

St. Cloud State University

theRepository at St. Cloud State

Culminating Projects in Kinesiology

Department of Kinesiology

5-2021

Effective Athletic Administration: Leadership Characteristics, Theories and Shortcomings in Collegiate Athletic Administration

Brandon Snoberger

brandon.snoberger@go.stcloudstate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/pess_etds

Recommended Citation

Snoberger, Brandon, "Effective Athletic Administration: Leadership Characteristics, Theories and Shortcomings in Collegiate Athletic Administration" (2021). *Culminating Projects in Kinesiology*. 12. https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/pess_etds/12

This Starred Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Kinesiology at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in Culminating Projects in Kinesiology by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact tdsteman@stcloudstate.edu.

**Effective Athletic Administration:
Leadership Characteristics, Theories and Shortcomings in Collegiate Athletic
Administration**

by

Brandon M. Snoberger

Starred Paper

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
St. Cloud State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Science
in Leadership in Athletic Administration

May, 2021

Committee members:
Trista Olson, Chairperson
Steven McCullar
Brandon Johnson

Abstract

The purpose of this paper was to examine the research on intercollegiate athletic administration to identify effective leadership strategies for athletic administrators, evaluate the shortcomings present in collegiate athletic administration, and determine the gaps in athletic administration research to present areas for future research. Research has evaluated the effect various leadership traits, behaviors, and theories have on athletic administrative effectiveness. There are also some significant gaps in the literature. The underrepresentation of women and minorities in collegiate athletic administration has yet to be fully evaluated. This paper set out to review the literature on collegiate athletic administration and examine the gaps in collegiate athletic administration. Findings of this paper indicated that both transformational and transactional leadership had impacts on outcome variables in collegiate athletic administration. Servant leadership was found to improve the ethical climate of an institution, which is especially important in collegiate athletics in the 21st century. Future research should be continued to address the barriers to employment for minority individuals, examine women in leadership positions in athletic administration, and evaluate the impact athletic administration has on the student-athlete experience at the DIII level.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	5
Research Questions	8
2. Literature Review	9
Traits of Athletic Administrators and Their Impact on Effectiveness	9
Leader Behavior of Athletic Administrators and Their Impact on Effectiveness	9
Leadership Theories of Athletic Administrators and Their Impact on Athletic Organizations	10
Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership	10
Transformational and Transactional Leadership in Athletic Administration	12
Leader-member exchange (LMX)	16
Ethical Leadership and the Role of Servant Leadership as it Pertains to Ethics	17
Leadership by NCAA Division	19
NCAA Division I	20
NCAA Division II	21
NCAA Division III	22
Lack of Women in Athletic Administration	23
Lack of Minority Representation in Athletic Administration	25

Chapter	Page
3. Conclusion	31
References	35

Chapter 1: Introduction

Leadership is a complex topic. Over the years, many researchers have established their own definitions of leadership. Most definitions of leadership include components such as the groups involved, processes that occur, and influences involved (Northouse, 2019). Hemphill & Coons (1957, as cited by Soucie, 1994) explain leadership as, "The behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group towards a shared goal". Janda (1960) defines leadership as, "A particular type of power relationship characterized by a group member's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a group member" (p. 358). Tannenbaum et al. (1961, as cited by Soucie, 1994) define leadership as, "Interpersonal influence, exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals." (pg. 24). Jacobs (1970) defines leadership as, "An interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes will be improved if he behaves in the manner suggested or desired." (p. 232). While many of the previous definitions touch on one or two key components of leadership, none do as exceptional a job of encompassing the numerous factors of leadership as the following definition. Yammarino (2013) defines leadership as:

...a multi-level (person, dyad, group, collective) leader-follower interaction process that occurs in a particular situation (context) where a leader (e.g., superior, supervisor) and followers (e.g., subordinates, direct reports) share a purpose (vision, mission) and jointly accomplish things (e.g., goals, objectives, tasks) willingly (e.g., without coercion). (p. 2)

Yammarino (2013) provides a useful definition of leadership, but there are also many different leadership styles and theories that have been developed over the years. This definition of leadership is particularly helpful when evaluating leadership in collegiate athletic administration due to the multilevel interactions involved in sport management (Peachey et al., 2015).

Measuring leadership effectiveness can be a challenging task, and different scholars have chosen various ways to evaluate the effectiveness of leaders in athletic administration. Some authors have evaluated specific traits and behaviors exhibited by successful athletic administrators (Branch Jr., 1990; Bravo et al., 2012; Won et al., 2013; Paitson, 2016). Others have used outcome variables like job satisfaction, job performance, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), turnover intentions, or extra effort to measure effectiveness (Burton & Peachey, 2009; Burton et al., 2017; Doherty & Danylchuck, 1996; Hoye, 2004; Kent & Chellandurai, 2001; Kim, 2009; Mossovitz, 2019; Peachey & Burton, 2011; Yusof, 2002).

Transformational leadership is one theory that has been shown to be an effective tool for athletic administrators. Research has shown transformational leadership can increase motivation, productivity, job satisfaction, and decrease turnover intentions (Burton & Peachy, 2009; Peachy & Burton, 2011; Yusof, 2002). Leader-Member-Exchange (LMX) theory has been linked to increased administrative effectiveness (Hoye, 2004), and servant leadership has been shown to develop an ethical work environment and helps to build trust in the organization (Burton et al., 2017).

Each year, nearly half a million college athletes participate in collegiate athletics as a part of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (NCAAa, n.d.). The NCAA is divided

into three division, each with their own priorities (NCAAb, n.d.). Over the years collegiate athletics has changed significantly, and large difference have emerged between Division I (DI), Division II (DII), and Division III (DIII) institutions (Belzer, 2015). College athletics, particularly at the DI level, have evolved into multi-million dollar operations exhibiting business oriented characteristics (Mossovitz, 2019). The median revenue generated by the Power 5 conference NCAA institutions (the largest revenue generating institutions in the NCAA) in 2019 was \$109.81 million dollars (NCAA, 2020). Even the smallest DI institutions generated a mean revenue of \$3.57 million dollars (NCAA, 2020). As athletic departments at NCAA institutions have changed, the responsibilities of the athletic director and athletic administrators in charge of these departments has changed as well (Mossovitz, 2019).

