DeHass, 2007). Black athletes are showcased as the face of collegiate athletics, but are allotted less control and lack acceptance to enter into leadership positions once competition is complete.

According to Carrington and McDonald (2002), sport is a “culture of racism” which mediates experiences of minority athletes (p. 2). As such, the racialized phenomenon of blackness has received much attention to understand ‘race’ and racial inequality (Fleming, 2001; Hylton, 2005) and how it is confined to hegemonic power structures (Gardiner & Welch, 2001). Sport policies and depictions in the media have been recognized as a means to perpetuate racism. For example, the enforcement of dress code in basketball has been recognized as an imposition of whiteness, as white men exert their control over their predominately black player's culture (McCann, 2005).
Considering basketball is predominately comprised of black athletes, but controlled by white men, the imposed dress code policy imposed on the National Basketball Association has been deemed as a way to control black masculinity and its associated blackness. Considering the lack of black leadership in the NBA league, the dress code policy is problematic as there are few blacks that can attest these racialized policies. To combat these socially imposed ideological structures requires an acknowledgement of race by those in power, but the existence of whiteness in sport culture perpetuates a denial of its presence.

Similarly, the discussion centered on black athletes serves as a source for racism. Spracklen (2008) observed that whites identified a biological difference to account for black athletes' success in athletics. Black athletes were proclaimed to have more fast-twitch muscles that allowed them to run faster than white athletes. As such, an assertion of a biological difference between white and black athletes was used to create an understanding of a racialized difference that allowed black athletes to succeed in a sport at a greater rate than whites. In this case, there was a logical difference for the athletic achievements of black athletes, as the historical construction of sports envelopment was geared toward the development of leadership and physicality of whites (Spracklen, 2008). The same examination and analysis is not provided to white athletes, instead their athletic ability is unquestioned and praised. Carrington (2010) addresses the perpetuation of racism in sports media by examining the way blacks and their black bodies are racialized and kept inferior to white athletes. For example, when referencing a black athlete in the media, journalists often reference their athletic ability, but when white athletes are discussed, journalists laud the intellectual capability required for their positions (Billings,
2004; Harrison & Lawrence, 2004). Even Lapchick (1999) noted that black athletes are more often depicted for their social deviance in comparison to their white counterparts. Overall, the media's representation of black athletes and the enforcement of administrative policies that limit the cultural expression of people of color, allows whiteness to remain intact and a racial order to persist. Blackness is problematic while whiteness, which perpetuates demarcation of racialized 'others', remains unchallenged and invisible (Long & Hylton, 2002; Nebeker, 1998).

Facets of whiteness have been studied contextually to gain greater insight as to its influence on societal institutions, such as the workplace, and how people of color navigate whiteness. Nkomo (1992) recognized that workplace organizations exclude racialized identities. During examinations of management, race was always considered an important factor, but only white males are considered for examination. The results from the white study are then generalized to all other groups. In turn, the cultural differences that exist in the workplace serve as a deviance from the norm set by white culture. Whiteness' sense of color blindness allows whites to not confront the social hierarchy that places limitations on their black employees and continue to impose a structural system based on an unmerited meritocracy. To fit in, people of color often conform to white norms and alter their language and demeanor in the workplace. Payne and Suddler (2014) conducted a study on black undergraduate students at a predominately white institution. They found that the black students would more commonly 'code switch' when talking with white faculty and staff, more than with their own black peers. Code switching allowed them to enact a more professional speech pattern desired in their dominant white environment, but then access a more urbanized speech pattern with their peers.
students recognized that in the professional setting, to conform to white culture, they needed to change a part of themselves, but whites did not.

Traces of whiteness can also be used to understand the experiences of black women serving in leadership positions in an athletic administration where they are underrepresented in decision making positions (Abney & Richey, 1992). To advance, black women athletic administrators can only do so in accordance to whiteness, which leaves them marginalized, due to their overtly nonwhite identity. As former athletes tend to funnel into athletic administration, athletes of color face greater adverse reactions in athletic administration positions than do white female colleagues (Bruening, Armstrong, & Pastore, 2005). McDowell, Cunningham, and Singer (2009) observed a clustering of racial minorities’ over-representation in academic support positions, such as life skill coordinator and academic supervisors, but underrepresented in executive leadership positions. The academic support positions cluster, serves as a relevant comparison to a feminine position, due to its communal qualities. White and minority women serve in opposition for these positions, but the white, hegemonic masculine culture leaves black women even more limited for advancement into hierarchical leadership positions (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009).

Black women must negotiate a means for survival in the dominant society, where racism and sexism is deeply embedded in social institutions (Bell & Nkomo, 1998), such as athletics. To armor themselves, black women must negotiate their presence in the workplace by either conforming to societal standards mediated by white culture or attempt to enmesh their cultural manifestations into their leadership positions (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996). The dilemma of ‘fitting in’ is only experienced by nonwhites, as people
of color in leadership are constantly questioned and challenged (Ladson-Billings, 2009). To better their chances for upward mobility, Collins (2000) quoted Angela Davis’s "lift as we climb" statement, meaning that successful black women must lend a hand to aspiring black women who also care to reach these same heights, in order to increase their visibility in an arena. This statement holds true for black women's ability to advance, even in athletic administration (p.219). As few black women do rise to the higher positions in athletic administration, it is their responsibility to lend a hand to aspiring black women who care to advance to the same heights.

**Intersectionality**

The feminist movement is credited with focusing on the stratification of gender relations between men and women, due to the identification of a hierarchical social order that privileges men. However, recognizing that the feminist movement only focused on issues of white, able-bodied, middle-class, heterosexual women, generated criticism from black women who were left from the discussion even though they were indeed women (Collins, 1998). In response, black feminists emerged to offer a voice for black women recognizing that black women's identity mediated their experiences differently from white women and black men (Collins, 1998; Hooks, 1984). In society, due to the hierarchical social order of gender and race, black women possess a marginalized status (Hooks, 2000). As such, black women are forced into a position of inferiority, relative to both whites and black men (Hooks, 1984).

King (1988) termed the positioning of African American women as a “double jeopardy.” Double jeopardy refers to the oppressive nature of black women’s identity, both as a woman and a racial minority, based on the social power structure. The
oppressive nature of either facet of their identity cannot be excluded from the other, and it is difficult to decipher the degree of discrimination from a multidimensional oppressive identity (Collins, 1986). However, the multidimensional nature of identity for Black women positions them to experience numerous forms of oppression, sexism, racism, and classism simultaneously (Crenshaw, 1991), whereas well educated, white women are primarily concerned with the oppressive nature surrounding sexism (Hooks, 1986). To best understand the experiences of black women, examining the social construction of identity serves as a fundamental component.

Crenshaw (1991) coined the phrase, intersectionality, to explain the oppressive social conditions of identity for people of color (Crenshaw 1991; Hooks, 1984). Intersectionality refers to the intersection of race, gender, and social class, as a source for domination and control over people of color (Crenshaw, 1989). The influence of gender may differ by race and vice versa (Rodriguez, 2008). The social construction of each facet of identity for people of color, serves as a “matrix of domination” which influences their lives (Collins, 2000, p. 299). For example, gender mediates sexism, and race mediates racism for people of color, and thus, black women are vulnerable to multiple forms of discrimination simultaneously (Crenshaw, 1989).

Intersectionality forces an interpretation of identity’s structural interrelationship versus a summative or exclusive analysis of each facet (Crenshaw, 1989). An intersectional analysis does not allow one facet of identity to hierarchical rank over another facet of identity, but one form may be more salient contextually (Andersen, 2005). For example, at a Historically Black College or University (HBCU), black women may experience sexism due to their gender among their predominately black male peers.
An exclusive facet dissection attempting to understand degree of oppression, will result in errors, as each facet of identity serves an oppressive function mediating experience best understood with an intersectional framework (Settles, 2006). Metaphorically speaking, intersectionality is an analytical lens for understanding the experiences of those left out of the discussion centered on identity construction, even though their identity serves a greater oppressive function (Baca-Zinn & Dill, 1996). For black women in athletics, being black is more salient (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009), but the influence of gender attracts a unique need for analysis, especially in a culture that imposes barriers on each facet of their identity.

'Outsiders Within'

A racial and gender ideologies have been recognized to place barriers on ‘outsiders’ through the construction of leadership and on experience in the workplace (Collins, 2000). Rossette, Leonardelli, and Phillips (2008) observed that race has an impact on leadership preference. In a four-part study, they observed “being white” was perceived to be an attribute of leadership, as whites were consistently evaluated as more effective leaders. The privileging of white bodies as the standard for leadership leaves nonwhites as outsiders, unqualified for advancement. Even worse, Eagly and Karau (1991) have suggested a gender standard, as men are considered to be better suited for leadership, based on stereotypical gendered roles. Men are considered to be more agentic, which is best accepted of a leader; while women, are considered to be more communal (Eagly & Karau, 1991). In all, these implications, based on gender and race, create barriers for black women, as their identity leaves them as ‘outsiders within’ as a leader and a woman (Rosser-Mims, 2010).
According to Bell (1990), black women must compartmentalize their identity, one black the other white, in the workplace. Their black identity is central to their sense of self, as a black woman; but their generated ‘white identity’ is necessary to gain acceptance in the workplace, due to its contested white terrain (Bell, 1990; McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). As such, the organizational culture of ICA serves as an institution relevant for analysis, as its culture perpetuates black women's outsider within status (Proudford & Thomas, 1999). Similar to a football team's captain, leadership is meant to be a white male due to his dominant demeanor, ability to think on his feet, and withstand the pain of adversity. These are the cultural images that surround an ICA leader, images that a black woman cannot inhabit.

Black women possess a "double outsider" position unshared by white women or black men, which imposes on their ability to be a leader (Parker, 2002). The perception of leadership has embraced whites and black men, leaving black women paradoxically situated for acceptance as a leader. For black women, success in the workplace requires awareness of the world “inside and outside formal institutional processes, to be successful.” (Jean-Marie, Williams, & Sherman, 2009, p.576). The social construction of identity leaves them ‘outside’ of acceptance ‘within’ their oppressively, dominant organizational culture, in need of an intersectional analysis (Crenshaw, 1991). Even so, Collins (2000) asserts that lack women’s outsider within status may serve as a source of frustration, but also a threshold for inspiration and creativity. Black women are able to serve within the athletic administration, but can also attest some its cultural boundaries as an ‘outsider within’.
Specifically, the current study seeks to understand how black women perceive their experiences as executive leaders of ICA’s administration. As ICA serves host to numerous ideological stances, I seek to understand how black women perceive their experiences to fit into ICA's white, hegemonic masculine organizational culture. To do this, an exploration of their perceptions is required where their voices are allowed to be heard (Reinharz, 1992). As such, in the current study I conduct qualitative interviews to generate a greater understanding of the nuances of their experiences that may leave them as 'outsiders within'.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The organizational culture of ICA exists within larger cultural contexts that are shaped by ideologies and mediate individual experiences. Imposed ideologies often based on strength, power, and dominance are then infused in structures, policies, and traditions of an organization. Due to the social construction of gender and race, which leaves blacks and women inferiorly positioned, Black women possess a unique social status. The primary focus of this study is to explore the individual experiences of black women in the context of ICA’s organizational culture. Intersectionality, a conceptual lens used to understand constructs of identity, is employed to garner a relational examination of how gender and race function in an organizational culture that perpetuates whiteness and hegemonic masculinity. To gain insight into the nuanced nature of participants’ experiences, I chose to employ a qualitative research design. A qualitative approach allows the participants and the researcher to engage in an intentional conversation on the dynamics of their experiences and perceptions while serving as an executive athletic administrator in ICA.

Site Selection

The NCAA is made up of three distinct divisions, Division I-III. Of these, Division I institutions are the most visible, revenue producing institutions of all intercollegiate athletic divisions, so I selected NCAA Division I institutions as they best represent the culture of ICA as a whole. Each of the participants are at Division I institutions located in range of the South to the Southeast region and were selected due to their accessibility to the researcher. At the time of the study, they were executive
committee members of an athletic administration, which gives them the ability to make key decisions regarding the functioning and future of an athletic program, at their specific institution and at their national conference level. An executive committee member (i.e. director of athletics, associate, or assistant athletic director) serves as the director of a department within its athletic administration; these departments include academics, SWA, public relations, athletic communications, compliance, sales and marketing, and ticketing.

**Gaining Entry and Building Rapport**

As an African American woman who has worked within an ICA, I share the ‘outsider within’ status consistent with the identity and status of the participants of my study (Collins, 1986). Having served as an Athletic Trainer for a Division I university and attending graduate school for Sport Management, I was introduced to many athletic administrators and realized the lack of diversity within the organization, especially for African American women. After conducting more research, I realize that this is common for intercollegiate athletics, even in the face of a diverse student-athlete population (Bruening, 2005). During my initial inquiry, I found that black women often experienced tokenism, as they were sometimes the only racial minority on staff and called upon to assist in recruiting efforts Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). Based on this information, I realized the need for further inquiry and understanding.

For the current study, I compiled a list of black women in executive athletic administration at Division I institutions. As previously addressed, the executive administrator will serve as the director of a department, which includes compliance, academic enhancement, marketing, or finance. From my preliminary search, I found ten
black women at Division I institutions that matched the description of participants I was in search of, as provided in Table 2.

