

**PUTTING ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES INTO PRACTICE:  
GENDER EQUITY FOR ATHLETES IN A CANADIAN UNIVERSITY**

by

**LARENA NICOLE HOEBER**

**B.S.P.E., University of Saskatchewan, 1993**

**M.Sc., University of Saskatchewan, 1996**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

in

**THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**(School of Human Kinetics)**

**We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

**July 2004**

**© Larena Nicole Hoeber, 2004**

## Abstract

Although gender equity has become an espoused organizational value for amateur sport organizations, research illustrating continued gender inequities at all levels of sport signal that it is not always enacted (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000; McKay, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Theberge, 2000a, 2000b). A post-structuralist feminist lens emphasizes the local meanings and the production of gendered knowledge, encourages critique of the embeddedness of dominant discourses in organizational cultures, and provides strategies for uncovering alternative meanings and organizational practices (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a). The purpose of this study was to understand and critique the meanings and practices of gender equity for athletes from the perspectives of administrators, coaches, and athletes in a Canadian university.

This was accomplished through case studies of four sport programs that varied in terms of structure and history in one athletic department. Data were collected from interviews with 5 administrators, 6 coaches, and 20 athletes, observations of practices and competitions, and analysis of related documents and field notes. These data were coded and categorized using Atlas.ti.

The findings revealed multiple but narrow meanings of gender equity that were not fully implemented into organizational practices. Overall, respondents were complacent about changing the status quo and used a variety of arguments to justify the observed gaps between meanings and practices. While it was assumed that gender equity had been achieved because the total number of men's and women's teams were similar, a number of inequities in terms of funding, promotion, and treatment were observed. The findings challenged the assumptions that there are unitary and widely shared understandings of organizational values and that espoused organizational values are fully put into practice (cf. Agle & Caldwell, 1999; Martin, 2002; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). To move further with a gender equity agenda, discussions in sport organizations must be initiated to disrupt existing discourses and develop new ways of addressing and implementing this organizational value.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Prologue</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Gender Equity and Sport	1
Gender Equity in University Athletics	2
Studying Organizational Values	4
Turning to Post-structuralist Feminism	6
Context and Purpose of the Study	8
Overview of Remaining Chapters	9
<b>2 Conceptual Framework</b>	<b>11</b>
Post-Structuralist Feminism	12
Key Features of Post-structuralist Feminism	13
Discourses	13
Power	16
Multiple meanings	22
Subjectivity	25
Deconstruction	26
Examples of Post-structuralist Feminist Studies of Gender Equity in Organizations	27
Organizational Values	29
Questioning Unitary and Shared Meanings of Organizational Values	30
Destabilizing the Voices of Upper Management	31
Studying Gender Equity as an Organizational Value	33
Examining the Connection between Espoused and Enacted Values	35
Post-structuralist Feminism and Organizational Values	36
Gender Equity in Sport	36
Conceptualization of Gender Equity in Sport	37
Meaning and Practices of Gender Equity	41
Positioning Gender Equity as a Women's Issue	42
Summary of Relevant Literature	44
<b>3 The Research Project</b>	<b>46</b>
Research Method: Collective Case Study	46
Site Selection	47
Case Study Selection	48
Data Collection	50
Temporal Order of Data Collection	51
Field Notes	53
Documents	55
Observations	56
In-depth Interviews	59
Selection of interviewees	61
Description of interviewees	62
Contact process	64
Reflections on Data Collection	66

Data Analysis	67
Deconstruction	67
Analysis of Field Notes – Memos	69
Analysis of Documents – Content Analysis	69
Mission statement	70
Policy documents	70
Operating budget	70
News releases	71
Analysis of Observations – Content Analysis	71
Analysis of Interviews – Coding and Categorizing	72
Development of Themes	73
Reflections on Data Analysis	73
Trustworthiness	74
Ethical Issues	75
Consent	75
Gaining Trust	76
My Identity	78
Representation	79
Interviewees' Roles	81
Summary of the Research Project	82
<b>4 Situating the Four Sport Programs</b>	<b>84</b>
The CIAU	85
Historical Context	85
Economic Context	86
The Athletic Department	87
Historical Context	89
Political Context	90
Social Context	92
Economic Context	93
Summary of the Context of the CIAU and Athletic Department	94
The Four Sport Programs	95
Basketball Program	95
History and accomplishments	95
Roster sizes	96
Staff	96
Facilities	97
Schedules	98
Resource support	98
Visibility	100
Fan support	101
Athletic council	101
Summary of the basketball program	102
Ice Hockey Program	103
History and accomplishments	103
Roster sizes	103
Staff	104
Facilities	105
Schedules	107
Resource support	107
Visibility	111
Fan support	112