Historically, athletic directors were hired for their experience and skill participating in sport as an athlete and or coach (Branch Jr., 1990). The changes in revenue brought on by the commercialization of collegiate athletics in the early 21st century resulted in the need for athletic directors to have a wider variety of skills (Mossovitz, 2019). Effective leadership is a vital resource in athletic administration (Paitson, 2016). While the athletic director role has changed significantly, the demographics of those in collegiate athletic administration has stayed relatively unchanged (Lapchick, 2021). In the 2019-2020 academic year, only 15.5% of all NCAA athletic directors were people of color (Lapchick, 2020). Twenty years ago, 2.4% of DI athletic directors were Black (Lapchick, 2021). Today only 10.3% of DI athletic directors are Black. The DII and DIII statistics are even more disappointing. In the 2019-2020 academic year 4.1% and 5.9% of DII and DIII athletic directors are Black respectively (Lapchick, 2021). Women are also underrepresented in collegiate athletic administration. 14.3% of all DI athletic directors were

women in 2019-2020 (Lapchick, 2020). Gender stereotyping, discrimination, and work life balance have been cited as common barriers to employment and advancement for women in collegiate athletic administration (Bower et al., 2015). Specific barriers to employment for minority individuals in collegiate athletic administration have yet to be identified in the literature.

The changing responsibilities of athletic directors over the last decade has resulted in an increase in research on leadership in athletic administration (Peachey et al., 2015); therefore, the purpose of this paper is to examine the research on intercollegiate athletic administration to identify effective leadership strategies for athletic administrators, evaluate the shortcomings present in collegiate athletic administration, and determine the gaps in athletic administration research to present areas for future research.

Research Questions

Three research questions were identified to guide the research on the topic of collegiate athletic administration.

- 1) What leadership strategies have been shown to be effective for current athletic administrators?
- 2) Are there shortcomings in representation in intercollegiate athletic administrations and what are the reasons for those shortcomings?
- 3) Where are the gaps in intercollegiate athletic administration research, and how can those gaps, if any, be addressed?

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Traits of Athletic Administrators and Their Impact on Effectiveness

Research into traits and characteristics of leaders began as early as the beginning of the 20th century; however, it wasn't until the 2010s that research took place examining the traits of athletic administrators (Peachey et al., 2015). Bravo et al. (2012) examined 10 readily observable attributes of job candidates, and 10 non-readily observable attributes for job candidates for a position in athletic administration. Readily observable attributes deemed important for successful athletic administrators were career-related work experience, positive recommendations, and leadership experience (Bravo et al., 2012). Non-readily observable leader attributes found to be most important for athletic administrators were work ethic, communication skills, motivation, conceptual skills, decision making skills, people skills, technical skills, advancement potential, and entrepreneurship respectively (Bravo et al., 2012). While the skills a candidate possesses are important, work related experience is consistently rated as very important for athletic administrators (Bravo et al., 2012; Won et al., 2013). Paitson (2016) found nine traits effective athletic administrative leaders demonstrated. Communication, drive, personality, poise, principles, self-awareness, skill, and vision were the themes found in effective sport management leaders at all National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) divisions, as well as National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics institutions (Paitson, 2016).

Leader Behavior of Athletic Administrators and their Impact on Effectiveness

Contrary to research on leadership traits in athletic administration, research on leader behavior in athletic administration began early in the sport management field. Research on leader behavior focuses on task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviors (Branch Jr., 1990). Task-

oriented behaviors focus on the completion of task and their outcomes, while relationship-oriented behaviors focus on developing relationships with co-workers (Branch Jr., 1990). Branch Jr. (1990) evaluated the changing landscape of the athletic administrator in collegiate athletics and examined the contributions of consideration (relationship-oriented behavior) and initiating structure (task-oriented behavior) on athletic organizational effectiveness in DI institutions. Results indicated that initiating structure as perceived by the athletic director had the largest correlation with athletic organizational effectiveness (Branch Jr., 1990). The author concluded that, while the results indicate task-oriented behavior may be the most effective for athletic organizations, they stress that this study only applies to NCAA DI institutions, and reiterates that other scholars have found a mix of task- and relationship-oriented behaviors to be the most effective (Branch Jr., 1990).

Leadership Theories of Athletic Administrators and Their Impact on Athletic Organizations

Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership

Transformational and transactional leadership have been at the forefront of the research on sports management leadership from the 1990s until the present (Peachey et al., 2015). Burns (1978, as cited by Northouse, 2019) developed transformational and transactional leadership theories to better explain the process of leadership. Transformational leadership was a revolutionary leadership theory where the leaders focused on influencing major changes in the organization and its members (Northouse, 2019), and increasing motivation of followers (Peachey et al., 2015). Previous leadership theories generally focused on the interactions between the leader and the follower where the leader gives followers some type of benefit, and in exchange

the followers continue to follow the leader (Northouse, 2019). Transactional leadership encompasses most of these previous leadership models.

Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2019). While transformational leadership places a heavy influence on developing followers, transactional leadership does not take in to account the individual needs of followers or try to encourage personal growth (Northouse, 2019). Transactional leadership has two factors, contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward is the process by which leaders incentivize followers with specific rewards in exchange for the effort of the follower (Northouse, 2019). Management by exception has two components, active and passive, that includes corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. Active management by exception involves correction of mistakes immediately after they occur, and passive management by exception does not involve confronting the improper behavior of the follower (Northouse, 2019).

Bass (1985) laid out four factors of transformational leadership. These factors are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985; Northouse, 2019). Idealized influence, is divided into attributional components and behavioral components. Attributional components are the positive perceptions that followers have of the leader that followers try to emulate (Northouse, 2019). Behavioral components are the leader behaviors that followers observe (Northouse, 2019). Inspirational motivation requires the leader to set high standards motivating them to commit to the organization's vision (Northouse, 2019; Paitson, 2016). Intellectual stimulation encourages followers to be innovative, pushing them to think critically (Bass, 1985; Northouse, 2019; Wells

et al., 2014). The fourth factor of individualized consideration explains a transformational leader's ability to consider each follower's needs and support them with respect and responsibilities (Bass, 1985; Northouse, 2019).

These four factors incorporate many of characteristics associated with effective organizations (Abuhlaleh, 2016). By establishing positive relationships with followers through intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration, leaders are able to motivate and influence followers resulting in powerful changes in follower engagement and behavior (Bass, 1985; Northouse, 2019; Paitson, 2016). Transformational Leadership inspires followers to do more than they ever expected to do. The transformational leader inspires followers to improve the quality of performance and convinces followers to develop themselves, establishing total commitment and belief in the organization (Bass, 1985). Ultimately, transformational leaders raise the expectation and production of followers and leaders (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Northouse, 2019; Wells et al., 2014).