Table 2. List of participants

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Academic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Athlete Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Generation**

Data for this project were generated primarily as a result of conducting semi-structured interviews with participants. I choose to speak of data generation instead of data collection because collection suggests that researchers pull from various sources of data and brings them together for analysis. However, during an interview, the researcher does not gather pre-existing data, but rather generates perceptions, values, and beliefs from first-hand accounts of the participants surrounding a specific phenomenon to which he or she is exposed. The accounts of the participant can be directly recalled with the use
of a tape recorder or an indirect reflection of the interaction with the participant and the researcher that is written in a personal field journal. The term generation also reflects the active interaction that allows an exchange of views, feedback, and development in understanding, rather than a precise calculation. It is important to note, conclusions and hypotheses established by the researcher, will never be able to take the place of lived experiences by participants and researchers, but seek to generate greater understanding. With these considerations in mind, I continue with a summary of the ways in which I generated data from my interactions with my participants.

**Feminist Interviewing**

Historically, quantitative research designs have served as the privileged method of knowledge construction in academia (Creswell, 2009). In the late 20th century, the necessity of a qualitative research design increased to address concerns of inequality and social injustice (Sprague, 2005). Specifically, feminist researchers sought to counteract and challenge dominantly accepted notions of women's inferiority and instead highlight accounts of their experiences as valid to the production of knowledge. Using this analytical process, feminist researchers began to engage qualitative research designs that gave women an opportunity to express their experiences and concerns first-hand. As such, feminists often employ qualitative designs to create a platform that allows women's voices to be heard and not sidelined as previously observed by the male researcher's conclusions whom dominate the research field (Sprague, 2005). Numerous research designs have been implemented to address issues surrounding inequity social practices, however, qualitative designs change *how* they are addressed (Sprague, 2005). According to Denzin and Lincoln (2011), qualitative research "consists of a set of interpretive,
material practices that make the world visible” (p. 3). Their definition recognizes qualitative research’s ability to create change in the world by bringing the issues and concerns of members of society that experience social injustice or are discriminated against to the forefront.

Qualitative research is a process where participants are able to attribute meaning to the social phenomena occurring in and affecting their lives. A basic premise of qualitative research is to understand the meaning people ascribe to their experiences. To generate this perspective, a researcher serves as the primary instrument for data collection, interpretation, and analysis (Creswell, 2009). As such, qualitative designs rely heavily on social interactions between researchers and participants, an approach that allows the researcher to probe, clarify, and challenge the information presented in an attempt to construct knowledge. Each person is considered to be a constructor of knowledge in the meaning making process, as descriptions and verbal interactions are interpreted as knowledge constructed of a specific phenomenon (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). As such, qualitative approaches include "interviews, texts, and observation with an intensive focus, seeking detailed analysis of process and/or meanings" (Sprague, 2005, p. 119).

Feminists have found the qualitative design as a prominent research tool to assist in their efforts to focus on equality between the sexes. The once silenced voices of women are provided with empowerment through the research process, as they are able to shed light on issues that have existed in the margins of societal concerns. For example, generalized views of women have often centered on white women, while nonwhite women are overlooked and unconsidered (Hooks, 1984). To understand nonwhite
women's experiences, the conceptual lens of intersectionality, allows the researcher to investigate experiences that stem from social constructs of identity, such as race and gender. Ideologies surrounding race and gender mediate their experiences and are better understood by the interpretive nature of qualitative research designs. In turn, a qualitative research design offers greater insight, with its ability to challenge injustices set in place by traditional methods (Reid, 2008). Every woman has their own perspective and their experience is valid, especially when considering dimensions of discrimination, sexism, or racism, which requires understanding and illumination of experiences. The intent of the research may be to tell a story about an experience of women or make observations of an experience women have encountered. As a result, participants may have a chance to confront imposed injustices and hierarchical standpoints, created by the voice of men through feminist research as ‘knowledge’ that is constructed by women.

Due to the exploratory nature of a qualitative research design, semi-structured interviews were implemented as my primary method for data generation (Creswell, 2009). The questions developed for the interview were agreed upon by a panel of two leisure and sport management scholars and one sociologist that specializes in qualitative research. Essentially, semi-structured interviews offer a chance for the participants to provide additional information that may not have been uncovered from an artificial line of questioning. An interview appeals more to the sentiments of the research study for its ability to empower and voice the opinions of the silenced, in an open-ended discussion on a specific phenomenon (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The researcher guides the discussion, but verbal interaction presses the interview onward. For example, I may ask the interviewee "Tell me about your process in becoming an executive athletic
administrator?” The open-ended question enables the researcher to engage in an exploratory discussion that allows for open feedback from the participant.

Interviews are a craft based on skills and ability of the interviewer to design a quality product (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For the current study, black women were enlisted as the constructors of knowledge regarding perceptions of their experiences mediated by their identity in a white, hegemonic masculine culture. Even so, it is important to note that the women did not seek me out to discuss the oppressive nature that their identity may or may not have on their experiences. But the research process allows for greater participation ‘with’ and not just ‘for’ an interviewee who agrees to tell her story. A collaborative effort between the researcher and interviewee sets the tone and allows for clarification or further discussion on relevant subject matter (Reinharz, 1992), and a power relation exists. The interviewee is part of the process and is not excluded from the outcome (Merriam, 1998), but the researcher controls the topics discussed. My participants were able to voice their thoughts, opinions, experiences, and concerns to further engage in discussion, but I initiate conversation and interpret their experiences, in a way that highlights the nuances of their experiences, even if unbeknownst to them (Sprague, 2005). In all, a power shift exists during this process whereby participants are able to offer their own personal theories and accounts of experience, but the researcher designates strategies that may attribute to social transformations of experience that enhance understanding (Maguire, 2014).

The sensitive nature of the study benefits from the interpersonal, casual structure provided by a semi-structured research design (Sprague, 2005). Race and gender concerns in the workplace are considered taboo, and all too often, are overlooked. The
social environment provided by ICA is unique for African American women, as their identity leaves them marginalized. Other areas of inquiry include the structure of an athletic department, formal and informal social interactions, and their perception of their race and gender's role in ICA. To alleviate potential tension created from discussing the sensitive nature of these issues, interviews were conducted in a setting most comfortable for the participants of the participants (Creswell, 2007).

Prior to the interview, I reminded them of the sensitivity of the information that will be discussed and ask permission to record the interviews. As such, only at the discretion of the participant will each interview be digitally recorded for accuracy. Knowing this, I will remind them that they can remove themselves from the interview or skip questions at any time. Recording the interviews gives me the ability to return to the data for analysis and interpretation. My goal was to conduct a semi-structured interview lasting about one hour with each participant about the impact of their intersectional identity on their experiences in an athletic administration.

**Data Transformation**

Data do not speak for themselves, and a systematic process occurs between acquiring data and actually making sense of it. The researcher transforms the data and constructs patterns from the data generated. Data is transformed through analysis and interpretation, in order to represent and foster an engagement with the experiences of participants.

**Analysis**

As interviews offer an exchange of perceptions and personal reflections surrounding specific phenomena, analysis extends the representation of experience by
constructing relationships and themes from the data (Wolcott, 1994). My analysis began by reading and rereading transcribed recordings and reflections from journal entries line by line (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2006). I identified sections that could be reduced into themes during processed phases of coding, for each interview. Phases of coding dissect the data, but maintain its fundamental qualities, as the researcher conceptualizes large amounts of data for further analysis (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2006; Creswell, 2007). These sections were highlighted where words and phrases were written in the margins of the section directed from the text (Charmaz & Belgrave). For example, if participants repeatedly reference their identity as a black woman, the term ‘black woman’ was written in the margins. The phrases in the margins were abstract codes to be developed into salient themes (Madison, 2005). This preliminary process is known as open coding because it allows the researcher to openly make interpretations of the text without limitations on ideas, in order to construct meaning (Creswell, 2009). Codes were then synthesized into a fewer number of codes, focused codes, that capture broader relationships in the data. For example, the code ‘black woman’ might be one of several that compose the broader focused code of ‘identity constructs’. The accuracy of the generated codes were then compared back to the data for interpretation. During this last phase of the analytic process, I explored implications of my findings to current relevant theoretical and conceptual debates regarding the implementation of intersectionality as an accurate conceptual framework. In doing so, I sought to challenge the homogenous nature of women’s experience within the confines of sport and extend current understandings of black women’s experiences, which are often left out of primary discussions and leadership discourse (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996; Tillman, 2002).
Interpretation

After construction of the emergent themes is complete, the researcher initiates interpretation of the findings (Wolcott, 1994). I had the ability to explore implications of my work based on relevant theoretical and conceptual debates or establish a new line of inquiry. The process of moving beyond one’s findings and connecting data to previous scholarship and/or theory, may lead to an extension, insight, or an exception to a theory. Considering the nature of the current study, interpretation of data is crucial to ensure connectivity with prevailing theories. To achieve connectivity, a balance must be achieved between interpretation and self-validation (Wolcott). The researcher's insights and sensitivities must be recognized when attempting to make an 'accurate' interpretation of analyzed data. Similarly, during interpretation, one's research findings are not the ‘be all end all’ on a topic, instead, the researcher must realize that their findings may provoke new questions or concerns. According to Dillard (2000), the language resurrected by interpretation must be "transforming particular ways of knowing and producing knowledge" (p. 662). From their current state, knowledge and theories are then challenged and transformed to produce a more accurate account of meaning and understanding. In this case, an intersectional analysis of black women's experiences extends current gendered research frames in regards to sport that recognize that the homogenous nature of describing women's experience do not account for the nuances of multiple identity constructs (Bruening, 2005).

Trustworthiness

As with any research design, the efficacy of the researcher’s interpretations needs to be analyzed for rigor of method. During the process of describing, interpreting, and
explaining the occurrences, validity is often cited to account for the legitimacy of the design (Maxwell, 1992). According to Messick (1991):

> Validity is an integrated evaluative judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of interpretations and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment (p. 5).

Messick's explanation of the term references the emphasis on the notion of measurement for validity's claims. However, it is safe to say that the concept of validity has stirred much debate in both disciplines surrounding its relevance in quantitative and qualitative studies on means of interpretation of data. In positivist approaches, stemming from Cronbach (1971), validity surfaced as a means to examine the accuracy or soundness of a test score. Examining the validity in quantitative research designs not only became the norm, but a standard. In quantitative studies, evaluating the degree of cronbach alpha determines the validation of interpretation for the entire design. In qualitative studies, the efficacy of validity’s ability to influence interpretation has received great criticism.

In qualitative designs, observations are made upon observations (Angrosino & Rosenberg, 2011). The experiences and perceptions of the interviewee do not serve as the definitive answer, the absolute. In such cases, the researcher must understand that their claims are created based on contextual experiences. To assert claims of validity when creating impressions and interpretations based on observations of observations, there is no fixed point of view from which to evaluate the truth. Knowing this, Wolcott (1994) suggests that qualitative designs should not be in search of validity *per se*. He argues that qualitative researchers may have too hastily invited the idea of validity to be equally achieved in their work as claimed by quantitatively-oriented researchers. Instead of
completely dismissing the concepts applicability to qualitative designs of interpretation, Wolcott suggests that qualitative researchers recognize validity's importance but demonstrate 'validity' in different ways. Different validating procedures are taken in order to ensure valid claims in qualitative designs. Value claims of validity by privileged positivist researchers entrust all researchers to attend to such claims in their work as well. Even so, Wolcott believes that qualitative researchers approach 'validity' claims in their work by negotiating the terms that better fit their research designs.

Validity centers on adequacy of interpretations, and reliability refers to the ability of achieving the same results if the study were repeated. Both claims in its purest forms take away from the process observed in qualitative research designs. Instead, trustworthiness aligns with the steps taken to strengthen the claims of accuracy in qualitative designs. Authenticity was later employed as another measure implemented to clarify quantitative claims of validity (Seale, 1999). Authenticity refers to the range of different perceptions of a phenomenon, as the addition of multiple perceptions of the same subject enriches the data and authenticity of the research design. In all, the theoretical backing in using validity and reliability create moments of hesitation for their use in qualitative research designs.

Wolcott (1994) asserts that scholars should attempt to enhance understanding of a particular phenomenon. Specifically, in the current study I seek to generate an understanding of how black women's intersectionality mediates their experiences and forces them to navigate ideological conceptions of a social hierarchy in sport leadership (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). Understanding is an enlightened intelligence based on a specific context that offers greater insight or explanations that are more difficult to
explore through quantitative methods (Wolcott, 1999). The researcher's ability to enhance understanding stems from a maturation of discernment, where they must stay 'true' to their generated data, as well as personal sensitivities. In regards to qualitative interviews, the questions addressed to the interviewee's should attempt to offer a holistic account of the specific topic. Also, Jaggar (1989) asserts that when conducting feminist research, feelings and emotions are often added to the equation to enhance understanding of a phenomenon. These subjective claims are often overlooked by positivist approaches, as they prefer and rely on "objective" claims. Even so, subjective accounts require interpretation techniques that will increase understanding from others, in this case, on race and gender. The perceptions of experiences surrounding each phenomena require unique tactics for validation of interpretation.