Athletic council	113
Summary of the ice hockey program	113
Rugby Program	114
History and accomplishments	114
Roster sizes	114
Staff	115
Facilities	116
Schedules	116
Resource support	117
Visibility	119
Fan support	120
Athletic council	120
Summary of the rugby program	120
Swim Program	121
History and accomplishments	121
Roster sizes	121
Staff	122
Facilities	123
Schedules	123
Resource support	124
Visibility	125
Fan support	125
Athletic council	126
Body image	126
Summary of the swim program	126
Summary of the Institutional Conditions of the Four Sport Programs	127
<b>5 Meanings of Gender Equity</b>	<b>130</b>
Equality	130
Equal Opportunities: "Gender equity is equal opportunities for men and women"	132
Equal Resources: "Equal funding for male and female teams"	134
Equal Treatment: "Teams are treated equally regardless of gender"	134
Multi-dimensional Meanings of Equality	135
Commentary on Equality	137
Conditional Equality	138
Considering Institutional Conditions: "It doesn't necessarily have to be dollar for dollar"	139
Not Taking Away From Others: "Not at the expense of the men's teams"	140
Commentary on Conditional Equality	141
It is a Women's Only Issue	142
Women were Undervalued: "Women are the curtain raisers"	143
Something Should be Done for Women: "Helping women's programs stay even with men's programs"	144
It was the Women's Responsibility: "She was one of the few who really made gender equity a priority"	145
Commentary on It is a Women's Only Issue	148
Concluding Comments on Meanings of Gender Equity	149
<b>6 Gender Equity and Organizational Practices</b>	<b>153</b>
Gender Equity and Programming	154
Equality in Programming: "If there's a men's sport, there's a women's sport"	155
Conditional Equality in Programming: It depends on "what model you use"	157
Gender Equity and Resource Allocations	159

Equal Distribution of Resources: "The teams have equal amounts of money"	159
Inequitable Distribution of Resources: "They don't have their own dressing room"	160
Conditional Equality in Resource Allocations: "The sports that are more popular tend to get more money"	165
Gender Equity and Promotions	167
Equal Promotions: "We promote both the same"	167
Inequitable Promotions: "If there's nothing else going on, then the girls' hockey team gets promoted"	169
Conditional Equality in Promotions: "There's no point in promoting sports that play one home event a year"	172
Relationship Between Meanings and Practices	174
Organizational Practices and Equality	175
Organizational Practices and Conditional Equality	175
Organizational Practices and It is a Women's Only Issue	175
Concluding Comments on Gender Equity and Organizational Practices	177
Gender Equity in a Canadian Setting	177
Inconsistencies between Meanings and Practices	177
Multiple Understandings of Gender Equity in Organizational Practices	180
<b>7 Explanations for Gaps Between Meanings and Practices</b>	<b>183</b>
Denying Gender Inequities	184
Gradual Improvements: "It's better than it would have been years ago"	184
Gender Equity Was Not a Problem: "It hasn't been a problem"	186
Rationalizing Gender Inequities	188
Gender Inequities were Inconsequential: "It is nothing blatant"	188
Other Values were More Important: "The men bring in more money than the women"	193
Gender Equity was not Their Responsibility: "I'm not going to step up because I don't foresee a problem with it"	197
Gender Inequities were Accepted and Normalized: "It's just the way things are"	199
Concluding Comments on Gaps Between Meanings and Practices	203
Organizational Logic and Resistance to Change	203
<b>8 Conclusion</b>	<b>207</b>
Meanings and Practices of Gender Equity: Conclusions and Contributions	207
Surfacing Multiple Meanings by Opening Up the Discussion to Marginalized Voices	207
Using Truth Rules to Rationalize the Gaps Between Meaning and Practice	210
Complacency and a Lack of Interest in Changing Meanings and Practices	214
Recommendations for Change	215
Develop Alternative Discourses	215
Change the Formal Practices	218
Areas of Future Research	220
Concluding Comments	223
<b>References</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>244</b>
Appendix A – Department of Athletics Gender Equity Policy	245
Appendix B – Observation Categories	247
Appendix C – Interview Guide	248
Appendix D – Department of Athletics and Recreation Mission Statement	254
Appendix E – Analysis of Mission Statement	255
Appendix F – Analysis of Policy Documents	256
Appendix G – Analysis of Operating Budgets for the Four Sport Programs	268

Appendix H – Analysis of New Releases	272
Appendix I – Analysis of Observations	277
Appendix J – First-order and Second-order Codes	287
Appendix K – Themes, Sub-Themes, and Categories	296
Appendix L – University Ethical Approval	302
Appendix M – Consent Letter	305
Appendix N – Meanings of Gender Equity	307
Appendix O – Understandings of Organizational Practices	318
Appendix P – Explanations for Gaps Between Meanings and Practices	329

