

# Analysing gender dynamics in sport governance: A new regimes-based approach

**Johanna Adriaanse**

University of Technology, Sydney

**Toni Schofield**

The University of Sydney

19<sup>th</sup> European Association for Sport Management  
Conference, 7-10 September 2011, Madrid

## OVERVIEW

- Purpose of the study
- Theoretical background:  
Gender and sport governance
- Methodology  
Part A: Quantitative  
Part B: Qualitative
- Results and discussion
- Conclusion and implications for advancing gender equality  
in sport governance

## THE BRIGHTON DECLARATION

Principle on leadership in sport:

“...increase the number of women...advisors, decision makers, administrators...at all levels (in sport)”

## PURPOSE OF STUDY

To investigate the gender dynamics on boards of national sport organisations in Australia

# GOVERNANCE

- Governance: directing, monitoring and regulating activities within an organisation (Clarke, 2004; Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007)
- 'Pilot' versus 'Watchdog' (Carter & Lorsch, 2004)
- Corporate governance versus non-profit governance (sport governance) (Hoye & Cuskelly, 2007)
- Board of directors critical nexus of governance (Clarke, 2007)
- Board composition: gender diversity

# GENDER

- Actively created – ‘doing’ gender  
(West and Zimmerman, 1987; Claringbould and Knoppers, 2008)
- Fourfold model of gender relations:  
Production, power, emotional and symbolic  
(Connell, 1987, 2009)
- Gender regime (Connell, 1987, 2009)
- Gender hierarchy in corporations  
(Kanter, 1977; Acker, 1990)
- Horizontal and vertical segregation in  
sport organisations (McKay, 1992, 1997)

# METHODOLOGY

Two parts

- A. Audit of gender distribution on boards of 56 NSOs
- B. In-depth interviews with directors and CEOs of 5 NSOs (12 women and 18 men)

Collection of documents in relation to gender diversity on boards of NSOs involved in the interviews

## RESULTS

### Women on boards of Australian NSOs 2008

- 87 women of 411 board directors - **21.2.0%**
- 12 of 56 (21.4%) NSOs NO woman on board
- 20 of 56 (35.7%) NSOs ONE woman on board
- 5 of 56 (8.9%) NSOs had a female President

## RESULTS SPORT A

Gender relations	characterised by
Production	male dominance
Power	male dominance
Emotional	masculine solidarity and respect for one woman director
Symbolic	sound understanding of gender equality in practical terms (participation, representation and remuneration); no strong commitment to achieving gender equality

## RESULTS SPORT C

Gender relations	characterised by
Production	male dominance
Power	male dominance in numbers but influence strongly contested due to powerful female chair
Emotional	divided and pronounced hostility
Symbolic	gender equality understood as equal opportunity; tension between merit-based board versus gender-balanced board

## RESULTS SPORT E

<b>Gender relations</b>	<b>characterised by</b>
Production	male dominance
Power	female minority exercised influence through their significant board positions
Emotional	masculine inclusivity
Symbolic	advancing gender equality at every level of the sport through equal contribution/participation by men and women

## CONCLUSION

1. Gender dynamics on boards are complex, played out in unique context for each sport organisation
2. Women directors face challenging dual role
3. Men directors and CEOs play critical role in advancing gender equality

Recommendation:  
Regimes-based method/approach can be used in other contexts or organisations