Creswell (2007) offers eight validation techniques that qualitative researchers can employ to attain accuracy in their designs. These validations techniques include: 1) prolonged engagement and persistent observations in the field; 2) the use of multiple sources, methods, investigators and theories to corroborate evidence; 3) peer reviewing and debriefing; 4) refining working hypotheses as the inquiry advances; 5) clarifying researcher bias from the outset of the study; 6) member checking; 7) utilizing rich, thick descriptions to allow readers to make decisions regarding transferability; and 8) and external audits (p. 207). Creswell notes that at least two out of the 8 validation techniques should be employed in any given study. The current design employed the use of multiple sources and theories to corroborate evidence, peer reviewing, and clarifying researcher bias from the outset of the study.
Prior to each interview, I documented potential research biases on topics of discussion that may appear throughout the conduction of interviews and interpretation of data. As a black woman conducting research on black women, acknowledging biases that may surface throughout the process allowed me to maintain focus on the issue being examined. Before each interview and each stage of interpretation, I returned to the page where I had written my biased assumptions, to enhance awareness and steer away from each throughout the process.

Also, at the conclusion of each interview, I attracted attention to my selected theories to observe if the interview responses are aligned with the guiding theories. Checking alignment with theories to corroborate evidence after each interview, allotted me the ability to restructure questions that may potentially guide the interviews to address the topic with the next interviewee. I was able to reflect on the questions to ensure whether each question actually addressed what I initially thought it would address. Peer reviews also assisted in maintaining focus of the research process. I engaged in bi-weekly conferences with Dr. Dunlap in order to review the transcripts from each interview. Having experience as an ethnographer and with interview conductions, Dr. Dunlap's insight on the process and interpretation of data strengthened my research design and outcome. Specific areas of interest included the perceptions of the participant’s understanding of how their identity influences their experiences. For example, questions asked include, but are not limited to: how do the women perceive their gender to influence their experiences? Race? Do they feel that their experience differs from white women or black men? And, what would change if a black woman served as the Athletic
Director of many Division I programs? In all, I sought to examine the nuanced nature of experience based on the women's perceptions.
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CHAPTER IV

AN EXPLORATION OF BLACK WOMEN’S INTERSECTIONALITY IN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

A discrepancy exists between the visibility of men and of women in sport leadership positions due to the prevalence of several hegemonic ideologies within prominent institutions whose privileges allow them to compose sport culture in the United States (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). Sport scholarship regarding the lack of diversity among these leadership positions offers binary conclusions of gender (Burton, 2014; Cunningham & Sagas, 2008; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002) and race identity (Cunningham, 2010; McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009; Smith & Hattery, 2011) to explain the current phenomena. The concern with these exclusive examinations of identity constructs is the lack of attention paid to the intersection of multiple identity constructs. In particular, there is a paucity of examination of the experiences of black women in sport leadership. Even today when gender is discussed, white women are at the center of examination while issues surrounding race mainly focus on black men (Hooks, 1981). The homogeneous nature in detailing the experiences of black women in sport as either being a gendered issue or a race issue, overlooks the hegemonic implications associated of their double minority status—being a woman and nonwhite.

As a prominent social institution (Frey & Eitzen, 1991), sport culture lauds masculine characteristics of aggression, power, and dominance that are showcased by
organized sport institutions, such as intercollegiate athletics (ICA). In turn, a social structure established by a masculinized sport culture limits the upward mobility for women. Case in point, an examination of sport leadership positions show that not even a proportion of women and nonwhite student-athlete’s participation numbers are carried over into ICA’s administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Specifically, the underrepresentation of black women in sport leadership positions has been well documented (Abney & Richey, 1991, 1992; Borland & Bruening, 2010), but their lack of representation among sport leadership positions raises concerns considering their prevalent presence among basketball program rosters, which is ICA’s most visible and highest revenue producing sport for women (NCAA, 2013). Sport scholars have concluded that black women's identity serves as the source for racial and gendered discriminatory social practices, which forces them—more so than white women—to negotiate their identity (McDowell, 2008), and potentially conform to ideological expectations of a gender and racial hierarchy that leaves them marginalized (Collins, 2000).

To gain insight regarding black women's experiences in context of ICA sport leadership, the current study examines how ICA’s hegemonic construction of gender mediates the experiences of black women's identities (Abney & Richey, 1992). Qualitative interviews were conducted to examine the nuanced nature of black women's social reality and to highlight the manner in which participants negotiated the expression of these identities.
Review of Literature

According to Lapchick’s (2014) Racial and Gender Report Card, 56.6% of the NCAA Division I student-athlete population is male, and 43.4% is female, of which percentage 65.2% are white, while only 18.9% are black. The overall population of African American athletes is relatively low, but African American athletes serve as the majority population of ICA’s men and women’s most popular sports; football and basketball (Lapchick, 2014). And as student-athletes participants are recognized to be the most qualified candidates for coaching and leadership positions (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002), a startling disproportion of racial minorities and women experience advancement beyond student-athlete participation in ICA. White men dominant the Athletic Director (AD) positions in Division I, followed by white women, black men, and lastly, black women (NCAA, 2013). Specifically, whites comprise 87.7 percent of Athletic Director positions and blacks only 8 percent. Additionally, the only gender specific position in ICA, the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA), is predominately occupied by white women at 84.7 percent, followed by blacks at 10 percent (Lapchick, 2014). Based on these numbers, it is clear that sport culture has a strong affinity for men, and racial minorities are mainly appraised for their physical ability and not intellectual capability (Harrison & Lawrence, 2003). But for black women, an affinity for male leadership and a racial inferiority may serve as limitations to their upward mobility.

Described as a male dominated entity, ICA has developed a reputation for perpetuating a gender hierarchy that privileges men over women (Burton, 2014; Walker & Sartore-Baldwin, 2013; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). Turning attention to leadership of ICA, numerous studies have examined the ways in which gender inequality
have been observed. Considering coaching selections, Walker and Sartore-Baldwin (2013) observed that while men are perceived as acceptable to coach women, an affinity for masculinity in men's basketball and a strong resistance to change may limit the acceptance of women into head coaching positions for men's teams. A coach from their study stated “the thought of change cannot be fathomed” when reflecting on the idea of a woman being head coach of a men's basketball team (p. 306). Their findings are troubling considering the large numbers of men that coach women's teams, but similar notions of male superiority are observed among ICA administration. As the only gender-specific position in ICA is the SWA, sport scholars have pointed out that the position is only a title and not a designated position enforced by every NCAA institution (Hoffman, 2010), as some institutions do not even have a woman on staff (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Marked as a terminal position (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012), the SWA serves under the AD and is not included in executive decisions for men’s sports or budgetary planning, which are deemed as masculine roles (Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012), and necessary skills for advancement to the AD position. Overall, consistent with an affinity for masculinity in sport, women remain inferiorly positioned to men. But for black women, gender only serves as one layer of limitation—race is another.

Though there is a paucity of sport leadership research on black women (Abney, 1988; Benton, 1999; McDowell, 2008), results have shown that black women's identity mediates many of their experiences (Collins, 2000). Accounts of social uplift have referenced how black women's identity can serve as a source for strength and means for social determinism (Armstrong, 2007). Greater attention has been paid to their accounts
of marginalization, racial discrimination, and how they must contextually negotiate their identity as sport leaders (Abney, 1988; McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). Specifically, considering the interface between black women’s identity and their sport leadership roles, McDowell and Cunningham (2009) identified six propositions—personal factors, social status, organizational status, and three diversity perspectives—integration and learning, discrimination and fairness, and access and legitimacy—as prominent fixtures to consider for black women. In result, they found that black women justify their personal identity as a source of strength but may conform to dominant culture. Their findings highlight the complex nature of experiences for black women as they cannot identify with hegemonic masculine ascriptions and must negotiate their intersectional black woman status, which are distinctively different from white women’s complaints of gender inequality between men and women.

**Hegemony and Hegemonic Masculinity**

The concept of hegemony originated from Gramsci (1971) to describe the ideological forces that allow a hierarchical organization of individual interactions and social practices. In such cases, power is established and maintained in a nonviolent, nonphysical manner, such that the ideas of a dominant class are then exerted over subordinate groups by means of persuasion, consensus, and manipulation (Connell, 1995). Hegemonic ideals are fully realized when they are finally accepted as a “normal reality” by those who stand to lose the most from their existence (Williams, 1985). Among many other ideological manifestations, gender is a social construct that is mediated by hegemonic ideals that perpetuate social inequities between men and women based on traditional understandings of masculinity (Messener, 1989; Willis &
In turn, masculinity, a quality most commonly ascribed to men, is privileged in relation to femininity, a quality most commonly ascribed to women. A gender continuum allows fluidity between masculinity and femininity for men and women, but there is a clear boundary that creates tension between the sexes when crossed (Connell, 1995).

Connell (1998) suggested that sport serves as one of most hegemonic institutions in society due to its masculine construction, as sport has traditionally been a male preserve enabling boys to mature into men (Messener, 1988). Consistent with sport culture, stereotypical masculine qualities of power, physical contact, and aggression are esteemed to stereotypical feminine qualities of being gentle, weak, and nurturing (Messner, 1989). In turn, sport culture is observed to reinforce its presence as a hegemonic masculine institution by its aggressive nature, thereby creating criticism of female participants’ expression of masculine qualities and presence in sport (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Messner, 1988; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002).

Essentially, sport's hegemonic masculine structure creates barriers and limitations on the upward mobility of women in collegiate athletics (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002).

Further examination of sport culture’s inhabitation of hegemonic masculinity center on its preservation of male leadership that limits the acceptance of women into sport leadership positions as administrators and coaches (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Miller, 2005). Even with the enactment of Title IX to decrease male hegemony, sport culture continues to preserve hegemonic masculinity that forces women to withstand the effects of a gender ideology that leaves them disadvantaged to a male leadership privilege.
(Burton & Peachy, 2009; Peachy & Burton, 2011). But as hegemonic masculinity negatively affects the experiences of women to that of men, even more harmful is the presence of gender and racial ideologies, which are imposed on black women due to their double minority social status (Collins, 2000). As a black man’s masculinity retreats to a white man’s masculinity, due to a racial hierarchy, black women must navigate hegemonic manifestations of a gender and racial discrimination. There is a dearth of research that attempts to understand the influence of how their intersectionality influences their experiences as sport leaders (Armstrong, 2007; Bruening, 2005; Burton, 2014).

**Conceptual Framework**

**Intersectionality**

Intersectionality is considered an analytical framework by which difference implicates subordination (Zinn & Dill, 1994). Rooted in black feminist scholarship, intersectionality, a term coined by Crenshaw (1989), called attention to black women's omission from debate surrounding women's equality, which primarily focused on white women, and racial parity, most commonly centered on black men (Crenshaw, 1989). According to Hooks (1984):

> No other group in America has had their identity socialized out of existence as have black women. We are rarely recognized as a group separate and distinct from black men, or a part of the larger group ‘women’ in this culture. (p. 7)

While a fairly new term, it is a seasoned concept that was first documented by black women pioneers, Maria Stewart and Sojourner Truth, in the nineteenth century, who initially contended the pitfalls of black women and denounced traditional notions of
race and gender that created distinctions in their experiences from white women and black men (Dill & Zambrana, 2009). Intersectionality examines the multidimensional interconnections of identity facets that compel power relations, which includes, but are not limited to gender, race, and social class (Crenshaw, 1989). Collins (2000) asserts that the overlapping and intersectional confrontation of identities envelop as a “matrix of domination” which leaves underrepresented social groups marginalized (p. 299). In such cases, for black women, being 'woman' and 'nonwhite', are mutually exclusive identity constructs based on an interrelated nature of power (Crenshaw, 1989, 1991) that influences their meaning making process of gender (Shield, 2008; Yuval-Davis, 2011). Intersectionality is distanced from an additive understanding of each identity construct, which summates oppressive forces of gender plus race. Instead, intersectionality centers attention on identity constructs as a social location of experience that entails an intersectional confluence that cannot be explored in isolation (Baca-Zinn & Dill, 1994). In turn, intersectionality assists in the understanding of differences between and within social groups (Crenshaw, 1986) that counteract notions of homogeneity between and within social groups (Jordan-Zachery, 2007).

For the current study, black women’s intersectionality, as being black and being a woman, in the context of ICA sport leadership positions will be explored. The paradigmatic nature of intersectionality can help diagnose the harmful social realities that result from a gender and racial hierarchy (Morris & Bunjun, 2007), and extend confounded assumptions of gendered leadership often based from white women and men (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996). Unique to other approaches, intersectionality provides a framework that not only confronts interrelated constructions of identity, but also liberates
those same constraints and serve as sources of strength (Armstrong, 2007; Collins, 2000; Jordan-Zachery, 2007). Within the athletic arena, an analysis of the intersections of gender, race, and sexuality is limited (Bowleg, 2008; Bruening, 2005; Seller, Kupermine, & Dames, 1997) and examinations of black women’s experiences as sport leaders are even smaller (Borland & Bruening, 2010; Bruening, 2005). The current study seeks to examine the ways black women perceive their intersectionality to influence their experience as sport leaders against the backdrop of ICA's hegemonic masculine culture.

**Methodology**

To focus on the nuanced nature of experience for black women in the context of ICA administration, semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted to elicit a critical, inductive analysis of data to enhance understanding of the influence of black women's intersectionality on experience (Crenshaw, 1991; Strauss & Corbett, 1990). A qualitative research approach allowed the participants and the researcher to engage in an intentional conversation regarding lived experiences that are difficult to capture quantitatively.