## List of Tables

<b>Table</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 1	<i>Selection Criteria for the Four Case Study Sport Programs</i>	50
Table 2	<i>Time Frame and Sequence of Data Collection</i>	52
Table 3	<i>Profile of Participants Based on Stakeholder Group, Gender and Sport Program</i>	63
Table 4	<i>List of Identifier Labels for the Respondents</i>	77
Table 5	<i>Description of Sports by Gender and Major-Minor Designation</i>	89
Table 6	<i>Operating Budgets Figures for the Athletic Department over Three Seasons</i>	94
Table 7	<i>Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons</i>	99
Table 8	<i>Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons</i>	108
Table 9	<i>Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Rugby Programs over Three Seasons</i>	118
Table 10	<i>Operating Expenses for the Swim Program over Three Seasons</i>	124
Table 11	<i>Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams</i>	160
Table 12	<i>Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams</i>	164
Table 13	<i>Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Rugby Programs</i>	165
Table 14	<i>News Releases for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons</i>	169
Table 15	<i>News Releases for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons</i>	171
Table 16	<i>News Releases for Swimming, Women's Ice Hockey, and Rugby over Three Seasons</i>	173
Table 17	<i>Pseudonyms of Selected Authors</i>	243
Table 18	<i>List of Observation Categories</i>	247
Table 19	<i>Analysis of Department's Mission Statement</i>	255
Table 20	<i>Analysis of CLAU Operations Manual</i>	256
Table 21	<i>Analysis of Regional Conference Operations Manual</i>	261
Table 22	<i>Analysis of LCU Policy and Procedure Handbook</i>	264
Table 23	<i>Analysis of Athletic Department Policy</i>	266
Table 24	<i>Detailed Operating Budgets for Four Sport Programs over Three Seasons</i>	268
Table 25	<i>Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons</i>	269
Table 26	<i>Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons</i>	270
Table 27	<i>Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's and Women's Rugby Teams over Three Seasons</i>	271
Table 28	<i>Analysis of News Releases</i>	272
Table 29	<i>Analysis of Basketball Observations</i>	277
Table 30	<i>Analysis of Ice Hockey Observations</i>	280
Table 31	<i>Analysis of Rugby Observations</i>	283
Table 32	<i>Analysis of Swimming Observations</i>	285

Table 33 - <i>List of First-order and Second-order Codes</i>	287
Table 34 - <i>Identification of Themes, Sub-themes, and Categories</i>	296
Table 35 - <i>Variations of Equality by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	307
Table 36 - <i>Variations of Equality by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	308
Table 37 - <i>Conditional Equality by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	310
Table 38 - <i>Conditional Equality by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	311
Table 39 - <i>Variations of Gender Equity is a Women's Only Issue by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	313
Table 40 - <i>Variations of Gender Equity is a Women's Only Issue by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	314
Table 41 - <i>Individual Meanings of Gender Equity</i>	316
Table 42 - <i>Gender Equity and Programming by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	318
Table 43 - <i>Gender Equity and Programming by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	319
Table 44 - <i>Gender Equity and Resource Allocations by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	321
Table 45 - <i>Gender Equity and Resource Allocations by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	322
Table 46 - <i>Gender Equity and Promotions by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	324
Table 47 - <i>Gender Equity and Promotions by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	325
Table 48 - <i>Individual Understandings of Gender Equity and Organizational Practices</i>	327
Table 49 - <i>Denial of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	329
Table 50 - <i>Denial of Gender Inequities by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	330
Table 51 - <i>Rationalization of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	331
Table 52 - <i>Rationalization of Gender Inequities by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group</i>	332
Table 53 - <i>Individual Denials of Gender Equity by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	333
Table 54 - <i>Individual Rationalizations of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group</i>	334

## Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to the creation of this document and the knowledge presented in it. First and foremost, I thank my doctoral advisor, Dr. Wendy Frisby, for providing me with many years of guidance, wisdom, support, and advice. From you I learned about the particular bodies of knowledge that are fundamental to this dissertation, the production and dissemination of knowledge, and the culture and values that underpin academia. Most importantly, you have shown me what it takes to be a strong, centred woman, a passionate, innovative teacher, and an insightful, critical feminist researcher.

Thank you to my current committee members, Dr. Deirdre Kelly and Dr. Carolyn Shields at The University of British Columbia and Dr. Lucie Thibault at Brock University, my university examiners, Dr. Bonita Long and Dr. Veronica Strong-Boag at the University of British Columbia, and my external examiner, Dr. Ellen Staurowsky at Ithaca College. Your advice, comments, and keen eyes for the big picture and the fine details have helped to make this a much stronger, clearer, and cleaner document. As well, I thank my past committee members, Dr. Lisa Kikulis and Dr. Richard Wolfe, who contributed to the early development of my dissertation.

Thank you to my family – your support was much appreciated through the entire process. A special thanks to Warren and Trent for providing me with the reassurances that the work I'm doing is still important and valid.

Thanks to my friends that I met at the Annex, particularly Sydney, Ted, and Kathy. I can't imagine going through this process without having others to goof off with, to discuss our work, to bitch and complain to and with, but most importantly to remind me to have a life. Thanks to my friends in Saskatchewan, particularly Carrie, Erik, and Lucy – for your encouragement and understanding, and to my colleagues and their families at the University of Regina – for contributing to a welcoming, fun, and comfortable environment in which I was able to complete this dissertation.