Transformational and Transactional Leadership in Athletic Administration

An early study by Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) evaluated whether leaders exhibited more transformational or transactional leadership in Canadian intercollegiate athletics. The study also examined the leadership style's effect on four outcome variables. These four variables were follower's satisfaction with leadership, perceived leader effectiveness, commitment of coaches to the department, and extra effort from the coaches (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). The researchers surveyed 114 head coaches about the leadership behavior of their athletic directors, using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X previously developed by Bass and Avolio in 1991 (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). The results from their study indicated that leaders

in athletic administration tended to display transformational leadership characteristics (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). All four factors of transformational leadership were found to be displayed more frequently than transactional leadership behavior (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996).

Leadership behavior was found to have a significant impact on the outcome variables as well. All transformational leadership behaviors were found to be positively correlated satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. Attributed charisma and individualized consideration had the largest positive correlation with satisfaction as well as effectiveness (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). None of the leadership factors were positively associated with commitment to the department (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). There was also a negative correlation found to be significant between transactional leadership behaviors and satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort. Passive management-by-exception was found to have the strongest negative correlation with satisfaction, effectiveness, and extra effort (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996). The authors concluded that the prevalence of transformational leadership in the athletic director role is not surprising due to the growing pressure in athletic departments to be creative and visionary in order to stay afloat in the changing world of intercollegiate athletics (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996).

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) studied the effect an athletic director's transformational leadership had on leader member exchanges, as well as the organizational commitment of subordinates. Participants were surveyed regarding their perception of the following: athletic directors transformational leadership, leader-member exchange (LMX) quality between their direct supervisors and themselves, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). The MLQ was used to evaluate transformational

leadership, the LMX-7 was used to assess the quality of leader-member exchanges, and an organizational commitment instrument developed by Meyer and Allen was used to assess organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). Results from the survey indicated that transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors did have some impact on leader-member exchanges of 2nd and 3rd tier employees, as well as organizational commitment (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). Charismatic leadership and individualized consideration were the two transformational leadership factors significantly correlated with LMX (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). The three factors of transformational leadership evaluated, as well as LMX were all significantly correlated with affective commitment (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). While intellectual stimulation was not correlated with normative commitment; charismatic leadership, individualized consideration, and LMX were all positively correlated with normative commitment (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). None of the transformational leadership factors had any correlation with organizational citizenship behaviors, however; LMX did correlate significantly with both altruistic and generalized compliance organizational citizenship behaviors (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). These results suggest transformational leadership has a ripple effect, influencing follower behavior, commitment, and indirectly affecting organizational citizenship behaviors (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001).

Kim (2009) examined the impact an athletic director's transformational and transactional leadership had on employee's a variety of factors regarding the employee's job satisfaction and performance. The researchers received surveys from 359 NCAA Division II (DII) head coaches. Coaches completed the MLQ 5X to evaluate their athletic director's leadership style, and several other questions about their job satisfaction, job performance (winning percentage and conference

standing, and a comparison of themselves to other coaches), turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior (Kim, 2009). Results from the survey indicated that transformational leadership was positively correlated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Kim, 2009). There was also an indirect, positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The study found positive correlations between transactional leadership and organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Kim, 2009). OCB, job performance, and turnover intention were not found to be directly related to leadership (Kim, 2009). The study's results indicate that both transformational and transactional leadership have positive impacts on employee behavior.

Burton and Peachey (2009) examined how gender may affect leadership perception and effectiveness in the Division III (DIII) setting. Ninety-eight athletic directors were sent one of four leadership vignettes, created specifically to demonstrate either a female athletic director as a transformational leader, a female athletic director as a transactional leader, a male athletic director as a transformational leader, or a male athletic director as a transactional leader. Participants then completed the MLQ-Form 5X, and rated outcomes associated with leadership behavior (Burton & Peachey, 2009). Transformational leaders were perceived more favorably on outcomes of extra effort and satisfaction. Contrary to other studies on the topic, transformational leadership was not shown to have any impact on perceived effectiveness when compared to transactional leadership (Burton & Peachey, 2009). The study also found no difference between the perception of organizational outcomes between genders. Transformational leadership was perceived to impact satisfaction and extra effort regardless of the gender of the leader, and both

transformational and transactional leaders were perceived as effective regardless of gender (Burton & Peachey, 2009).

Peachey and Burton (2011) extended the previous study into NCAA DI and DII. The researchers used four similar but different versions of transformational and transactional leadership vignettes and used the MLQ as well as surveys to evaluate extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and leader effectiveness (Peachey & Burton, 2011). Forty-seven Division I athletic directors and 52 Division II athletic directors completed the survey. Results from the survey found that transformational leaders garnered greater follower satisfaction and follower effort than transactional leadership (Peachey & Burton, 2011). Similar to Burton and Peachey (2009), the study found no significant impact of gender on the perception of leaders, whether they were transformational leaders or transactional leaders, and also found no support for transformational leadership positively influencing perceived leadership effectiveness more than transactional leadership (Peachey & Burton, 2011). The authors concluded that it is likely transactional leadership was perceived to be just as effective as transformational leadership due to the large amounts of detail orientated work required of intercollegiate athletic directors (Burton & Peachey, 2009; Peachey & Burton, 2011).

Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory differs from most leadership theories in that leadership is evaluated as separate interaction between the leader and each individual follower rather than a collective attitude towards all followers (Northouse, 2019). In LMX theory, followers fall in to one of two categories, the in-group or the out-group. The in-group are generally individuals who make a significant connection with the leader, either through

personality traits or work related effectiveness (Northouse, 2019; Paitson, 2016). These in-group followers tend to receive more benefits from the leader than those in the out-group. These benefits include greater role responsibilities, more influence, stimulating work, and greater chances for career advancement (Hoye, 2004; Northouse, 2019; Paitson, 2016). Out-group followers receive little to none of these benefits (Northouse, 2019).