**Context & Participants**

The context of the current study was essential to consider as ICA is situated within the confines of higher education. Separated by the NCAA into Divisions I-III, Division I is the most visible and revenue productive entity that harbors a culture of power, dominance, and superiority in every aspect. After an explicit disproportion in representation between student-athletes and its sport leadership, ICA calls into question its function as a social institution that perpetuates social equality. To explore this issue the participants in this study are 10 black women sport leaders working in ICA at
predominately white NCAA Division I institutions. Each participant, at the time of the study, served as an executive committee member (i.e. SWA, Compliance, etc.) of a department at their respected institution. The reason for the exclusive sampling of black women was two-fold. First, when exploring the unparalleled experiences of black women, the inclusion of black women as the target population is crucial (Collins, 2000). And second, black women’s presence as prominent sport leaders is rare as their association with a position of power disunites with traditional notions of leadership being white and male. Of the ten participants, only three were former student-athletes that made the transition into ICA’s administration. Lastly, years of experience serving in an administrator role ranged from one year to twenty-five years. In some capacity, all of the women were able to interact with both male and female student-athletes and head coaching staff personnel.

Procedure

For the current study, I compiled a list of black women in executive leadership positions of all NCAA Division I athletic programs in range of the South to the Southeast region. Based on the availability and distance between the researcher and the participants, the interviews were conducted in person or via Skype. The skype interview afforded the capture of verbal and non-verbal data as in a face to face interview (Bertrand & Boureau, 2010). The qualitative semi-structured interview process ranged from 45 minutes to an hour covering topics regarding their perception of their identity’s influence on experience. Central to the premise of a qualitative interview, the participants offered unprompted dialogue that was often provoked by a set of questions. Credibility of the questions were analyzed by a panel of two leisure and sport management scholars and
one sociology scholar with a specialty in qualitative research methodology. At the induction of each interview, the primary researcher reviewed a list of potential biased assumptions that needed to be avoided in order to maintain an open mind regarding related discussion. Before analyses began, member checks were conducted by the researcher to enhance trustworthiness and rigor of method (Maxwell, 1992).

**Data Analysis**

According to Dillard (2000), language resurrected by interpretation entails "transforming particular ways of knowing and producing knowledge" (p. 662). Analysis was conducted to examine the representation of experience by constructed relationships and themes from the data (Wolcott, 1994). Once member checks concluded and data was modified, phases of analyses were conducted from open, focused, to selective codes. First, reading line by line, the researcher inductively identified sections of discussion from the data. This initial, open phase of coding, allowed the researcher to maintain the data's fundamental qualities, while deducing large amounts of data (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2002). Next, the relevant open codes were intentionally reduced into themes, based on underlying concepts and ideas that captured broader relationships within the data. This phase of axial coding involved the creation of conceptual memos that reflected analysis of constructed questions and generated responses from the interviews (Creswell, 2009). During the last phase of the analytic process, the researcher explored implications of my findings to current relevant theoretical and conceptual debates regarding the implementation of intersectionality as an accurate conceptual framework. In doing so, the current study sought to challenge the homogenous nature of women’s experience within the confines of sport and extend current understandings of black women’s experiences,
whom are often left out of primary discussions and leadership discourse (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996; Tillman, 2002).

Results

Analysis of the data incited a binary emphasis of black women's intersectionality as either being a source for social uplift or a hindrance to upward mobility. Seeking to garner convergent and distinctive accounts of experience as executive leaders in ICA, their responses were captured and provided below. In order to maintain confidentiality of each participant a pseudonym has been provided.

‘It's a She and She's Black’

Most participants expressed notions of the beneficial roles that their intersectionality ensues as an ICA administrator. The common theme of 'representation' was referenced numerous times when reflecting on their identities as black women. Laura, a SWA, stated that when athletic administrators are sought out to discuss certain issues on campus, she feels that she is summoned "to get us representation from athletics, a woman, and a minority." Her perception reflects how their intersectionality can be dissected into representative demographics that are dually underrepresented, but needed.

Similarly, Toni, a Director of Academic Advising, stated that:

I think, that in a male dominated profession, being an African American female, one [way] or [an]other, it didn’t matter, it has thursted me [upward]. They want a different perspective, more of something else than themselves at the table. I've been able to give that to them.

Her statement reflects the perception of how identity encompasses a unique social group, which can provide greater opportunities for upward mobility. Consistent with notions of their identity that can assist with social mobility, the women reflected on the
ways that organizational members have responded to their presence as executive leaders in ICA. Kim, a SWA, discussed how student-athletes were appreciative of seeing a black woman in a prominent leadership position that was different from traditional ICA leaders. She declared:

When they're in a meeting, it's no longer just a white male telling them what to do. There is now a black female up there, in the athletic department as well as staff. That is empowering to [them to] see that this organization will hire a black leader. This is our second in command. It's a she and she's black!

Traditional leadership roles in ICA are comprised of white men and women, but there are many racial minorities among the student-athlete population in a diverse array of sport teams. In such cases, nonwhite, racial minority leaders stand out and equate as role models, especially for ICA's racial minority student-athlete population. Specifically recounting an instance when she was requested to assist with a group of incoming male student-athletes by an administrator, Tamara, a SWA, recollected her introduction to ICA administration:

This particular year, they were bringing in two local kids, black kids, who were academically at risk. People were having an uproar about them. He said "Listen, I want you to work with them." At first it was just Men's basketball team, and [he said] "I think these kids needs to see somebody who, went through the program, you know, someone who understands their experience.

Tamara's testimony implicates that for black women, not only do they serve as role models exclusively for women, but their racial identity also incites their presence as a role model for black men. Also, suggested by Hope, a SWA, the presence of a black woman in ICA is essential to the leadership of ICA's most visible, revenue producing sport, football.
But having a black female oversee football. Well out of the 105, 90 of them are black and they probably look at her, they'll probably pay more attention to you and they’re viewing her as a mother figure or sister figure that they don’t get the same from an administrator or white male.

Sport culture is considered to be an institution that perpetuates hegemonic masculinity, where women are more commonly relegated to positions that oversee women's sports. In contrast, explicitly noting that football rosters are primarily comprised of black student-athletes, she highlights the importance of her black woman identity for racial comparison that also impresses a feminine quality that could be useful in ICA.

In all, the participants acknowledged that their intersectionality was a source for social capital that assists in their acceptance as a leader, allowing them to serve as role models to student-athletes, and offer a unique perspective to the organizational culture of ICA. However, just as accounts of their intersectionality were recognized as a benefit, the women also expressed how ideological associations of their identity enhanced barriers and limitations that distinguish their experience from white women and black men.

‘I’m Two Things Different’

In contradiction to positive accounts of their intersectionality, the participants also highlighted ways in which their identity creates a degree of dissonance from the dominant white male culture in ICA. Explaining the consistent trend of leadership within an ICA’s conference, Tamara notes, "I remember three black women and then all white men. A few white women. But, and it’s always like that. It seems to always feel that way." Additionally, Amber, a SWA, proclaimed:

But I do think it's a bit different because, again if the majority of the people in the room are white males. I'm two things different from them as opposed to the white females in the room. White female is a more of a known entity to him than I am.
Because his mother is a white female, his sister, generally speaking. Not only am I not male, I'm also not white.

Amber's statement suggests that a continuum exists between men and women that is referenced from white hegemonic masculinity. In ICA, the primary leadership position is the AD, and is typically filled by white men. Supported by the explanation of a racial and gender hierarchy, Amber believes that distance created by a racial and gender hierarchy can place limitations on black women's upward mobility more so than for white women. Additionally, when explaining the manifestations of a gender and racial hierarchy, Tamara, a former student athlete, recounted an interaction she had with her institution's AD after having obtained her Master's degree. Over the course of her exit interview, she realized that he (a white male) perceived her to only be successful after entering into a career of coaching. She recalled:

He said, "Well have you thought about coaching?" It sort of, it was interesting to me that that was the first thing he asked me. It wasn’t that the question itself [that] offended me...it wasn’t that the coach piece offended me, but he really didn’t think there was anything else. He actually said to me "black women actually do well in coaching" and then he said "you'll probably never be the head coach, but you could do really well in this."

As an overt account of sexism and racism, Tamara's interaction captures the complex nuance of black women's intersectionality in ICA. Explicitly being told that she would be limited due to her intersectionality is not only startling, but illustrates a degree of power white men possess within ICA. Would the same statement be made to a white woman or black man? Lastly, moving beyond intersectional influences of race and gender, Hope detailed how even amongst women, race and sexuality can serve as a barrier for social interactions. She explained:
And this only happened one time where [a] coach basically said they did not want me to oversee [student-athletes]. I felt that it was because I was black, because she had a student athlete on her team who was black and she ran her off. And then she had another who was biracial who was having issues... It is very interesting because the person she wanted to oversee her is a white male, heterosexual, 4 kids, been married for 40 years and its funny.

She later explained that the coach was a bisexual white woman, and her preference for a white, heterosexual male-supported accounts of an affinity for men in leadership that can constrain social relationships between women. As a white woman, potentially being overseen by a black woman contradicted the hierarchical social order of identity. Male is superior to female and white is superior to black. Even though the study did not examine intersectional accounts beyond race and gender, Hope's experience was included to illustrate how constraints of intersectionality are consistently related to the multi-dimensional nature of power.

Overall, while the women recognize that they are a unique entity among organizational leaders, the current section highlighted how they also experienced discriminatory social practices that would not be captured by gendered analyses. Particularly, the women noted that their identity forced them to be “two things different” from ICA’s dominant sport leaders, white men. As distance is created between black women and ICA’s dominant white male leadership, they recognize that their social interactions differ from the known entity “white women”, allowing gendered issues to be further complicated.

Discussion

The current study explored the influence of black women's intersectionality of race and gender on their experience as executive leaders in ICA. Their voiced accounts of
nuances in experience provided a greater understanding of the ways in which they perceived their intersectionality to reject assumptions of gender parity (Collins, 2000). As such, generated themes 'It’s a she and she's black' and 'I'm two things different' emerged to illustrate the contradictory notions of their identity's influence on experience as sport leaders. Guided by the conceptual framework of intersectionality to examine power relations of their racial and gender inferiority (Collins, 2000), their expressed narratives of racism and sexism are consistent with current scholarship centered on black women's experience in the workplace (Collins, 2000; Jean-Marie, Williams, & Sherman, 2009).

All but one of the participants felt that their intersectionality accounted for some degree of overt and/or more subtle forms of discrimination at some point in their professional careers in ICA.

In the section entitled, ‘It’s a she and she is black’, the women described their identity and how their identity may be perceived as being summative (Bowleg, 2008). Even though they are not able to separate parts of their identity, many of the participants noted that their race and gender were sometimes observed to be in addition to one another. When considering their presence as a leader, their gender served as one layer, but their race was often more robust (Settles, 2006) due to their underrepresentation in sport leadership. Even so, being able to provide representation from two distinct social groups, being a woman and a racial minority, the women's presence is complementary to perceptions of ICA’s diversity.

While interacting with student-athletes, they recounted numerous times where they were asked to assist male and female racial minority student-athletes. Even though the participants saw the benefit in this institutional practice, it is really not as beneficial as
they may think. The exclusive call for racial minorities to deal with racial minorities implicitly incites an appreciation for their presence to mainly assist with racial matters, which nonwhite administrators will not have to deal with. Their accounts of being called to assist with diversity issues due to their social status incite the relevance of the concept ‘cultural taxation’ (Padilla, 1994). Cultural taxation is the idea that members from underrepresented populations are positioned out of good will to serve as a representative example of upward mobility. In turn, they are often called upon to provide insight on cultural issues of diversity and connect personally with racial minorities. An issue with this interaction is that none of the women stated that they were asked to speak with whites when they were in trouble or having academic or social issues For the participants being black women reflects an ‘achilles heel’, which enables a cultural appreciation for their gender and racial background, and yet is subjected to assumptions of inferiority inscribed by their intersectionality.

In the section “I’m two things different”, greater analyses of ICA’s organizational manifestation of hegemonic masculinity were observed (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). Hegemonic manifestations of masculinity superiorly position men to women and often serve as the reason women are overlooked for advancement (Burton, 2014; Walker & Sartore-Baldwin, 2013; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). As a woman, black women also experience the same gender based stereotypical assumptions that undermine their acceptance into leadership (Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010), but their intersectionality forces them to negotiate their differences and also endure hegemonic norms of race (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). Comprised of a double minority status, they have a greater potential to fall victim to both racial and gender
ideologies, often times ignorant of which identity construct is ‘at fault’ (King, 1988).

Interestingly enough, the women noted that their social status allowed them to commonly engage black men. Based on their contextual accounts of experience, while 'two things different' from ICA's white male leadership, their unique social status was embraced when the organization was in crisis.

In conclusion, black women not only negotiate constraints of sexism, but also racism, as their emergence into leadership roles contradicts notions of leadership’s historic male preserve (Eagly & Carli, 2003; Parker & Ogilvie, 1996). Implications of race and gender's intersection force black women to interpret and experience a ‘double jeopardy’ that obscures a specific target of oppression to either one of their identity sources (King, 1988); such forms of oppression can only be examined through intersectionality’s experiential lens (Crenshaw, 1991; Morris & Bunjun, 2007).