Thank you to my husband, Orland. You have supported me through the entire process. You listened to me go on about a myriad of ideas that are not part of your everyday vernacular (see, I got those two words in). You were there for the 'aha' moments, the periods of confusion, the flurry of data collection, the lapses in momentum, and the times of frustration. And following all of that, you decided to follow a similar path. At least you know what you're getting yourself in to.

The intuitive mind is a sacred gift, and the rational mind is a faithful servant. We have created a society that honors the servant and has forgotten the gift.

Albert Einstein

The vital role of the academic is as both critic and source of knowledge for society.

David Suzuki

## Prologue

For five years as an undergraduate student at a Canadian university, I volunteered as the manager of a women's university basketball team. Following that, I was employed by the athletic department for two years as a sport event manager. I was attracted to university athletics because of the special bonds that are created on the teams and the status and privileges associated with elite level sport, such as the opportunities to travel and to meet people. Although I realized that I was privy to many experiences that were not afforded to many other students on campus, I was also aware of and troubled by the discrepancies between the men's and women's basketball teams.

Few fans attended the women's basketball games. While the poor record of our team could partly explain this, the scheduled start time of 6:15 pm also placed us at a disadvantage to the men's game that was scheduled at a more reasonable time of 8:00 pm. I always wondered why it was that the women's game had to be scheduled first. What would happen if the times were reversed? Would more fans attend our games if it was scheduled at a more convenient time, or would, as the athletic director indicated on several occasions, fans leave after the men's game, thus negating the change in time?

Both the men's and women's team rooms were located near the gymnasium, but that is where the similarities ended. The women's team room was a small, unlocked space located within a larger, public women's locker room. It consisted of a small bench and 25 lockers and was virtually impossible for the entire team of 14 players to be in the room at the same time. In contrast, the men's team room was large and spacious. Since it was located separate from the men's public locker room, the team was able to maintain private access to it. It was furnished with over 50 lockers, a long bench, a private washroom, a chalk board, and could easily accommodate all the players and staff for meetings. I wondered why the women had to take turns changing in the cramped and uncomfortable room, when the men had plenty of room and were unlikely to be concerned about teammates invading their personal space. In addition, I noticed differences in the level of support from sponsors, the availability of scholarship monies, and the extent of media attention to name a few inequities. I thought that these inequities were inevitable because the women's team was not successful and thus had little power to influence change in the department. However, when the men's team started losing too, but was still afforded with many privileges, I wondered why was it that

the men were taken better care of than the women. I also began to question why women accepted their disadvantaged situation as many of my teammates, myself included, did little to advocate for change. For my doctoral research, I became curious about whether similar discrepancies existed at other Canadian university athletic departments, if various stakeholders, including athletes, were cognizant of them, and if there was an interest in addressing them.

My master's work on strategic decision making in the Canadian university athletic system piqued my interest in the role organizational values play in organizations (Hill, 1996; Hill & Kikulis, 1999). In much of the management literature, successful and productive organizations are those in which organizational members espoused and enacted shared values. In my study, I found that some of the athletic directors whom I spoke with were committed to broad-based programming, while others believed it was more advantageous to specialize in a few sports. Some of them strongly believed in maintaining ties to historical rivals, regardless of the travel costs, while others were committed to re-configuring the conference boundaries and establishing new rivalries between universities in order to control costs. Even though these athletic directors all belonged to the same regional conference and the literature would suggest that they espoused the same values, the findings from my master's study suggested that they did not espouse the same values. From this, I turned my attention to one organizational value in particular – gender equity. Based on my previous experiences, I wondered what the connections were between what coaches, administrators, and athletes said and what they did, as it appeared to me that there were gaps between meanings and practices.

I decided to carry on in some ways with the research I did for my master's degree, because I was dissatisfied with the lack of research being paid to gender equity in the Canadian university athletic system. In the early stages of my doctoral research, I was questioned by academics, students, friends, and colleagues if gender equity really was an issue. The implication was that there were no problems in the Canadian system. The gaps between men's and women's teams did not appear as great as they have been documented at some universities and colleges in the United States. At the university in which this research was situated their equity office compiled an annual report on equity. In 1999, only 1% of the 205 cases (approximately 2 cases) of harassment and discrimination were from athletics, while in 2000, 2% of 136 cases (approximately 3 cases) dealt with cases pertaining to the



athletic department. From this, some could conclude that there were few inequities in the department, but I had a hard time accepting that argument as I had experienced numerous inequities.