Research has shown LMX to be associated with member job performance, job satisfaction, commitment, turnover intentions, supervisory satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Northouse, 2019). LMX research has also expanded to focus on the creation of in groups and out-groups, as well as the relationships between each dyadic relationship (Graen & Uhl-bien, 1995; Northouse, 2019). While there has been significant interest in research on LMX theory in other academic circles, LMX theory has not been as heavily researched in the sports management field as other leadership theories like transactional and transformational leadership (Peachey et al., 2015). Hoye (2004) studied the relationships between board chairs and paid executives and volunteer board members among Australian voluntary sport organizations. Participants completed the LMX 7, developed by Graen and Uhl-bien (1995). Board members, board chairs, and executives each completed the LMX 7 regarding their perception of each of the other members (Hoye, 2004). Results from the study found strong, positive correlations between board performance and high-quality leader-member exchanges (Hoye, 2004) While this study does not address collegiate athletic administrations, it suggests that LMX has some impact on administrative performance in sports organizations.

Kent and Chelladurai (2001) evaluated the effect of transformational leadership on perceived manager level LMX. The study indicated that transformational leadership is positively

correlated with LMX (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001). The authors suggest that this correlation is likely due to the charismatic and individualized consideration factors that define transformational leadership. The study also indicated that the positive increase in LMX was also associated with increased organizational citizenship behaviors, suggesting that positive LMX between leaders and followers may have positive impacts on organizational citizenship behaviors (Kent & Chelladurai, 2001).

Ethical Leadership and the Role of Servant Leadership as it Pertains to Ethics

Ethics have been a large focus for disciplines of all kinds for much longer than any of the previous leadership theories or characteristics have been studied. The five principles of ethical leadership draw from the works of Aristotle and vital to everything from business, to medicine, and education (Northouse, 2019). Ethical leadership has recently received increased interest in the sports management field (Peachey et al., 2015). This increase in interest in ethical leadership has increased alongside large changes in NCAA structure and an increase in concern over the increase in commercialism of collegiate athletics (Paitson, 2016). Starting in the late 1990s and continuing into the 2000s, Athletic departments started bringing in significantly larger profits. From 2004 to 2014 the income of all the Power 5 athletic departments almost doubled from \$2.67 billion to \$4.49 billion (Mossovitz, 2019). CBS signed a \$6 billion dollar deal with the NCAA for exclusive rights to the Men's Division I basketball championships (Geist, 2001). The increased emphasis on revenue and successful athletics programs can make it difficult for large programs to maintain or improve their ethical standards (Burton & Peachey, 2014).

As defined by Brown et al. (2005), ethical leadership is “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and

the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (pg. 120). Northouse (2019) lays out five principles of ethical leadership. The author states ethical leaders respect other, serve others, show justice, manifest honesty, and build community (Northouse, 2019). A review of the sports management research by Burton & Peachey (2014) found that research had not evaluated the effects of ethical leadership in the sports management setting yet, but they have stressed the importance of ethics in the new landscape of college athletics (Burton & Peachey, 2014). Research has still not addressed the effect of ethical leadership in the current sports management setting.

One leadership theory that has been evaluated with respect to developing an ethical climate is servant leadership (Burton et al., 2017). Servant leadership emphasizes followers more than other types of leadership theories, and has been suggested as the most important leadership approach for ethical development (Burton & Peachey, 2014). Servant leaders listen to their followers, empathizing with them, and helping them to grow as professionals and people (Northouse, 2019). Northouse (2019) presents a model of servant leadership providing a framework to help understand servant leadership. Three antecedent conditions influence servant leadership. These factors are context and culture, leader attributes, and follower receptivity (Northouse, 2019). All of these factors impact the way servant leadership is displayed and how effective it may be. Seven leader behaviors form the core of the model. These behaviors are the foundation of servant leaders and are as follows: conceptualizing, emotional healing, putting followers first, helping followers grow and succeed, behaving ethically, empowering, and creating value for the community (Northouse, 2019). These antecedents conditions and leader

behaviors effect follower performance and growth, organizational performance, and societal impact, the three main outcomes of servant leadership in the model (Northouse, 2019).

Burton et al. (2017) evaluated the effect that servant leadership has on developing an ethical climate in sports organizations. The researchers used a survey with four different validated scales to measure servant leadership, ethical climate, trust, and organizational justice. The survey was completed by 168 participants from 151 NCAA DI athletic departments (Burton et al., 2017). Results from the survey indicated that servant leadership of an athletic director was positively associated with the development of an ethical climate, trust in the leader, and organizational justice (Burton et al., 2017).

Leadership by NCAA Division

With 1,098 colleges and universities, 19,886 teams, and nearly half a million student-athletes, the NCAA is the largest collegiate sports organization in the U.S. (National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA]a, n.d.). The landscape of collegiate athletics in the U.S. has changed dramatically over the last decade, specifically at the DI level. Each division has very different requirements mandated by the NCAA (NCAAb, n.d.). DI schools are responsible for sponsoring more sports for men and women than both DII and DIII schools, as well as attendance requirements for Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools, and mandates on the level of opponents played during a season (NCAAb, n.d.). DIII schools on the other hand are not allowed to give any athletic scholarships, have no requirements for attendance, and minimal requirements on competitions. Instead DIII schools focus on student-athletes and their experience (NCAAb, n.d.).

NCAA Division I

Research has shown that transformational leadership is the most common style of leadership for athletic directors at the DI level (Manning, 2012; Mossovitz, 2019; Yusof, 2002). While an early study by Branch Jr. (1990) stated that DI athletic directors should possess more task-oriented behaviors to be successful, the more current research has shown transformational leadership has the largest impact on effectiveness. A study conducted by Manning (2012) found that DI athletic directors perceived themselves showing significantly more transformational traits than their athletic director counterparts in DII and DIII. The author contributes the difference in leadership styles to the large differences in resources and responsibilities DI athletic directors have (Manning, 2012).

Yusof (2002) studied the effect of transformational leadership had on job satisfaction for coaches at the NCAA DI and DIII levels. The study sampled 310 DI coaches and 308 DIII coaches. Results from the study showed that transformational leadership has an effect on coaches job satisfaction at both the DI and DIII levels (Yusof, 2002). The study showed that DI athletic directors showed significantly higher transformational leadership traits than that of their DIII counterparts. Coaches at the DI level also reported higher levels of job satisfaction than coaches at the DIII level (Yusof, 2002).