Possessing a double minority identity, the prominence of one facet of their identity may be highlighted more than another contextually, but neither construct can supersede the pragmatic feature of their intersectionality.

Conclusion

Results from the current study support the conceptual emphasis of examining the experiences of black women through an intersectional framework (Shields, 2008) in the context of ICA. As represented by emergent themes, the study observed the ways in which the participants additively and intersectionally accounted for their identity to influence their experiences as leaders in ICA. Additive accounts directed attention to each identity construct in addition to the other, such as race plus gendered issues. Their intersectional accounts centered on the confluent nature of their gender and race. Even so,
their intersectionality served as a salient feature to their perception of experience. Specifically, in support of intersectionality as a conceptual framework, the participants incited instances where the interrelated nature of their identity forced them to navigate ideological conceptions of a social hierarchy (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). And oppressive functions based on the confluence of race and gender were depicted to perpetuate a hierarchy that often left them marginalized.

Even so, a multilayered, multidimensional analysis was deemed important for two reasons. First, the examination of intersectionality allowed the researcher to understand the ways in which the participants expressed their accounts of the interrelated nature of their identity's influence while serving as executive sport leaders. Particularly, the women’s contradictory accounts of their intersectionality were a salient finding. Many women stated that their identity allowed them to “more of something else than themselves at the table”, but on the other hand they recognize that their representative feature in ICA allowed them to endure a ‘cultural taxation’. The exclusive call for racial minorities to ‘deal’ with racial minorities ignites concerns of the lack of value associated with diversity in ICA beyond gendered constraints, and can generate inferior assumptions of black women’s leadership in ICA’s organizational culture. Second, the function of race and gender as ideological social constructs enhances the relevance of a larger conceptual framework that encapsulates the confluence of identity constructs as a social location of understanding.

For managerial purposes, it is important to note that increased representation, not just numerically, for more women and racial minority leaders will only be achieved if greater opportunities for mentoring, leadership development programs, and hegemonic
norms of race and gender are dispelled within ICA culture (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). Their presence in leadership should not consistently be lauded for their representative features, being a woman and racial minority, but recognized as an essential contributor to ICA’s function. As observed by the findings in the current study, there is an even greater need to dispel notions of black women’s or any minority’s leadership role to be delineated ‘cultural’ tasks that are not undertaken by other members of leadership. Instead, greater emphasis on the value of diversity within an organization, beyond their representative contributions to a particular population is needed.

Lastly, organizational leaders need to be cognizant of the cultural norms that perpetuate notions of inferiority for women and racial minorities within the confines of ICA. A greater valuation of diversity is necessary beyond relying on a sense of adequate representation to satisfy the status quo. For instance, with the enactment of a gender appropriated leadership position and limited number diversity initiatives, ICA continues to undermine the need for racial appropriations that can assist more racial minorities in achieving upward mobility beyond their collegiate playing career. As the participants comprise hierarchical positions in ICA that are ideologically preserved for men and whites, they must resist and navigate ideological constructs that undermine their leadership acceptance. Findings from the current study contribute to the debate surrounding ICA’s threshold for access and opportunity by shedding light on ideological confrontations that underrepresented member’s experience (McDowell, Cunningham & Singer, 2009). The marginalization of black women or any social group within ICA is not only unethical, but contradictory to the notion of ICA’s presence as a developmental tool within society.
Limitations and Future Research

Limitations were observed by the complex nature of the current study. Due to the small sample size, the results from the study cannot be generalized to account for the experience of all black women as not all black women have similar experiences. Second, due to the exclusive sampling of black women, the results were not able to capture and compare distinct nuances in experience from other social groups (i.e., white women). Additional research is needed to enhance understanding of intersectionality as a relevant framework to examine black women's experience in ICA as sport leaders and participants. Most of the research concerning intersectionality and identity mainly focuses on their oppressive social function. In doing so, white women’s perspective on matters of race are often left unexamined. In result, white women have not been asked about how they feel their identity influences their experiences as ICA leaders in comparison to racial minorities. Future research efforts should examine the ways in which white women view race and gender within ICA’s organizational culture. As qualitative research efforts offer a voice to members who have been left voiceless, examining the ways in which white women view social issues surrounding race and gender, is imperative as they more prominently serve as executive leaders of ICA administration. Their insight on these complex issues are imperative to understand and will offer a comparable reference when considering experiential differences and similarities between black and white women sport leaders.
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CHAPTER V
EXAMINING THE NEGOTIATIONS OF RACE AMONG BLACK WOMEN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS

Introduction

Due to the prevalent representation of racial minorities in sport, the sporting arena has been deemed as a post-racial institution void of a ‘race’ issue (Hartmann, 2000). This notion of sport aligns with societal beliefs of the athletic arena as a level playing field that purports equity, equality, and opportunity for all (Smith & Hattery, 2011). However, if this were the case there would be greater representation of racial minorities, among other social groups, in leadership and across other sporting ventures beyond football and basketball (Bradbury, 2013; Cunningham, 2010; Smith & Hattery, 2011). Contrary to societal beliefs, among its many hegemonic presumptions, sport culture is recognized as a “contested racial terrain” (Hartman, 2000), that substantiates white supremacy (King, 2005).

Race, traditionally treated as a biological marker for simple categorization of individual differences (Omi & Winant, 2004), is more commonly recognized as a set of ideas and shared beliefs that enhance assumptions of racial differences. In such cases, biological markers, such as skin, hair, and facial features, are instead substantiated as a drive for a social hierarchy. Consistent with an ideological stance, scholars have identified that the social construction of race contributes to hegemonic notions of superiority that leads to social inequities experienced by racial minorities in society (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Feagin, 2006; Omi & Winanat, 2004). Specifically, sport, a microcosm of society (Frey & Eitzen, 1991), is recognized to perpetuate social standings
of race and racism, and induce conversations surrounding its hegemonic social structure of whiteness (Frankenburg, 1993). Ascribed as a meritocratic, equal opportunity organizational entity (Smith & Hattery, 2011), racial minorities are consistently underrepresented and overlooked for advancement in sport (Bradbury, 2013; Cunningham, 2010; Hylton, 2010; Smith & Hattery, 2011). In turn, featured ‘frames’ of post-racial narratives and progressive accounts of sport as a color-blind institution (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Brown et al., 2003), limit the examination of race and racism among racial minority student-athletes and sport leaders (Bimper, 2015; Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Bradbury, 2013; Harrison, Lapchick, & Janson, 2009; Hylton, 2010; Smith & Hattery, 2011).

As such, the current study explores how post-racial discourses influence the perceptions of race and racism for black women sport leaders in the context of intercollegiate athletics (ICA). As paradigms of sport purport that sport organizations operate as color-blind institutions, scholars recognize that their inhabitance of post-racial discourse influences the experiences and perceptions of racial minority’s student-athlete (Bimper, 2015; Miller & Wiggins, 2004; Singer, 2005), and the upward mobility of racial minorities into leadership (Brown et al., 2003; Cunningham, 2010; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Smith & Hattery, 2011). To examine black women’s perceptions of race in context of ICA’s administration, qualitative interviews were conducted and examined through the conceptual framework of whiteness.

**Review of Literature**

In sport, a common examination of whiteness has directed attention to the overwhelming representation of racial minority student-athletes, contrasted by a
predominately white leadership (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). According to Lapchick (2014), black student-athletes are dominantly observed in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I’s most revenue producing sports, football and men’s and women’s basketball at 46.9 percent, 57.6 percent, and 48.4 percent, respectively. In contrast, whites are primarily observed in head coaching positions of men’s sports at 86.8 percent and women's sports at 85.2 percent, and among its athletic administration at 87.7 percent. These numbers are not only stifling, but scholars believe they underscore the contention of ICA as a color-blind institution that perpetuates notions of white privilege (Smith & Hattery, 2011). Black student-athletes are lauded for their athletic prowess (Hartmann, 2000), and whites are positioned to exert their prevailing intellectual capabilities (King, 2005; McDonald, 2005). Even so, people of color often use sport for upward mobility, to challenge and resist society's racial ideology (Hartmann, 2000); however, the ever-present privilege of whiteness in a color-blind enterprise hinders their efforts in attaining equality (King, 2005; Long & Hylton, 2002; Long, Robinson, & Spracklen, 2005).

Specific examinations of whiteness in sport have identified how sport policies (McCann, 2005), ascribed biological differences (Spracklen, 2008), and depictions in the media (Billings, 2004; Harrison & Lawrence, 2004; Hoberman, 1997; Lapchick, 1999) perpetuate whiteness and substantiate white supremacy (Spracklen). For example, in a study conducted to examine how the National Basketball Association’s (NBA) enforcement of a dress code served as an imposition of whiteness, McCann (2005) noted that the policy enacted by white men was exerted to illustrate their control over their predominately black player's culture (McCann, 2005). Considering the lack of black
leadership in the NBA league, decisions are thus created by white leaders are imposed on their predominately black athletes. Similarly, Spracklen (2008) recognized that in an attempt to identify a biological difference to account for black athletes’ success in athletics perpetuated the notion of a racialized difference in sport. In this case, there supposed logical accounts of racial difference between black and white athlete's athletic achievements conflicted with historical perceptions of sport as a development tool for leadership and physicality of whites, and thus needed to be explained (Spracklen, 2008). The same examination was not provided for white athletes. Instead their athletic ability was unquestioned and praised for their hard work (Billings, 2004). Lapchick (1999) even noted that black athletes are more often depicted in the media for their social deviance in comparison to their white counterparts. In all accounts, the cultural exploitation of racial minorities are not observed for whites, and consistent with notions of whiteness, white privilege is instead allowed to remain intact while a racial order persists.

More specifically, the sporting arena has not been able to escape the scrutiny of perpetuating white supremacy (Smith & Hattery, 2011). Whether considering racial privilege in youth sports (Glover, 2007), collegiate coaching (Cunningham, 2010), or athletic administration (Harrison, Lapchick, & Janson, 2009; McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009), whites have consistently been concluded as the privileged social group. Most specifically, McDowell and Cunningham (2007) examined the reasoning for an underrepresentation of racial minorities within ICA’s administration. They found that along with preferential placement of racial minorities for lower hierarchical leadership positions, black administrators were more prone to experience racial discrimination—which limited their ability for advancement. Even though ICA is comprised of numerous
racial and ethnic backgrounds, a discrepancy exists between recruiting racial minority student-athletes and recruiting racial minorities for leadership in ICA's administration. Each year, black student athletes are recruited to ICA’s revenue producing sports, but unfortunately are less often recruited into ICA’s administration in comparison to their white counterparts (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). These findings are problematic because as ICA operates as a color-blind institution, their lack of acknowledgement to race will continue to leave racial minorities underrepresented in leadership (Smith & Hattery, 2011).

**Theoretical Perspective**

'Whiteness'

Race is a two-fold construct that lies between identity and a social structure (Omi & Winant, 2004). Historically reserved as a pseudo-biological reality to rationalize slavery as early as the 20th century (Fields, 1990), race embarked a social reality that served as the basis of differences between members of society that enhance the labeling of 'us' and 'them'—a racialized 'other'—referenced from a white identity (Collins, 2000). The labeling of 'other' creates a dissonance between racial groups and allows for a systematic appropriation of a hierarchical social structure (Omi & Winant). The social hierarchy allows white identity to be normal, standard, leaving nonwhites inferiorly positioned along a racialized continuum for power (Frankenburg, 1993). As scholars turned their analytical lens' onto those in positions of power, the concept of whiteness emerged. Scholars recognized that blackness was deemed as problematic, while whiteness—which perpetuates division of a racialized 'other'—remained unchallenged and invisible (Long & Hylton, 2002; Nebeker, 1998). Due to the dominant power afforded to
whites' hierarchical social positioning, without examination, white privilege is left unchallenged for its superior monopoly and social order (McIntosh, 2012; Sullivan, 2006). To define whiteness, King and Springwood (2001) suggest:

Whiteness is simultaneously a practice, a social space, a subjectivity, a spectacle, an erasure, an epistemology, a strategy, an historical formation, a technology, and a tactic. Of course, it is not monolithic, but in all of its manifestations, it is unified through privilege and the power to name, to represent, and to create opportunity and deny access. (p. 160)

King and Springwood (2001) acknowledged that whiteness is a dynamic concept that helps unpack and challenge the ideological construction of race as 'a way of life'. Focusing on whiteness allows an understanding of how white culture is projected as the norm—a measuring stick (McIntosh, 2012). McIntosh (1990) acknowledged that the racial privilege afforded to whites often goes unnoticed due to its default acceptance of power by whites and nonwhites. As such, a focus on whiteness examines how “white privilege operates unseen, invisible, even seemingly nonexistent” (Sullivan, 2006, p.6). But the guise of whiteness is perpetuated by the dominant notion that we are living in a post-racial society that does not see color, fundamentally color-blind (Bonilla-Silva, 2003), which is problematic for racial minorities (Gines, 2010). As such, Bonilla-Silva (2003) asserts that color-blindness affords whites the deniability of a social hierarchy as they proclaim that society is based on a race neutral meritocracy. In turn, a social structure—residing on the foundation of a racial hierarchy—remains intact and allows for the maintenance of racism by those in power against nonwhites. White culture inherits a privilege that has been deemed unproblematic. In turn, people of color struggle to claim a position of equal merit, especially in sport (Long & Hylton, 2002). To combat these
socially imposed ideological structures requires an acknowledgement of race by those in power, but the existence of whiteness perpetuates a degree of color-blind racism. To fit in, people of color often conform to white norms and alter their language and demeanor, especially in the workplace (Payne & Suddler, 2014). Even though currently there has been an increased presence of racial minorities in leadership positions, Rosette, Leonardelle, and Phillips (2008) observed that there is a strong affinity for white leadership. As more racial minorities enter into leadership positions (Gines, 2010), a white standard for leadership in a color-blind organizational entity places greater pressures on nonwhites to abide by the privileged accretions of whiteness.