Finally, I was drawn to post-structuralist feminist theory as a lens for examining the questions I had about gender equity and athletes, because critical questions were not being adequately addressed by most of the sport management literature that has relied on a liberal feminist stance. Instead of proposing that inequities existed because of some natural deficiencies of women or that there were structural barriers, post-structuralist feminist theory, with its emphasis on discourses, knowledge, power, and gender, directed my attention to the embeddedness of gendered discourses in organizational cultures. This dissertation is my attempt to uncover and disrupt the assumptions we take for granted, but which perpetuate inequities in university athletics.

# 1

## Introduction

From my past experience in university athletics<sup>i</sup>, I was aware of how easily and nonchalantly coaches, administrators, and even athletes justified gender inequities. It was not uncommon to hear the argument that men's teams deserved a greater share of the resources because they generated more revenue that helped to subsidize women's teams. I heard that it was virtually impossible to increase the size of the women's locker room because it would cost too much to renovate the facility. I heard that attendance was higher at men's games because their display of strength and physicality made the game more exciting to watch. These explanations were accepted even by women athletes, who were the most disadvantaged in the university sport system, because the reasons seemed logical and normal given the historical context that privileged male athletes. It is through the acceptance of such arguments as natural, instead of questioning them, that one becomes victimized by the power in the production of knowledge and the social construction of dominant discourses that protect the status quo. An aim of this study was to understand and critique dominant discourses of gender equity<sup>ii</sup> as an organizational value that are espoused in Canadian university athletic departments and to raise questions about how such knowledge is produced and put into practice.

## *Gender Equity and Sport*

Athletic achievement, financial responsibility, national recognition, mass participation, excellence, and fair play are some of the typical and potentially conflicting organizational values espoused by managers of sport organizations such as national governing bodies and university athletic departments (Hinings, Thibault, Slack, & Kikulis, 1996; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe, Hoeber, & Babiak, 2002). In recent years, gender equity has also become an organizational value that appears in the mission and policy statements of these types of sport organizations (cf. Hoeber & Frisby, 2001; Shaw, 2001). For example, the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU)<sup>iii</sup>, which is the national governing body for university athletics in Canada, established an equity and equality committee and developed goal statements that demonstrate a commitment to this organizational value (CIAU, 1999). Certainly institutional pressures in the form of government legislation such as

the National Policy on Women and Girls in Sport, Research and Physical Activity (1999) in Australia, the Sport Canada Policy on Women in Sport (1986) in Canada, the Making English Sport Inclusive guidelines (2000) in England and Title IX legislation (1972)<sup>iv</sup> in the United States have motivated some sport organizations to adopt gender equity. Yet, calls for greater gender diversity in leadership and athletic participation (cf. Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink & Pastore, 1999, Fink, Pastore & Riemer, 2001), coupled with research illustrating continued gender inequities at all levels of sport (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000; McKay, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Theberge, 2000a, 2000b), signal that gender equity is an organizational value that is not always enacted, even when it has been incorporated into policies and organizational mission statements.

### ***Gender Equity in University Athletics***

In the past thirty years, the opportunities for Canadian female athletes<sup>v</sup> to participate in university sports has increased (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Hums, MacLean, Richman, & Pastore, 1994; Inglis, 1988; Keyes, 1974; Pomfret, 1988). In the early 1970s, there were only four national championships for women in the sports of basketball, gymnastics, swimming and diving, and volleyball (Keyes, 1974). Currently there are 10 national championships for women in the sports of basketball, cross-country running, field hockey, ice hockey, rugby, soccer, swimming, track and field, volleyball, and wrestling, which is one more than the number of national championships for men (see page 86, chapter 4) (CIS, 2002a). However, despite these increases in programming opportunities, male athletes continue to outnumber female athletes. In 2002, there were 5,417 registered male athletes (54%) compared to 4,536 female athletes (46%) registered in the Canadian university system (CIS, 2002b). This discrepancy is primarily due to the large number of males playing football.

At first glance, athletic department administrators may assume that gender equity has been successfully put into practice because there are significantly more opportunities for female athletes to participate. This liberal feminist approach to gender equity is based on the idea that removing structural and bureaucratic barriers will result in equal opportunities for women and men (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). While this goal of achieving equal numbers may have contributed to the expansion of the number of teams for women, it ignores other dimensions of inequity (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990). Research has shown that women

receive fewer scholarships than men, women's teams are promoted less often, and men's teams generally receive a greater share of operating budgets (CIS, 2001, Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Inglis et al., 2000). Furthermore, adding more teams for women and establishing goal statements does not, as some may expect, adequately address inequities because the prevailing gendered culture, power imbalances, and the allocation of resources have not been challenged or altered (Gherardi, 2001; Rao, Stuart, & Kelleher, 1999). Alvesson and Billing (1997) noted that despite the social pressures to be gender equitable the commitment to it often borders on tokenism because it is rarely translated and embedded into organizational practices.