Mossovitz (2019) examined the best leadership practices of NCAA DI athletic directors and how they were perceived to effect athletic program outcomes. Participants were interviewed regarding athletic director's leadership practices, and which leadership practices they deemed most important. The perceived effect of those leadership practices was also gathered (Mossovitz, 2019). Results from the study identified the following five important themes: building rapport,

people operations, organizational alignment, supporting the student-athlete's experience, and background (Mossovitz, 2019). Building rapport established positive connections that participants associated with positive outcomes and increased employee satisfaction (Mossovitz, 2019). People operations, organizational alignment, and supporting the student-athlete experience were identified as important to the athletic director's role but no perceived effects of these themes were highlighted (Mossovitz, 2019). Background varied for the participants in the study, but participants indicated that education in athletic administration will be important for the next generations of athletic directors (Mossovitz, 2019).

NCAA Division II

Geist (2001) evaluated the perceived leadership style of athletic directors, as well as the senior women administrators and an associate/assistant athletic directors. Results indicated that athletic directors tend to perceive themselves as more transformational than transactional; however, middle managers perceive athletic directors to be less transformational than they perceive themselves to be. This also study showed no difference in the perception of athletic director's transactional leadership, and no difference in leader abilities by gender (Geist, 2001).

A study by Kim (2009) examined the effect that athletic director leadership had on head coaches at the DII level. The researcher surveyed 359 DII coaches on their athletic director's leadership style, as well as their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, OCB, job performance, and turnover intentions (Kim, 2009). The results of this study were somewhat contradictory to other studies on the topic. Results indicated that the contingent reward component of transactional leadership had a larger positive effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment than transformational leadership at the DII level. The study also

found that transformational leadership had a positive effect on turnover intention and OCB, and to a lesser extent job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Kim, 2009). While transactional leadership was found to have a larger effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, transformational leadership was found to have a broader effect on followers than transactional leadership (Kim, 2009).

NCAA Division III

Burton and Peachey (2009) evaluated the effect that transformational and transactional leadership had on organizational outcomes at the DIII level. The study surveyed 98 DIII athletic directors using leadership vignettes and the MLQ Form 5x to determine leader's perception of leadership style and organizational outcomes. Results found that transformational leaders were evaluated more favorably for the organizational outcomes of extra effort and satisfaction, but not on leader effectiveness (Burton & Peachey, 2009). The effect of leadership style on organizational outcomes did not vary by gender (Burton & Peachey, 2009). These results are contrary to findings in other business management studies which found that role congruent leaders are evaluated more favorably than role incongruent leaders (Powell et al., 2008). The authors contributed this finding to the value of relationships and the importance of the student-athlete experience at the DIII level. They suggested that at the DIII level, female leaders exhibiting role incongruent behaviors is more acceptable because transformational leadership is more important to achieving organizational outcomes than the gender of the leader (Burton & Peachey, 2009).

As stated previously, NCAA DIII institutions place a large emphasis on the student-athlete experience (NCAAb, n.d.). While the student-athlete experience should be a factor used

to evaluate the effectiveness of at DIII athletic director, research on the effect of athletic administration on the student-athlete collegiate experience was not represented in the current literature.

Lack of Women in Athletic Administration

Bower et al. (2015) laid out numerous challenges facing women working in intercollegiate athletic administrations. The authors surveyed 514 subjects across the NCAA, the NAIA, the National Christian College Athletic Association, Junior Colleges, and Canadian Colleges. Seven challenges were observed as the most common obstacles faced by women in athletic administrations. These challenges were divided into two categories, gender stereotyping and structural forces. Gender stereotyping occurred in various forms. Women were stereotyped as nurturing and having communal attributes not suitable for successful leadership, and commonly treated as a secretary or assistant. Structural forces were outlined as access discrimination, treatment discrimination, lack of social networking, and the nature of the profession. Treatment discrimination occurred as subjects felt they needed to prove themselves more than their male coworkers, at the same time receiving the same or less benefits and was experienced more often than access discrimination. Access discrimination occurred most often as the Glass Ceiling Effect and the Queen Bee Syndrome. The Glass Ceiling Effect is a phenomenon that makes it more difficult for women to advance to higher outcome positions (Cotter et al., 2001). The Queen Bee Syndrome occurs when females in senior positions in a male-dominated field do not assist other women trying to succeed (Staines et al., 1973, as cited by Bower et al., 2015). Some subjects found that women in leadership positions were less likely to help other women in inferior positions to advance (Bower et al., 2015). Social networking and

work life balance were found to be the most common barriers to employment for women in athletic administration. Subjects felt they were not included as easily as men in the social network of their institutions and were expected to take on more family responsibilities than their male counterparts. The authors identified the need to continue this research. They note that it is important to study women who have made it into collegiate athletic administration, not only to continue to understand the issues women face when seeking employment, but also to provide women with a model for advancing in athletic administrations (Bower et al., 2015).

Burton et al. (2011) evaluated the effect gender has on the perception of athletic administrators. The study surveyed 158 women and 118 men in NCAA DI athletic administrations (Burton et al., 2011). Participants were sent a vignette in which either a male or female was a candidate for athletic director, compliance director, or life skills director. Results of the study indicated that female candidates for the athletic director position were perceived as less feminine than female candidates for life skills director (Burton et al., 2011). There were no differences found between genders for perceptions of success in all three possible positions (Burton et al., 2011). While there was no perceived difference in success by gender, male candidates were found much more likely to receive the job of athletic director than female participants (Burton et al., 2011). The authors wrote the following:

Even though the female candidate for athletic director had overcome the first tenet to role congruity (that she had the skills or abilities to be successful); she still faced the perception (prescriptive stereotypes) that she would not be selected for such a masculine position (Burton et al., 2011)

The authors concluded the results support the perception that women don't fit in athletic administration leadership positions (Burton et al., 2011).

The underrepresentation of women in sport leadership, and the challenges women face when seeking positions in sport organizations is well understood in the literature. Yet women continue to encounter these barriers to employment (Burton, 2014). Further research into women's perceptions of gender roles and stereotyping that occur in leadership positions is necessary for further understanding of the struggles women face when seeking leadership positions in athletic organizations (Burton, 2014).