Research Design and Methodology

Qualitative research designs are conducted to gain insight into the intersection of personal impressions and social phenomena, such as the perpetuation of ideologies within an organizational culture. To generate an understanding of black women's negotiation and perception of race and racism in ICA, semi-structured qualitative interviews were conducted to capture their unquantifiable accounts of lived experiences (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As an underrepresented population in society and among ICA leadership, it is not often that they are considered as worthy constructors of knowledge (Collins, 2000; Reinhartz, 1993; Stanley & Wise, 1990). Contrarily, the current study sought out black women so their voices could be heard.

Context & Participants

The power afforded to leaders assists in their ability to create change and enhance constructive values that can steer a culture (Schein, 2010). As intercollegiate athletics exists within a larger cultural context that is shaped by societal ideologies, its
composition of leadership is essential to the maintenance and control of its culture. Specifically, the NCAA is separated into three divisions, but Division I institutions are the most visible, revenue producing programs and best represent the culture of ICA as a whole. To explore cultural understandings of race in ICA, the current study consisted of 10 black women executive sport leaders working at predominantly White Division I institutions. Each participant, at the time of the study, served as an executive committee member (i.e. SWA, Compliance, etc.) of a department at their respected institution. Their status as executive leaders enables them to have more decision making authority within the confines of ICA, allowing them to be a part of the hiring process of either coaching staff members or other administrators. Of the ten participants, only three were former student-athletes that made the transition into ICA's administration. Their years of experience serving in an administrator role ranged from one year to twenty five years. As executive leaders each of the women had sport oversight of football, men's or women's basketball.

Data Collection

As the current study is an extension of a previous study related to issues of race, data collection remained the same. I compiled a list of black women in executive leadership positions of all NCAA Division I athletic program ranging from the South to the Southeast region. The interviews were conducted in person or via skype and lasted approximately 45 minutes to an hour. Credibility of the questions were analyzed by a panel of two leisure and sport management scholars and one sociology scholar with a specialty in qualitative research methodology. Before analyses began, member checks were conducted by the researcher to enhance trustworthiness and rigor of method.
(Maxwell, 1992). Responses generated from the qualitative interviews served as the basis for analysis.

Data Analysis

Data analysis extended the representation of experience by constructing relationships and themes from the data (Wolcott, 1994). Analysis was initiated as data was processed into phases of coding. The first phase of coding, called open coding, consisted of an inductive selection of a group of words that seemingly expressed an underlying concept or idea. Next, focused codes were constructed, which results in a reduction of open codes into more operative codes that encapsulate an emerged theme. This allowed the researcher to conceptualize large amounts of data for further analysis (Charmaz & Belgrave, 2002; Creswell, 2009). During the final phase of coding, the researcher compared the emerged themes to current theoretical debates regarding the whiteness and color-blind racism. Based on the findings, the researcher appropriated two major themes, 'I don’t see color' and 'It just so happens'.

Results

Findings from the current study recognize that post-racial discourses have influenced the ways in which the participants’ perceive and account for issues related to race and racism in ICA. Analysis shows a multilevel effect (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000), as an ideological stance on race (macro-level) impacts the perceptions of race and racism for black women sport leaders (micro-level) in ICA’s administration. To present these findings, emergent themes ‘I don’t see color’ and ‘It just so happens' were organized to represent my interpretations of the data.
‘I Don’t See Color’

As persons of color in leadership, a common theme among the participants in regards to race within athletic administration was the notion that ‘I don’t see color’. The participants declared that this approach to leadership was particularly important when observing prominent leadership positions in ICA. Common to each of their responses, notions of color-blindness actually served as one of the basis for many of their social interactions (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). Macy, a SWA, explicitly stated that due to the nature of leadership positions in ICA, it is an injustice to acknowledge racial differences during social interactions. She stated:

My mom told me several years ago, when you’re a position of authority and power, you can’t look at people's faces…so it had to probably be 7 years ago when [I was] in the AD seat. I've always been a leader, but that was a powerful, authoritative position in a male dominated [organization]. I'm dealing with Presidents and going out of the country, and dealing with Chiefs of Staffs'. So I took that and put it in my repertoire, so I don’t see the differences. It's almost like I got blinders on.

Represented by Macy’s statement, many of the participant’s echoed the assertion of how notions of color-blindness are crucial features of leadership, due to the constant engagement in social interactions afforded by ICA. She references an inability to “look at people’s faces” and to “not see the differences”, to underscore how race is a matter that simply should not be considered in order to be successful. To support these claims many of the women discussed how diversity efforts in ICA are implemented to embrace these color-blind properties. Cocoa, a Director of Academic Advising, reflected on how diversity efforts can actually become counterintuitive to the hiring process. Accounting for diversity, she declared:
I've had to reflect and make my hiring decisions on diversity going the other way. Currently, I have an all-African American staff, you know, we're not an HBCU. And I had to think about the implications of that. And you know how would it be seen by our coaching staff, how would it be accepted by our student athletes? But in the end, I had to make the decision. I'm going to hire the best people. Doesn’t matter what color they are, what their nationality they are, it doesn’t matter. I'm going to hire the best people.

In Cocoa’s explanation of the importance of diversity within athletics, she depicted the counterproductive notions race plays in the hiring process. She pointed out that at a Historically Black College or University (HBCU), there is not only a greater presence, but also a greater acceptance of racial minorities. Her comment represented an implicit affinity for whites in Non-HBCU’s, even though she does not see color. In the end, she feels the need to justify her hiring by saying “I’m going to hire the best people” regardless of their demographics, which was consistently mirrored by all of the participants. Particularly, Stacy, a Director of External Operations, asserted:

I was raised to see people as people and not you know like, you guys are white and we're black. I wasn't raised that way. So it's kind of hard for me to conceptualize because when I think about people as people I think we’re equal.

Based on the above quote it should be noted that it was difficult for Stacy to even appropriate an answer. While she stated that she did not see a difference, she declared that “there are ignorant people out there that are still definitely racist and sexist.” Like Stacy, most of the women agreed to the notion that “we are equal” to that of men, women, and other racial minorities while navigating the organizational terrain of ICA. But while accounts of equality and lack of value placed on color were declared, the
women reluctantly noted that racial minorities experience greater limitations and barriers
than nonwhites.

'It Just So Happens'

The emergent theme of ‘It just so happens’ resonated with the women’s
acknowledgement that while they do not adhere to a valuation of color, they recognized
the contradicting accounts of ICA as a color-blind institution. Consistent with notions of
color-blindness, the participants often offered opposing overt and covert accounts for
racial differences among leadership experiences (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). In response to
direct questions related to race's influence on experience, some of the participants
diverted away from racial accusations and instead reflected on how meritocracy and
happenstance hiring processes generated a dominant presence of whites over nonwhites
in ICA. But even more accounts of the hegemonic functions of whiteness were depicted
to explain how ICA’s operation as a color-blind institute has limited the upward mobility
of racial minorities. In support of a meritocratic structure, Stacy, a Director of External
Operations contended:

I don’t think this was an approach that was decided. Yes, we’re only going
to hire white males, but it just happened that, when you look around 10
years later. That is what you have or you have a mixture of [white]
women.

The comment provided by Stacy suggests that she believes that the dominant
presence of whites in leadership positions just happened to be that way. Implicit in her
comment is a dismissive account of racism that leads to the limitation of racial minorities
from entering into ICA leadership positions. In contrast, Toni, a Senior Associate AD
discussed how she encountered racism when discussing hiring practices with a collegiate
board member who observed the abundance of black leaders emerging among a university’s coaching staff. She retorted:

[He said] Well you have enough people that look like you now. [Her inclination:] So it’s okay for you white people to have as many white people on staff but you have four black people out of 100 that just happen to hold top level positions and now it’s a problem. So, [they] think it’s fine when its one way, but it’s not fine when it’s another and it doesn’t favor them, as the people in power.

Toni’s specific interaction represented how the increased presence of racial minorities in leadership can be deemed problematic. She added that normally coaches and athletic administrators are white, but when the roles are comprised of racial minorities their presence is questioned. Toni's encounter, while isolated, reflected many of the participant’s subconscious beliefs regarding the upward mobility of racial minorities. In effect of these decisions, the participants noted that when decisions are made regarding hiring, a divergence from student-athlete to leadership exists and advances as a racial issue in ICA’s organizational culture. Laura, a Senior Associate AD, specifically referenced that leadership in athletics often does not reflect the demographics of student-athletes recruited. She proclaimed:

The decisions we make end up disenfranchising certain groups, or we say, we want all the black boys to run fast to play basketball, football. But when it's time to figure out who coaches them, it’s not a lot of people who look like them, there’s not a lot of people in the room, giving them instruction. On top of that, the people who are hiring the coaches, they don’t look like them. Or the people who hire the people, they don’t look like them.

She pointed out that ICA has a paradigmatic system that preserves white leadership within athletics. Many of the participants echoed Laura's statements by recognizing that while many of their athletic rosters comprised racial minorities, there are
very few racial minorities that make the transition from student-athlete to coach. Specifically, Laura supported Toni’s claims of how leadership structures do not reflect the same demographics as of those for whom they make decisions. From coach to Athletic Director to University President, many of the participants stated "they don't look like them" to suggest that while most of the stakeholders they are making decisions for, leadership consistently places whites in the room "to give them instruction". Laura elaborated:

We just hired a new head coach, football coach, almost a year ago. And we said it about him, man I want him to do well. Because when you're black and you don’t get it done the first time, you don’t get another chance. You could have great integrity, be a great family man, and know the game. If you don’t win... we were trying to think, me and my boss [of] a coach who seemed to have everything going for him, just didn’t win. Did they get another chance? We still haven’t come up with anybody. And that’s crazy. But you can have a white coach, cheat on their wife, on the NCAA, whatever, do this, national news, and they’ll get a better job.

Laura’s implication of a racial capital among coaches implicates racial undertones in ICA's organizational culture of whiteness that is left unchallenged due to an overarching perpetuation on color-blindness.

**Discussion**

For the current study, a multilevel analysis (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000) of post-racial discourses was explored to understand its influence on individual experiences and perceptions of race and racism among black women sport leaders in ICA. Analyzed through the conceptual framework of whiteness and the tenets of color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2003), the results illustrate how post-racial assumptions in ICA perpetuate white supremacy, even by its members that do not benefit from its ideological hold. The
post-racial narratives of the participants were explored against the backdrop of ICA as a color-blind institution. In all, the generated themes of "I don't see color" and "It just so happens", while contradicting, emerged to reflect the complex nature of race perceived by the participants. A salient finding observed from the study was the color-blind tendencies the participant’s inhabit that resulted in their contradicting accounts of race and racism as perpetuated by ICA.

In the section ‘I don’t see color’, a common theme amongst the participants was the lack of acknowledgement on race as a mediator of their decision making and social interactions. Macy’s declared notion that she, among others ‘do[es] not see differences’ is especially powerful when considering the demographic makeup of leadership within ICA, which is white. For a black woman to enter into a professional, white male dominated workplace, she exemplifies the complex assumptions for the understanding of social hierarchies of individuals who “occupy multiple social groups simultaneously” and “are inclined (or disinclined) to acknowledge their own experiences of social privilege.” (Rosette & Tost, 2013, p. 1421). As a black woman who does not see color in a leadership position biased to whiteness (Rosette, Leonardelle, & Phillips, 2008), her unacknowledged account of color—while socially appropriate—complicates the notion of social inequities experienced by nonwhites who seek upward mobility in a color-blind institution.

As such, in Cocoa’s explanation of the importance of diversity within athletics, she depicts the complex nature of hiring in an organizational culture coerced to not see color. Reflecting on organizational by-laws and federal legislation regarding the importance of diversity within the NCAA, her acknowledgement of white privilege
within the athletic arena, made her hesitantly question the implications of hiring another racial minority into the department. In the end, she relied on the incentive of ‘hiring the best person’ that just happened to be black. While African American’s are reported to be most concentrated within Academic Advising (Lapchick, 2014; McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009), the spotlighting nature of her statement depicts the normalization of hiring whites and having to strategically justify the hiring of racial minorities (Rosette, Leonardelli, & Phillips, 2008) in ICA. As she proclaimed, she had to consider “diversity going the other way”, which features the contradictory sentiment of hiring blacks in a white dominated, supposed race neutral industry (Cox & Nkomo, 1990). And lastly, Stacy’s reference to equality in saying, “we’re equal”, supports the notion of abstract liberalism, one of Bonilla-Silva’s (2003) key points of color-blind racism. Abstract liberalism resides in the liberal principle of equal opportunity and freedom of choice as an account to explain racial matters. Recognizing that racism and sexism are “definitely” preserved in society, many of the women purported that equal opportunity and meritocratic structures account for everyone’s upward mobility. There accounts of color-blindness, in a social institution reticent to racial discourse, diminish the opportunities to confront facets of whiteness that perpetuate a culture of white supremacy (Bonilla-Silva, 2003).