There have been few documented cases of gender discrimination at Canadian university athletic departments, which contrasts sharply with the American situation where Title IX legislation has forced athletic departments to assess their practices and address inequities. Compliance with Title IX legislation has been contentious and there have been several notable examples of legal action taken on behalf of athletes (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Fink & Pastore, 1997; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). Some may conclude that the absence of publicly documented legal cases in Canadian universities points to successful policy implementation. However, prevailing societal discourses that have historically privileged the physicality and athletic performances of men over those of women reinforce inequities in athletic structures, policies and practices (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Shaw, 2001). The privileging of one version of truth that argues gender equity is not a problem over evidence of continued gender inequities demonstrates that hegemony is operating to perpetuate them. Drawing on Gramsci's theory of hegemony, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) and Fraser (1997) contended that hegemony operates when the knowledge produced by dominant groups becomes privileged and takes on the status of common sense, and thus often goes unquestioned, while the preferences of the dominated groups go unnoticed, especially when they consent to the existing order characterized by asymmetrical power relations. A danger for stakeholders in sport is that they may become complacent by assuming that equal numbers of participants or sport teams for men and women adequately address this organizational value and thereby ignore other strategies that would lead to a more comprehensive approach to gender equity for athletes. It is precisely because it is taken for granted that Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000) have argued that we should "ask questions that are an insult to common sense ... to promote a kind of thinking which differs radically from

established modes” (p. 132), and in turn, calls into question the arbitrary nature of the production of knowledge.

Through case studies of four university sport programs situated in one university athletic department at a Canadian university, this study sought to question the status quo and challenge the taken for granted assumptions that influenced the understandings and practices of gender equity as an organizational value. This study was informed by post-structuralist feminist theory that provided a lens for understanding the local meanings and the production of gendered knowledge, promoted a critique of the manner in which dominant discourses are embedded in organizational cultures, and encouraged discussion of transforming meanings and practices (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a). Studying gender equity as an organizational value provided a way of understanding the “unobtrusive ways that gender inequity is sustained and reproduced in organizations” (Fletcher, 1999b, p. 2). In doing so, we can enter into discussions about the ingrained meanings and practices that perpetuate inequities and entertain possibilities for transformation.

### ***Studying Organizational Values***

Schein (1985), one of the early researchers of organizational culture, conceptualized organizational values as windows into the deep structures of organizations or the “collection of values, history, culture and practices that form the unquestioned, ‘normal’ way of working in organizations” (Rao et al., 1999, p. 2). I argue that studying gender equity as an organizational value with multiple potential meanings will challenge dominant discourses and reveal alternative ways of embedding it more deeply and fully into organizational practices.

Agle and Caldwell (1999) reviewed eight definitions of organizational values, most of which conceptualized them as preferences about desired behaviours (e.g., cooperation, efficiency) or organizational outcomes (e.g., profit, success). For example, Enz (1988, p. 287) defined organizational values as:

the beliefs held by an individual or group regarding means and ends organizations “ought to” or “should” identify in the running of the enterprise, in choosing what business actions or objectives are preferable to alternative actions, or in establishing organizational objectives.

While Agle and Caldwell (1999) maintained that the proliferation of definitions is indicative of a well-defined construct, most of these definitions portrayed organizational values in a

rationalistic manner that failed to tap into their political or socially constructed dimensions (cf. Hill & Kikulis, 1999; Hoeber & Frisby, 2001).

Martin (2002) was critical of the rational perspective because espoused organizational values are not always widely shared or understood by organizational members and are not always reflected in organizational practices. Rather, espoused organizational values may merely serve as corporate propaganda to maintain the status quo and divert attention away from gendered power relations that sustain inequities (Martin, 2002). For example, it is commonly assumed that organizational cultures and values are gender neutral and that organizational practices objectively reward meritorious skills, abilities, and achievements. Yet, a growing body of organizational research has shown that practices and discourses presumed to be gender neutral are highly gendered and contribute to systemic inequities (cf. Acker, 1990, 2000; Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a; Martin, 1994; Martin & Meyerson, 1998; Rao et al., 1999). It is generally assumed that the characteristics of a good worker, such as working independently, sacrificing one's private life for work and attending to crisis in a heroic manner, are gender neutral. Yet Rao et al. (1999) and Fletcher (1999a) argued that these qualities favour men over women who are still largely responsible for domestic and childcare tasks in the home, because of prevailing societal attitudes about the gendered division of labour. Likewise in sport, it has been shown that employment roles and hiring processes are underpinned by gendered assumptions (Hovden, 2000, Shaw, 2001; Shaw & Hoeber, 2003). Shaw (2001) demonstrated that while men and women were not explicitly singled out for particular positions in English national sport governing bodies, the role of regional development officers have traditionally been associated with femininity and women because they required individuals who were loyal, caring, and well-organized. In contrast, senior management roles were typically linked with masculinity and men because they required leaders who acted in a professional manner and would not be distracted by family commitments (Shaw, 2001). Based on this conception, it is important to determine whether understandings of organizational values are shared, whether there are multiple meanings attached to them, and whether they are actually embedded in organizational practices.