Lack of Minority Representation in Athletic Administration

The lack of minority representation was recently documented in the Racial and Gender Report Card (Lapchick, 2020). This is a yearly report that outlines the hiring practices of NCAA institutions, including the NCAA itself and its conference offices. Results from the report show people of color make up just 15.5% of DI athletic directors, 9.4% of DII athletic directors, and 8.7% of DIII athletic directors. In many categories of employment, minority representation in 2020 decreased from the previous year (Lapchick, 2021). The following categories all experienced a decrease in minority representation in management roles: DI head coaches of men's and women's teams, DI assistant coaches of men's teams, DI associate athletic directors, Senior Women Administrators, and Sports Information Directors (Lapchick, 2021). While the grade given for racial hiring of DI athletic directors has increased since the first report in 2005 (13.4%), there has been only a small change in the last 16 years (2.1%) (Lapchick, 2006, 2020).

Myles (2005) examined the challenges minority individuals face in collegiate athletic administration. The study surveyed 66 Black senior-level athletic administrators from NCAA DI

institutions regarding stereotypical beliefs, discriminatory acts, racist attitudes, and old boys' networks they had experienced in their careers (Myles, 2005). The old boys' network refers to the network of mostly White men interconnected across the athletic administration profession. The results from the study indicated that Black DI athletic directors acknowledged that while stereotypical beliefs were somewhat of a factor in their careers, they did not think the impact of stereotypical beliefs was as great as it was in the past (Myles, 2005). Results from the discriminatory acts and racists attitudes sections revealed varied perceptions on the impact they had in Black athletic director's careers. Ten percent of participants indicated that discriminatory acts and racists attitudes were factors in their career and 22% said they were somewhat a factor in their career respectively (Myles, 2005). The majority of participants indicated perceived discriminatory acts and racist attitudes were seldom a factor or non-factors in their career (Myles, 2005). Results from the old boys' network section showed that 40.4% of subjects indicated that the perceived old boys' network had some impact on their careers, and 40.4% perceived them to have a major impact on their career (Myles, 2005). The author concluded that while racial stereotypes and discrimination were not as prevalent as they have been in the past, the old boys' network still provides a legitimate roadblock to the employment and advancement of Black individuals in collegiate athletic administration. The author suggests university officials need to become more involved in the hiring process and ensure diversity is achieved (Myles, 2005).

Shim et al. (2020) examined the challenges faced by minority individuals in the realm of collegiate athletics, however this study was not limited to athletic administration. Six self-identified Asian employees who had worked or worked in NCAA DI institutions were

interviewed. Results suggested four primary factors that impacted Asian employment in collegiate athletics. The first factor identified was the value that Asian cultures place on education over sport participation (Shim et al., 2020). Subjects indicated that family influence and educational competitiveness in Asian countries push Asian children to invest more heavily in their education than in athletics (Shim et al., 2020). Another factor the researcher found to impact people of Asian descent's participation in sport is the generally perceived stereotypes that people of Asian descent are less successful in sports (Shim et al., 2020). This perception leads to less people of Asian descent participating in sports, and in turn limiting the amount of Asian individuals in athletic administration (Shim et al., 2020). Language barriers were also found to impact Asian representation in US sport. Lack of communication skills were perceived to negatively impact Asian representation in athletic administration, as well as limiting the ability of Asian individuals to create a network important for advancement in sport (Shim et al., 2020). The final factor examined in the study was exclusion due to race. Three of the six subjects indicated they believed racism had impact their participation in US sport (Shim et al., 2020). The author concludes that cultural influences and racial stereotypes have contributed to the lack of people of Asian descent in collegiate athletic administrations. They suggest the NCAA should participant in campaigns to understand and/or dispel the stereotypes commonly placed on people of Asian descent, and work to address the underrepresentation of Asian individuals in collegiate athletics (Shim et al., 2020).

Cunningham (2021) examines possible causes of the underrepresentation of racial minorities in sports leadership positions using macro-, meso-, and micro-level factors that effect minorities. Macro-level factors involve influences from society and include institutional racism,

political climate, and stakeholder expectations. Institutional racism is the assertion that major societal institutions including educational systems, the legal system, and sport are built upon racist ideals (Cobb & Russell, 2015; Cunningham, 2021). The landscape of sports in the US, including intercollegiate athletics, is largely made up of White leaders, and operates in ways that give privileges to those in power (Cunningham, 2021; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). When privileges continue to be granted to those in power, it becomes more difficult to change those practices (Cunningham, 2021). The political climate influences sport organizations as well. Politics can effect sport organizations through policies regarding diversity and inclusion (i.e. affirmative action), as well as the laws enacted governing employment practices (Cunningham, 2021). Stakeholders, such as alumni and donors, can have significant impact in institutional and are made up mostly White men, tend to want representatives of the institution to be individuals they feel they can identify with, ultimately resulting in a preference for hiring Whites and men (Cunningham, 2021; Cunningham & Sagas, 2005).

Meso-level factors contribute to minority underrepresentation at the organizational level and include biases, stereotypes, and organizational culture. Biases in decision making often come from stereotypes and prejudice, and are a result of the historical influence of White, able-bodied, heterosexual men in leadership positions (Peachey et al., 2015). These stereotypes cause women and minorities to be negatively affected at all levels of sports leadership (Cunningham, 2021; Peachey et al., 2015). Organizational cultures lacking diversity impede the advancement of racial minorities and negatively impact minorities (Bradbury, 2013). Organizational policies that promote diversity and inclusion have been found to increase applications by racial minorities (DuBois, 2016).

Micro-level factors are specific to each individual and are outlined by Cunningham (2021) as capital investments, personal identity, and self-limiting behaviors. Capital investments include things like education and experience, as well as an individual's social network. Research suggests that Whites are rewarded more favorably for similar capital investments made by racial minorities (Cunningham, 2021; Day & McDonald, 2010). Cunningham (2021) describes personal identity as how an individual sees themselves. Racial identity is the extent to which someone relates to their race (Steward, 2016). Research in personal identity has found that Whites rate racial minorities with a strong racial identity more poorly than another individual they perceive to have a weak racial identity (Steward, 2016). The final micro-level factor described by Cunningham (2021) is self-limiting behaviors, which have been shown to be present in women and minorities involved in intercollegiate athletic administration. Wells and Kerwin (2017) showed that women and minorities had similar levels of confidence in their ability to perform as an athletic director when compared to their White male counterparts; however, they exhibited much lower expectations of becoming an athletic director. Cunningham (2021) concludes this examination of the underrepresentation of racial minorities in leadership positions by clarifying that the implications offered are theoretical, and mostly pertain to coaching. These factors have not yet been evaluated specifically in the context of collegiate athletic administration and further research is needed to investigate the barriers to minority representation specifically in collegiate athletic administration.