While the participants asserted that they do not see color, they acknowledged that race and racism are inconspicuously embedded in ICA culture. Consistent with notions of color-blind racism, in 'It just so happens', the women provided accounts of institutional racism (Hylton, 2010). Contradicting to their strong beliefs of ICA as a meritocratic institution, they specifically highlight notions of cognitive dissonance when discussing
their perceptions of racial capital between student-athletes and white privilege in ICA (Brown et al, 2003). In turn, the most common observation provided by analysis was their complicity with whiteness. Specifically, many of the participants adhered to notions of the naturalization ‘frame’ in color-blind racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2003), that is used to rationally justify accounts of racial phenomena as a natural occurrence. For example, Stacy suggested that ‘It just so happens’ that there was a prominence of whiteness in leadership. Similarly, when highlighting that the hiring process just so happens to showcase an affinity for white leaders, Laura references the cyclical occurrence in hiring that perpetuates how natural the social hierarchy surrounding whiteness persists. Also, in Laura’s statement, and ascribed to by other women, were the covert and overt perpetuations of white supremacy, as referenced by Laura and Toni. Laura’s account of white privilege rooted in the lack of people on the hiring committee that “don’t look like [the student-athletes]. Toni, on the other hand, retorted how while as an uncommon occurrence, institutionalized practices that are different from the norm may place limitations on the upward mobility of racial minorities in sport (Feagin, 2006; Scott, 2001).

In result, cultural practices such as the increased hiring of racial minorities, which can be perceived as going against the ‘norm’ or standard way to doing things must then be justified and challenged. Lastly, Laura reflected on the lack of second chances observed by black coaches in comparison to white coaches. Aligned with the findings of Dovidio and Gaertner (2000), regarding averse racism, whites are often observed to be more privileged when compared to racial minorities. And as white privilege remains unchallenged, an affinity for white leadership will consistently leave racial minorities
overlooked. Explaining that the same appropriations among hiring practices for whites are not observed for racial minorities, the emerged assumption in this section is that “It just so happens” illustrates the passive nature of the women’s accounts regarding white privilege in ICA.

**Conclusion**

The current study sought out to understand how perceptions of race and racism are embedded in the organizational culture of ICA that allows for the underrepresentation of racial minorities from leadership positions. Findings from the study revealed that a multilevel effect (Kozlowski & Klein, 2000) of race and racism operated at two primary levels. At the macro-level, the participants noted that ICA has consistently operated as a color-blind institution that ultimately leads to the perpetuation of whiteness. As whiteness operates unseen, it is often left unchallenged for its superior hold that ultimately accounts for the inferior positioning of racial minorities (King & Springwood, 2001). For instance, as white leaders are consistently observed in dominant leadership positions the privileges afforded to whiteness, creates a subtle hierarchy over racial minorities. The hierarchy is soft, and is imposed non-violently. In turn, racial minorities are not able to objectively account for their hierarchical positioning due to their embraced notions of whiteness as the standard (McIntosh, 2012). To support these claims the women offer accounts of the ways whiteness, color-blind racism, and institutional practices all lean in the favor of whiteness, and leave racial minorities disadvantaged.

Contradicted by their claims of ICA as a hegemonic institution, the women consistently stated that they do not see color, and are essentially color-blind. Scholarship surrounding color blindness have examined the ways access and opportunity are depicted
to deny racial bias (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee & Browne, 2000), and decree their basis of merit to undermine implications of racial inequality (Bonilla-Silva, Lewis, & Embrick, 2004). Consistent with these assertions, the post-racial narratives of race by the participants acknowledges their complicity with white supremacy and exemplifies the power of an ideology. If racial minorities deny the presence of a racial hierarchy afforded to race in ICA’s organizational culture, the ability to counteract hegemonic interruptions of superiority will continue. Declaring that they do not see color, but perceive distinctions in racial experiences between whites and racial minorities, the participants reinforce facets of an ideological social structure. Considering that racial minorities benefit the least from a perpetuated social hierarchy, their adherence to post-racial discourse disrupts the ability to challenge its hegemonic hold in ICA. And while operated as a level playing field in an institution that incites relevance of a contested racial terrain (Hartmann, 2000), its implications of whiteness will continue to perpetuate a degree of discrimination observed by racial minorities as student athletes and among its leadership (Cunningham & Singer, 2010).

In all, athletics is observed to offer equal opportunities and access to all, but narratives from the participants confirm the presence of oppressive functions based on race that perpetuate notions of whiteness. In ICA, overt forms of racism are not as common within the workplace due to legislative enactments that obliterate its tolerance. Instead, the participants note that they observe that their racial backing enlists more subtle forms of discrimination (Bonilla-Silva, 2003). As functions of race are implicitly and explicitly negotiated at the individual level of experience, the participants showed that in order to ‘fit in’, they must embattle situational instances where whiteness is
privileged in a color blind institution that diminishes the influence of a racial hierarchy (Brown et al., 2003). In turn, the ability for racial minorities to achieve upward mobility in ICA may be twice as hard, as they also have to endure an upheld ideological imbalance from racial minorities already in leadership.

**Implications**

Implications from the current study should direct attention to the importance of addressing issues surrounding race and racism within ICA institutional practices. While the assertions of color-blind racism alleviate pressures for discussion of race and racism, it also perpetuates the existence of racial dichotomies in favor of whites. While ICA, in general, has been observed to exploit many of its stakeholders, especially its black student-athletes, more attention should be paid to the discrepancies experienced by racial minorities in order to produce counter measures that increase the chances of equal opportunity. Specifically, an increase in initiatives for student-athletes to garner leadership skills in sport is crucial. To actually level the playing field, appropriations should be made to ensure that racial minorities have increased opportunities for leadership development initiatives beginning at the youth level. The ability for all sport participants to have an opportunity to experience upward mobility beyond their playing careers should not be overlooked. Overall, until sport leaders acknowledge that institutional practices that privilege whites leads to the underrepresentation of, equally if not more qualified racial minorities, ICA will never be a level playing field.

**Limitations**

Not uncommon to social science explorations, limitations were observed. The small sample size of participants limits the generalizability of the study’s findings and
should be interpreted as isolated to the current study. Bimper (2015) examined the implications of color-blind racism among black male intercollegiate student athletes and found the relevance of Bonilla-Silva’s (2003) post-racial narrative frames. The current study sought to continue the conversation of color-blind racism by looking at ICA’s administration. To expand influence of post-racial narratives in sport culture, future research efforts should seek to include black female student-athletes. Also, similar discussions with whites and other racial minority groups should be explored regarding their experiences and perceptions of race within ICA’s administration. Lastly, while adhering to only a few mentions within the current study, University presidents and athletic program stakeholders’ regard to race and racism within ICA should also be explored to extend the conversation about ‘race in sport in higher education’.
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CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Given the underrepresentation of black women executive leaders within society and ICA, it is not uncommon for their experiences and voice on sociological issues to be overlooked and unexplored (Collins, 2000). For instance, gendered assumptions are often based on white women's experiences, and notions of racial discrimination are examined from the standpoint of black men. Knowing this, I sought to gauge the perceptions and understandings of black women from black women's standpoint (Collins, 2000). Specifically, in an attempt to extend current scholarship regarding nuances in experience and their perceptions of experiences in result of their identity were explored. The previous articles (Chapters 4 and 5) were based on transcribed data generated from ten black women in executive leadership positions of ICA's administration. Essentially, their perceptions of the ways in which gender and race influence their experiences based on ICA’s organizational culture were analyzed.

Sport, a prominent social institution, perpetuates hegemonic assumptions of social constructs that allow gender and racial hierarchies to be constructed and negotiated (Connell, 1998; Hartmann, 2000). These assertions served as the guiding force for data analysis that lead to the development of the two articles. In the first article, Chapter Four, my research question sought to explore the ways black women perceive their intersectionality to influence their experiences as sport leaders in ICA. Relevant to discussions of sport's influence on a gender hierarchy, the confluent nature of black women's race and gender were examined. My second article, Chapter Five, was contrived from the responses observed by the participants regarding race within ICA while
discussing their intersectionality. As the women discussed how they perceived race to be a mediating factor of ICA culture, I realized that they also contended race to be inconspicuously visible. I constructed each article to engage the perceptions of black women on social topics that not only influenced their experiences, but incite the importance of expanding current research frames regarding gender and race in ICA.

While sport offers great benefits to all of its participants and stakeholders, it also serves host to many of society's ideological stances that enhance social hierarchies. Deemed as a hegemonic organizational entity, sport invokes social practices that force women and racial minorities into positions of subordination and inferiority (Cunningham, 2010). For black women, possessed with an identity that subjects to a gender social hierarchy, they also must negotiate an ideological racial hierarchy. In result, while responses related to gender and race were significant to the perception of experience, their racial identity proved as a more salient fixture (Settles, 2006). My findings showed that even when faced with gendered stereotypes regarding emotional display, unequal power privileges, and stereotypical leadership qualities, the women also negotiate the influence of a racial ideology that leaves them marginalized.

**Intersectionality**

As intersectionality offers an experiential lens that lends insight to gendered and racial social sensitivities, the results highlight the complex nature of conceptualizing their experience due to the devices of one single category or another. As ICA's organizational culture complicates the upward mobility of women due to its cultural manifestations of hegemonic masculinity, black women may find it difficult to pinpoint which identity source contextually mediates oppressive interactions beyond the accounts of sexism
mainly ascribed to by white women. My study only examined nuances of experience related to gender and race, but as individuals possess numerous identity constructs that are hierarchically understood by society, more research is needed to understand their experience.

Complications observed in this study stemmed from the complex nature of examining intersectionality. Bowleg (2008) has consistently pointed out the counterproductive accounts of studying intersectionality specifically, as intersectionality is not an additive assumption. Moving beyond theory and actually understanding that intersectionality is an experience, it should be noted that it was very difficult for many of the participants to distinguish which facet of their identity attributed to different accounts of their oppression. Specifically, as observed in the current study, the women often used ‘black’, ‘woman’, and ‘black woman’ interchangeably, even though they mainly labeled themselves as black women. I believe that their distinct labeling, while not examined in the current study, can inform contextual implications of the ways they feel that any one of their identity facets must be outwardly expressed in order to conform or hurdle over particular ideological instances. For example, while one participant discussed being called upon to take minutes at a committee meeting, she stated that it was because she was a woman. However, later while identifying how her colleagues would speak over her during departmental meetings, she blamed these encounters on her race. Even though the interchangeable nature of their identity as being tentatively dissectionable, they must still rely on their holistic ‘black woman’ status—which complicates notions of their experiences as being exclusively informed by a single construct (Settles, 2006). For
future purposes, I feel that more substantive conversations will be observed when questions broadly center on contextual accounts of their experiences.

Overall, the current study allowed me to recognize the essentiality of implementing intersectionality as a conceptual framework when examining black women’s experiences in ICA’s workplace as leaders. Their experiences and perceptions served as a reflection of the way they view the world and the ways societal members view them, based on the confluent nature of their identity. While specifically looking at only two facets of their identity, it was obvious that they must negotiate the manner in which the world perceives their identity, and how their black woman individuality accounts for nuances in their individual experiences from other black women. All women are not the same, and all black women are not the same. Even so, I still believe that black women’s experiences do and will differ from white women and all other racial minority women, especially in regards to the workplace. As current gendered research frames are generalized to all women, they actually complicate the examination of socially oppressive and uplifting accounts that different social groups observe. Until we can actually account for individual differences as being a valued asset, the importance of highlighting nuances in experience will continue to persist in order to create counterproductive measures that need to be set in place.

**Whiteness**

In extension to the discussions generated regarding the women’s intersectionality, the second article was the result of their responses based on race and racism within ICA. As black women in executive leadership positions, they discussed how they do not see color, but they recognize how ICA operates as a color-blind entity. These findings
highlight the power of whiteness within the confines of ICA that racial minorities not only adhere to, but also embrace, even though it serves as no benefit to them. Possessed with a personal proclivity to not see color, they too operate as being color-blind, which inadvertently perpetuates white supremacy. The nature of sport culture shows an affinity for white men in leadership positions (Cunningham, 2010), who are allowed to maintain their power through an ideological value of “whiteness”. As whiteness continues to operate invisibly by those in power and be embraced by racial minorities, racial minorities will continue to be limited from advancement.

Only recently has there been an increased visibility of racial minorities to enter into leadership positions, but these opportunities are largely controlled by a culture that perpetuates whiteness. As there is a systemic account of racism that exists within society and ICA, more work will be needed to counteract hegemonic holds of white privilege. Also, until a greater valuation for diversity is observed beyond moral grounds, racial minorities will not achieve the same degree of advancement as observed by whites due to white privilege (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). As a black woman, I even found myself recognizing the power of a racial ideology that is so easy to overlook when uncritically operating in a culture that is considered to be meritocratic. Particularly, in the current study, the women recognized that there is a major discrepancy between minority student-athlete participation numbers and minority leadership representation, but the idea of this being the norm limits questioning. As such, I felt it necessary to consider what life for them would be like if they were to ask, challenge, or reject, currently accepted cultural norms within ICA’s organizational culture? I fear that they would see drastic changes in their experiences, become isolated from their colleagues, or even worse,
eventually lose their jobs? Society and the culture of ICA have a greater toleration for
gendered appropriations, but due to post-racial narratives, those in power have
consistently been observed to undermine and overlook the oppressive function of race.
To me, the women’s lack of acknowledgement to the presence of whiteness is code for I
don’t see color and I won’t treat others differently due to our differences. But, I will have
to do what needs to be done in order to continue to ‘fit in’.