### ***Turning to Post-structuralist Feminism***

In the sport management literature, explanations for gender inequities and the barriers that block women's access to administration or participation have focused on organizational structures and deficiencies in individual skills and abilities (Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Hall, 1996). While this research has been helpful in demonstrating that inequities continue to exist, it does not explain the deeper mechanisms by which they are sustained and reinforced. Shaw (2001) was one of the first sport management scholars who argued that research must "progress from analyses of what occurs within sport organizations to an examination of how and why they continue to be arenas in which gender relations are far from equitable" (p. 4). This suggests that the role of the researcher is to "initiate open discussion of images widely spread by dominant groups and mainstream management thinking by drawing attention to hidden aspects and offering alternative readings" (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000, p. 17). Although largely untapped as a conceptual framework in the sport management literature, post-structuralist feminism offers an exciting new lens for examining gender equity. This theory focuses on the construction of meanings and the implementation of particular meanings in practice (Fletcher, 1999a). It is useful for this study because it acknowledges "the gendered nature of knowledge production and the way it maintains and reinforces the power relationships between the sexes" (Fletcher, 1999a, p. 21). In this process of gendered knowledge production, "advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine" (Acker, 1990, p. 146). In this way, gender hierarchies and distinctions are made to appear normal, which in turn furthers the interests of some dominant groups (Fletcher, 1999a).

The aim of post-structuralist feminism is to disrupt the status quo and traditional power structures by critiquing taken for granted assumptions and establishing contexts and conditions whereby individuals can draw upon alternative vocabularies to produce new meanings and practices that go farther in reflecting and enacting desired organizational values (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). By adopting this perspective, my attention was directed toward the identification and analysis of gender equity discourses to reveal the meanings that organizational members of an athletic department used to make sense of it and how it was manifested in practices.

Although gender equity is a frequent topic of discussion and research, Bryson and de Castell (1993) argued there is little agreement about how to define and interpret it. This is problematic because discourses are constructed and power is enacted through the meanings or the manner in which people make sense of organizational realities (Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Post-structuralist feminism recognizes that power is located “in systems of shared meaning that reinforce mainstream ideas and silence alternatives” (Fletcher, 1999a, p. 17). Thus, if it is assumed that understandings of gender equity are unitary and shared, it takes on the status of being a taken for granted organizational value and little effort will be made to promote further change.

With a post-structuralist approach to the study of organizational values, it is argued that organizational cultures are a struggle where the dominant groups’ understandings are usually privileged and seen as normal, with little or no consultation with other organizational members (Alvesson, 1987). Recognizing that socially constructed meanings that are or are not contested reveal the “gender we think” (Gherardi, 1994, p. 591), one purpose of this research was to determine if there were multiple meanings of gender equity for athletes from the perspectives of various stakeholder groups in university athletics (e.g., administrators, coaches, and athletes). I examined the meanings held by those at different levels of the organizational hierarchy to avoid the problem that pervades the management literature where the views of top administrators are assumed to represent the views of all other organizational members (Martin, 2002).

According to Alvesson and Deetz (2000), the insight gained from the perceptions of those who are studied are valuable for understanding the common and accepted meanings of a phenomenon, but this must be balanced with an awareness of how discourses operate to shape the understandings of those being studied. Depending on the particular setting, individuals draw upon existing discourses to understand their experiences (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Weedon, 1997), suggesting that not all discourses are accessible to all individuals in this process of constructing reality. It also recognizes that “there is no subjective reality independent of the socially constructed forces that create it” (Fletcher, 1999a, p. 39). It is through the “observation of social process” (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000, p. 70) that we become aware that certain interpretations of values are implemented and maintained by dominant powerful groups in an effort to suppress conflicting interpretations that may pose a threat or challenge to existing power structures.



In her study of gender equity in the British higher education system, Bagilhole (2002) argued that examining organizational practices related to it was useful in determining which meanings were enacted and to pinpoint gaps between meanings and practice. Recognizing that gender inequities are socially constructed and that organizational practices are “carriers of cultural meaning, drawing upon and producing gendered ideas ... and assumptions” (Alvesson & Billing, 1997, p. 106), by identifying which ones contribute to them, discussions can be raised about how to alter them to promote social justice (Kenway, Willis, Blackmore, & Rennie, 1998; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000).

Since practices reveal the enacted understanding of organizations or the “gender we do” (Gherardi, 1994, p. 591), the other aims of this research were to determine which meanings of this organizational value were implemented into practice, and how stakeholders accounted for any observed gaps between meanings and practices. Critiquing the mainstream and accepted views about the potential incongruities between meanings and practices can disrupt the status quo and establish a space to construct new ways of thinking.