Research by Cunningham and Sagas (2005) demonstrated access discrimination in DI men's basketball coaching. Results of this study concluded that White head coaches were more likely to have White assistant coaches. Minority individuals were significantly underrepresented

on coaching staffs with White head coaches, but not on coaching staffs with a minority head coach (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). It is important to note this research study is specific to coaching and cannot be applied to leadership positions in collegiate athletic administrations.

Chapter 3: Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to examine the research on intercollegiate athletic administration to identify effective leadership strategies for athletic administrators, evaluate the shortcomings present in collegiate athletic administration, and determine the gaps in athletic administration research to present areas for future research.

Studies identified numerous traits that athletic directors need in order to be effective. Conceptual skill, personal communication skills, and career-related work experience were among the most important traits of effective athletic directors at all three NCAA divisions. Transformational leadership was found to have the largest impact on outcome variables overall, most notably on job satisfaction, perceived leader effectiveness, extra effort, and organizational commitment. Transactional leadership had a larger effect on organizational commitment than transformational leadership due to the contingent rewards transactional leadership offers. There was no difference in perceived leadership effectiveness between transformational and transactional leadership. Transformational leadership was also shown to impact LMX quality. Positive LMX has been demonstrated to improve performance in sport organizations. There is significant evidence that transformational leadership has a much broader impact on organizational outcome variables; however, authors have suggested that there are also positive benefits from transactional leadership and a mix of transformational and transactional leadership may be the most effective strategy for athletic administrators. While not directly related to organizational effectiveness, servant leadership was found to positively associated with an

ethical climate, organizational trust in the leader, and organizational justice, which is important in collegiate athletics today.

Research has found there are significant shortcomings in collegiate athletic administration in the form of underrepresentation of women and minorities in leadership positions. The lack of women in athletic administration has been attributed to a number of different factors. Gender stereotypes, discrimination, exclusion from professional networks, and work life balance were the most commonly encountered barriers for women with careers in athletic administration. Minority individuals are also significantly underrepresented in collegiate athletic administration. The research has yet to effectively identify specific barriers to employment for minority individuals in athletic administration. Possible causes of the underrepresentation of racial minorities in sport leadership positions are institutional racism, biases and stereotypes, and personal factors. This suggestion was aimed at all levels of sport, including professional sports in the US. At the DI level, the old boys' network was found to be a barrier to employment for Black athletic administrators. Further research is needed to better understand the specific barriers to employment for minority individuals in college athletic administration.

There are a number of gaps in the literature regarding collegiate athletic administration. First, the impact of the athletic administration at the DIII level needs to be assessed. Division III athletics places a large emphasis on the student-athlete experience; however, research on leadership in DIII athletic administration and its impact on the student athlete experience is lacking. DIII institutions account for 40% of all NCAA institutions, and one out of every six students at a DIII school is a student-athlete (NCAAa, n.d.). In order to fully evaluate the

effectiveness of an athletic administration at the DIII level, it is important for future studies to address how the administration impacts its student-athletes. The results from these studies would be used to determine if athletic administrative leadership has any significant impact on the student-athlete experience, as well as which style of leadership has the largest, if any, impact on the student-athlete experience.

The most important gaps to address in the intercollegiate athletic administration are the lack of representation of both women and minority individuals in leadership positions. This underrepresentation has been documented in the Racial and Gender Report card each year since 2005, and yet there has not been significant progress made in the last 15 years. Research must be done to fill these gaps. Research regarding women in athletic administration has done a good job of determining many of the factors that are responsible for the lack of women in sport management positions. Gender stereotyping and structural forces have been significant barriers to employment for women in collegiate athletic administration. While continued research on the roadblocks to employment in athletic administration is important for shedding light on the issue and working to eliminate those barriers, little research has been done to examine the leadership characteristics of the individuals currently in those positions. Research should follow the work done by Bower et al. (2015) to examine the barriers women find to advancement in collegiate athletic administration, as well as how they address stereotypes, discrimination, and negotiate social situations throughout their career. This research would best be done by studying women currently working in leadership positions in athletic administrations at all three levels of NCAA competition. The results of this research would help to better understand how women achieved leadership positions in collegiate athletic administration, as well as determining how women's

career paths differ by NCAA division, providing a career advancement roadmap for women in collegiate athletic administration.

Lastly, research needs to examine the specific barriers to employment for minority individuals in athletic administration. There is a paucity of research in area. Before progress can be made in minority representation in athletic administration, an understanding of the barriers is needed. While a few authors have presented some potential challenges to employment for minority individuals, further research needs to be done to investigate why there is still such a significant lack of minority representation in athletic administration. In order to determine the barriers to employment for minority individuals in athletic administration, athletic administrators at all three levels of NCAA competition should be included in the study. Separate studies should be conducted for each minority group to determine the barriers to employment that may be specific to members of specific minorities. The results of these studies would help to determine what factors present challenges for employment in athletic administrations for minority individuals. These studies would also be able to determine if there are differences in challenges for minority individuals by NCAA division.

References

- Abuhlaleh, A. (2016). *The Impact of Interscholastic Athletic Directors' Transformational Leadership Style and Gender on Organizational Effectiveness*. (Publication No. 10123990) [Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University]. ProQuest Publishing.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26–40. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(85\)90028-2](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2)
- Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., & Grappendorf, H. (2015). Same Story; Different Day: Greatest challenges of women working in intercollegiate athletic administration. *International Journal of Sport Management, Recreation & Tourism*, 19, 12–39. <https://doi.org/10.5199/ijsmart-1791-874x-19b>
- Bradbury, S. (2013). Institutional Racism, Whiteness and the under-representation of minorities in leadership positions in football in Europe. *Soccer and Society*, 14(3), 296–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14660970.2013.801262>
- Branch Jr., D. (1990). Athletic director leader behavior as a predictor of intercollegiate athletic organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 4, 161–173. <http://0-eds.b.ebscohost.com.aupac.lib.athabascau.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=13d69899-7bde-4a1e-a803-4b8506c0250b@sessionmgr115&vid=11&hid=104>
- Bravo, G., Won, D., & Shonk, D. J. (2012). Entry-level employment in intercollegiate athletic departments: Non-readily observables and readily observable attributes of job candidates. *Journal of Sport Administration & Supervision*, 4(1), 63–78. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sph&AN=92948828&site=ehost-live>

- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical Leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Burton, L. J. (2014). Underrepresentation of women in sport leadership: A review of research. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 155–165. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.02.004>
- Burton, L. J., Grappendorf, H., & Henderson, A. (2011). Perceptions of gender in athletic administration: Utilizing role congruity to examine (potential) prejudice against women. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25(1), 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.25.1.36>
- Burton, L. J., Peachey, J. W., & Wells, J. E. (2017). The role of servant leadership in developing an ethical climate in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(3), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2016-0047>
- Burton, L., & Peachey, J. W. (2009). Transactional or transformational? Leadership preferences of Division III athletic administrators. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 2(2), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2.2.245>
- Burton, L., & Peachey, J. W. (2014). Ethical leadership in intercollegiate sport: Challenges, opportunities, future directions. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.7.1.1>
- Belzer, J. (2015, February 19). *The Dynamic Role Of The Modern Day College Athletics Director*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jasonbelzer/2015/02/19/the-dynamic-role-of-the-modern-day-college-athletics-director/?sh=47055fe46076>

- Cobb, F., & Russell, N. M. (2015). Meritocracy or complexity: Problematizing racial disparities in mathematics assessment within the context of curricular structures, practices, and discourse. *Journal of Education Policy*, *30*(5), 631–649.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.983551>
- Cotter, D. A., Hermsen, J. M., Ovadia, S., & Vanneman, R. (2001). Glass Ceiling Effect. *Social Forces* (*80*, 2), 655–681. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2675593>
- Cunningham, G. B. (2021). The Under-representation of racial minorities in coaching and leadership positions in the United States. *Ethnicity and Racism in Sports Coaching* (*9*), 3–21. Routledge.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2005). Access discrimination in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *29*(2), 148–163.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723504271706>
- Day, J. C., & McDonald, S. (2010). Not so fast my friend: Social capital and the race disparity in promotions among college football coaches. *Sociological Spectrum*, *30*, 138–158.
- Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, *10*(3), 292–309.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.10.3.292>
- DuBois, C. (2016). The impact of “soft” affirmative action policies on minority hiring in executive leadership: The case of the NFL’s Rooney Rule. *American Law and Economics Review*, *18*(1), 208–233. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aler/ahv019>

- Geist, A. L. (2001). *Leadership and Followership in NCAA Division II Athletic Directors*. (Publication No. 3011062) [Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University] ProQuest Publishing
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership : Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX). *Management Department Faculty Publications*, 57(Lmx), 30.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1059&context=managementfacpub>
- Hoye, R. (2004). Leader-member exchanges and board performance of voluntary sport organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(1), 55–70.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.53>
- Janda, K. F. (1960). Towards the explication of the concept of leadership in terms of the concept of power. *Human Relations*, 13(4), 345-363.
- Kent, A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Perceived transformational leadership, organizational commitment, and citizenship behavior: A case study in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15(2), 135–159. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.15.2.135>
- Kim, H. (2009). *Transformational and Transactional Leadership of Athletic Directors and Their Impact on Organizational Outcomes Perceived by Head Coaches at NCAA Division II Intercollegiate Institutions* [The Ohio State University].
<https://doi.org/10.15957/j.cnki.jjdl.2009.07.004>
- Lapchick, R. E. (2006). *The 2005 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sports*.
<https://www.tidesport.org/college>

Lapchick, R. E. (2020). *The 2020 Racial and Gender Report Card*.

<https://www.tidesport.org/college>

Lapchick, R. (2021, February 24). *2020 college racial and gender report card shows*

'insignificant progress. ESPN. <https://www.espn.com/college->

[sports/story/_/id/30956744/2020-college-racial-gender-report-card-shows-insignificant-progress](https://www.espn.com/college-sports/story/_/id/30956744/2020-college-racial-gender-report-card-shows-insignificant-progress)

Manning, L. W. (2012). *NCAA athletic directors' self-perspective of*

transformational/transactional leadership. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] East

Carolina University.

Mossovitz, M. (2019). *Division I athletic directors' leadership influence on athletic departments: A*

multi-site case study. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] Drexel University.

Myles, L. R. (2005). *The absence of color in athletic administration at Division I institutions*

[Unpublished doctoral dissertation] University of Pittsburgh.

NCAA. (2020). *Finances of Intercollegiate Athletics Database*. NCAA.

<https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/finances-intercollegiate-athletics-database>

NCAAa. (n.d.). *WHAT IS THE NCAA?* [https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-](https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/ncaa-101/what-ncaa)

[center/ncaa-101/what-ncaa](https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/ncaa-101/what-ncaa)

NCAAb. (n.d.). *Divisional Differences and the History of Multidivision Classification*. NCAA.

<https://www.ncaa.org/about/who-we-are/membership/divisional-differences-and-history-multidivision-classification>

Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications Inc.

- Paitson, D. A. (2016). *Assesment of leadership traits required for the intercollegiate athletic director position*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] Sam Houston State University.
- Peachey, J. W., & Burton, L. J. (2011). Male or female athletic director? Exploring perceptions of leader effectiveness and a (potential) female leadership advantage with intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 64*(5–6), 416–425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9915-y>
- Peachey, J. W., Damon, Z. J., Zhou, Y., & Burton, L. J. (2015). Forty years of leadership research in sport management: A review, synthesis, and conceptual framework. *Journal of Sport Management, 29*(5), 570–587. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2014-0126>
- Powell, G. N., Bartol, K. M., & Butterfield, D. A. (2008). Leader evaluations: A new female advantage? *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 23*(3), 156–174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17542410810866926>
- Shim, K., Carter-Francique, A. R., & Singer, J. N. (2020). The foreigner: Race-based experiences of asian employees in intercollegiate athletics administration. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 13*, 70–93.
- Steward, A. (2016). *Racial Identity and its Impact on Applicants*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation] Texas A&M University.
- Wells, J. E., Peachey, J. W., & Walker, N. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, leader effectiveness, and turnover intentions: Do subordinate gender differences exist? *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 7*(1), 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.7.1.64>
- Won, D., Bravo, G., & Lee, C. (2013). Careers in collegiate athletic administration: Hiring criteria and skills needed for success. *Managing Leisure, 18*(1), 71–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13606719.2012.742222>

Yusof, A. (2002). Transformational leadership behaviours of athletic directors and their effects on coaches' job satisfaction. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 10(1), 1–8.http://psasir.upm.edu.my/3385/1/Transformational_Leadership_Behaviours_of_Athletic_Directors.pdf