As race is socially constructed, it accounts for a unique social experience by those
who have been ‘raced’. The same accounts of race and racism that are being observed in
society, are also reflected by members of dominant social institutions. In this case, as
ICA serves as a prominent social institution, many of its ideological stances impact the
experiences of its underrepresented members. The only way to counteract these issues is
the effect of those in power to actually acknowledge that a power structure exists that
may create particular biases towards certain group members. Similarly, an institutional
cultural change is warranted where more attention is paid to the educational abilities of
racial minorities, more so than their athletic capacity. A cultural change should not only
be brought to the forefront by racial minorities. It should not only be up to racial
minorities to consistently address these issues in isolation, but when they stop
recognizing that an issue exists, the power structure will remain intact.

In all, the results from both studies exemplify the importance of including black
women's voices on matters beyond gender, but also race. An examination of black
women's intersectionality suggests that research exclusively conducted on gender
excludes intersectional accounts of identity that substantiate nuances in experience.
Moving beyond gender, race proved to be a salient feature to black women's experiential
lens, especially within context of ICA. Similarly, the angle of vision afforded by color-blindness that perpetuates whiteness within ICA is harmful to nonwhites. But when accepted as the norm, whiteness can limit racial minorities’ opportunities for upward mobility and remain overlooked by leaders that can change its allowance. Both studies contribute to research frames that seek to highlight and deconstruct hegemonic notions that perpetuate unjust social hierarchies.

My Journey as a Scholar

Seeing that I am an emerging scholar, the current research study was a first in many ways. A new way of thinking about concepts and a new way to examine concepts based on lived experiences. Until now, I have never had the opportunity to intentionally interact with someone in hopes of garnering their perspective on such sensitive topics, in hopes of shedding the results with society..or anyone who decides to read my results. As such, this study employed a qualitative research method. In result, the reflexive nature afforded to a semi-structured interview and subsequent analyses have enhanced my understanding of its importance.

Semi-Structured Interviews

From initial development of the current study, I knew that I wanted to employ a qualitative method to enhance the study’s ability to allow black women a chance to offer their personal accounts and perceptions of experience. Early on, I knew that the sensitive nature of topics afforded to race, gender, sexism, and racism are difficult to measure objectively, therefore, a quantitative research design would not have been as useful to gather nuanced accounts of their experiences. Also, to steer away from a more formal social interaction that was based on a strict set of questions, a semi-structured interview
was used to allow the women more ‘open’ opportunities where they could steer away from my sometimes guided direction. In fact, this type of dialogue was often encouraged so that the participants could feel that they were included in the meaning-making process (Reinharz, 1992). This approach proved to be beneficially especially when they felt their narrative would enrich our interaction.

Particularly, as black women are not often sought for their opinions, the current study was especially important to allow for their voices to be heard (Collins, 2000). As a black woman myself, I feel that the women were more comfortable speaking with me regarding the current issues, once they realized that I too was a black woman. I feel that this played a role in the responses that were generated, as they often referred to me as “sister girl” and made statements, such as “YOU know what I mean”. These statements made me feel that they were comfortable. But just as I can state that the women were probably comfortable with me knowing our similar cultural background, I do feel that a greater rapport between myself and the participants could have produced even better data results. In turn, as the current study examined issues that require a holistic approach and understanding, I feel that day to day interactions would be necessary. I believe that more consistent communication allowed between us would not only allow me to hear, but also see what they feel occurs in ICA’s organizational culture that can be oppressive and/or uplifting. Knowing this, while unconsidered for the current study due to time constraints, future analyses of these cultural issues would be further enlightened by an ethnographic research design (Wolcott, 2009). An ethnographic research design would allow me to immerse myself in the culture of ICA and develop a more relevant understanding of its
contextual influences. Even so, I believe the current study has afforded great insight into social matters that often go unnoticed.

**Contributions**

As Title IX allowed for an exponential increase in participation for women, researchers have pointed out that racial minorities, especially black women have not experienced the same benefits as white women (Conrad, Dixson, & Sloan-Green, 2014). While an overarching inclusion for women ignites praise, the startling limitations observed by racial minorities highlight the notion that more work needs to be done in regards to ‘equal opportunity’. Implications of research related to women often exclude limitations based on other facets of identity that leave women that possess intersectional identities underrepresented (Collins, 2000). As intersectionality accounts for race, social class, religious beliefs, among other identity facets, which are subjected to social injustices by their inferior social status, greater in-depth examinations are warranted. Utilization of an intersectional framework sought to explore distinct experiential nuances that harbor a degree of dissonance from an exclusive gendered assumption. While looking at gender and race for black women, nuances in experience based on racial and gendered expectations were highlighted, which extends current gendered research frames. Considering the organizational structure of ICA, the SWA is the only position that has been deemed to consider systemic instances of inequality based on gender. Enveloped to ensure that women receive the same benefits from their sport participation to that of men, there is no position that examines the implications of racial inequality.

As such, my current research highlights instances in experience that move beyond gendered appropriations to include race within ICA. Perplexed with gendered
assumptions of inferiority, race also serves as a barrier for men and women that seek to enter into the leadership of ICA. Additionally, as the women expressed accounts that reflected an acceptance of whiteness, it is important for an increase in diversity initiatives that are not tolerant, but are reactive to the importance of diversity among ICA leadership (Fink & Pastore, 1999). Particularly, a cultural shift is needed within ICA that centers on the educational opportunities for racial minorities that will eventually allow them to be eligible for diverse representation (McDowell, Cunningham, & Singer, 2009). Bimper (2015) pointed out that many racial minorities are forced to complete specific degree programs in order to remain eligible for athletic competition. This is problematic and creates a cyclical issue, as once done with eligibility, many racial minorities may actually be entering career fields that are of little interest and limit their career opportunities. To counteract this imbalance, the educational system should create greater appropriations that allow women and racial minorities to learn of the vast array of career opportunities within the sport field beyond being a student-athlete starting in middle school. Also, more stringent protocols should be set in place to ensure that student-athletes are not only passing, but exceed current accepted measures for athletic eligibility. If organized sport participation continues to align with the educational system, a call to expand knowledge of current career opportunities and raise educational requirements is necessary. When education meets opportunity, only those who are well prepared beyond a foreclosed outlook on athletic participation can meet the demands for leadership and beyond (Lally & Kerr, 2005).
Implications for Future Research

By offering insight to the experiential understanding of race, gender, and intersectionality the current work seeks to contribute to feminist, racial identity scholarship that examines the dynamic nuances of gender and race among leadership for black women athletic administrators. Based on findings from the current study, I sought to extend current gendered research frames as they pertain to the sport industry.

Generalizations of experience for women too often do not consider cultural values associated with other identity constructs including race, sexuality, and religion, among others. Therefore, the current study is believed to be the first step in a series of research efforts that will examine distinctions in experience that stem from gendered research frames within the sport industry. Explicitly observed from the conversations between myself and the participants, race also has a distinct degree of separation for black women that is often unexplored in gendered research. Understanding that while still a woman, race also played a major factor in the ways they interacted, lead, and negotiate their identity within an organizational culture that is mainly white and male (McDowell & Cunningham, 2009). Limitations and instances of uplift provided by black women's intersectionality in ICA is crucial to highlight for future leaders that may enter into the profession. As such, issues related to how intersectionality influences leadership style and role congruity within ICA need to be explored. Considering researchers have observed that preferential treatment is experienced based on gender inequality, the influence of race can extend these research frames and highlight the ways in which black women's intersectionality may actually be a benefit to ICA.
Leadership Style

The concept of leadership styles has been heavily examined in terms of addressing differences between men and women in leadership positions. In short, an efficient leader has been identified to possess a transformational leadership style. Transformational leaders possess an ability to inspire their followers and contribute to organizational goals (Eagly & Carli, 2003). But dichotomized gender roles have been ascribed to men and women leaders as either being agentic or communal, respectively. Even though examinations of the transformational leadership style have identified women as being more prominent transformational leaders due to their communal gender roles, men are more accepted in leadership positions due to their ascribed agentic qualities (Eagly & Carli, 2003). In result, the consistent gender role stereotype has limited women from being accepted into executive leadership positions. Where gendered research centered on women has consistently been used to generalize its findings to all women, little research has been conducted on how racial influence complicates current findings. A generalized view diminishes ethnic-cultural differences among all women. Specifically, an emerged focus on women serving in leadership positions neglects an examination of Black women in leadership (Parker & Ogilvie, 1996; Rosser-Mims, 2010). Theories surrounding leadership hypothesize gender differences in leadership styles between men and women, and neglect other sources of identity. Traditionally, leadership has been developed and structured from the image of White men (Nkomo, 1992). As the sport industry ascribes hegemonic masculine tendencies, exploration of leadership differences beyond gender, but also race are important to consider. As more
black women enter into the professional arena, an exploration of their leadership style using an intersectional analysis is crucial.

*Role Congruity Theory*

Similarly, as women have been ascribed gender roles based on biological sex differences, more research is needed to understand the ways in which their intersectionality extends current gender role frames. Gender roles influence the social lives of men and women and mediate acceptance of behavior in the family, workplace, and as leaders. Role congruity theory, an extension of social role theory, centers on the influence of the gender and its interaction with other socially constructed roles, such as leadership (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Perceptions of gender and leadership congruity are observed to lead to prejudice and discrimination of women based on the social construction of gender roles. In the athletic arena, role congruity theory has been linked to the explanation for women’s lack of upward mobility into leadership roles. For example, Tiell, Dixon and Lin (2012) examined the roles and tasks of the SWA in a longitudinal progress report. They observed a discrepancy in roles and tasks between the SWA and the AD exist, where SWA’s expressed deficient experience in areas of budgetary planning and management over the men's programs. As exclusion in budgetary planning and management over the men's program limits their upward mobility and highlighted the sex typing of leadership positions within ICA limitations in their upward mobility were observed. Considering black women not only deal with gendered appropriations but also race, more research is needed to examine how their intersectionality may also halt or stimulate their upward mobility.
Overall, the highlighted research projects will hopefully expand current frames of experience that showcase the importance of how identity greatly influences experiences and perceptions in ICA and society. As more racial minorities seek to enter into the sport field, it is important for them to understand how ideological constraints based on identity may have to be managed and negotiated. Similarly, it is important to explore how an extension of gendered research frames can highlight the benefits of intersectionality within a diverse organizational institution. Specifically, for current sport managers, these research efforts should assist in initiating dialogue on how immoral current cultural practices can limit the upward mobility of qualified individuals due to dated ideological stances.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Interview Prompt and Questions

You have been asked to participate in a research study centered on the experiences of black women in athletic administration. The title of this project is: An Exploration of Black Women's Intersectional Identity in the Context of Athletic Administration. Essentially, my research project will be used to provide further insight into the organizational structure and culture of intercollegiate athletics for black women. Only black women athletic directors have been asked to participate in this study. If you agree to participate in this study, you were sent a corresponding e-mail so that we can set up an interview date and time that best fits your schedule, along with potential interview questions. The interview will be audio recorded with your consent, and will only last 45 minutes to an hour in length. If you do not consent to be recorded, I will manually take notes of the interview. No risks are likely to occur from participating in this study.

There are no anticipated direct benefits to you for participating; however, your participation in the study will benefit other African-American women, other minority women who seek these positions, or for those who seek minority women for these positions.

All data were handled for confidentiality. In order to ensure confidentiality, your name will not be recorded in the interview or recorded on any documents. Instead, a pseudonym will be used in exchange of your name and the name of any persons that are stated in the interview. Only me, the primary investigator, will know the true identity of the people. Additionally in the write up, I will leave out any descriptors that would indicate your identity. So let's get started:

Please describe how you became involved in ICA. First Job (all jobs)

Can you tell me what type of relationship have you had with your mentors/bosses/leadership/peers?

Okay, let's switch gears a little:
Definition of culture: symbols, mottos, policies, procedures, interactions, traditions (unofficial).

Based on the definition how would you define your experience within ICA?

Suppose I am unfamiliar, how would you describe Division I ICA culture? In comparison to other workplaces, how does ICA compare?

Do you feel that any social structures in ICA limit your upward mobility in athletics?

What is the value of diversity?

Do you want to be an AD? If so, what steps have you taken to reach this goal?
What is the essence of a woman? Man? How do we learn differences? Do you see this is in your work responsibilities?

If you could change the culture, what would you do?

Would be academics like, what would fundraising, marketing, do you think there would be there would be any changes?

Do you consider yourself to be an outsider? Do you feel that your experiences differ because you are a black woman?

What is white culture, what is black culture?

Have you ever felt like your identity served as a source for success or created complications for your role as a leader?

Can you give me some examples of any beneficial/harmful experiences you've had?

How do you navigate/manage your experiences?

Do you think about race/gender have influenced your experiences? Separately or combined?

What would it be like to have more black women in charge?

Is there anything else you would like to add about your experiences as a leader in AA?
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