### ***Context and Purpose of the Study***

The purpose of this study was to understand and critique the meanings and practices of gender equity for athletes from the perspectives of administrators, coaches, and athletes in a Canadian university context. This was accomplished by utilizing a qualitative approach and conducting case studies of four sport programs at one Canadian university. I posed three specific research questions:

- RQ1: What meanings did administrators, coaches, and athletes associate with gender equity for athletes?
- RQ2: Which meanings of this organizational value were implemented in organizational practices related to four different sport programs?
- RQ3: How did the administrators, coaches, and athletes explain any uncovered gaps between meanings and practices?

Alvesson and Billing (1997, p. 104) argued that understanding meanings rooted in organizational cultures requires a research design that emphasizes the fostering of insight and critique through “unpacking the deeper aspect of a phenomenon.” A qualitative approach was suitable for this study because it encouraged a nuanced appreciation of the local context through rich descriptions of settings and advocated a sensitivity to the

meanings held by those being studied (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). These are important considerations since the production of knowledge occurs at the local level, even though it is embedded in a broader historical, social, and political context (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

University athletics provided a rich site for examining and critiquing the taken for granted assumptions underpinning gender equity for three main reasons. First, sport has traditionally been identified as a male domain, but recent advances made by female athletes may lead to complacency about gender equity. Second, since athletic departments have sports with different histories and gender structures, it is important to examine the complexities that are deeply embedded in their cultures. Third, there are identifiable stakeholder groups at different levels of the organizational hierarchy (e.g., athletes, coaches, administrators) with potentially different understandings of this organizational value and how it should be implemented. As explained further in chapter 3, for this study I selected four sport programs in one Canadian athletic department with different institutional conditions. In three of the sports, the men's and women's programs operated separately with teams having separate coaching staff, schedules, operating budgets, and equipment. One sport operated in an integrated manner where the male and female athletes shared access to resources. In two sports, both the men's and women's teams had comparable long histories on campus, while for the other two sports, the men's teams had a long history on campus which contrasted with the recent additions of women's teams in the athletic department. I expected that I would find various practices and meanings of gender equity as a result of the different institutional conditions.

### ***Overview of Remaining Chapters***

This dissertation consists of eight chapters. In chapter 2, I provided the conceptual framework for this research, which was informed by three bodies of literature: post-structuralist feminism, organizational values, and gender equity in sport. In chapter 3, I described the research methods, my role as the researcher, and how I analyzed the data. Since post-structuralist research is grounded in a rich understanding of the local context, I devoted chapter 4 to describing the larger historical, political, social, and economic contexts surrounding the athletic department under investigation along with the specific institutional conditions of the four case study sport programs. In chapters 5, 6, and 7, I discussed the

major findings: respondents' meanings of gender equity are found in chapter 5; practices of gender equity are in chapter 6; and the explanations respondents used to justify the gaps between meanings and practices appear in chapter 7. Finally, in chapter 8, I drew conclusions, made recommendations, and suggested future directions for research.

---

<sup>i</sup> The term 'intercollegiate athletics' has long been used to describe the context in which teams from American colleges and universities competed against each other and were members of the same league, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). In Canada, sport teams from Canadian colleges and post-secondary institutes are members of the Canadian Colleges Athletic Association (CCAA) and use the term 'intercollegiate' to describe their structure. Sport teams from universities compete in a separate system governed by Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS), formerly the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union, and use the term 'interuniversity' to identify their structure. Thus, for this study, I referred to the context as 'university athletics' rather than the more common label of 'intercollegiate athletics' that pervades the sport literature.

<sup>ii</sup> Labeling an organizational value as gender equity presumes that there is an intimate and unique relationship between gender and the experiences of equity. It fails to consider the intersectionality of subjectivities in that one's experiences of equity are interconnected between gender and other aspects such as, but not limited to, age, ability, class, and sexuality. Nevertheless, I choose to focus specifically on gender equity as an organizational value because at the time of data collection that was how the value was positioned.

<sup>iii</sup> In 2001, members of the CIAU voted to change the name of their organization to Canadian Interuniversity Sport. Since the data was collected before the name change, I used the CIAU acronym in the body of the text, except when citing organizational documents published after the name change.

<sup>iv</sup> Title IX legislation was established in 1972 by the United States Congress to address gender discrimination in federally funded educational programs, including university athletics. Specifically, the policy states that "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (Title IX Educational Amendment of 1972, Title 20 U.S.C. sections 1681 to 1688). See Greendorfer (1998) for a more detailed account of this piece of legislation in relation to the working of the NCAA, the prominent governing body for university athletics in the United States.

<sup>v</sup> In academic and popular literature university athletes are commonly referred to as 'student-athletes.' Despite its widespread use, there is some criticism and calls for change of this term. In the United States, concerns have been raised that although these individuals are technically enrolled as students in universities, for some of them the majority of their time and energy is focused on their athletic pursuits (Eitzen, 2003). Emphasizing the 'student' role also diverts attention away from the exploitation of these individuals by universities and athletic departments that financially benefit from their athletic accomplishments. Others have argued that the term is redundant as only students can legitimately participate as university athletes. The Drake Group, a national American group composed of faculty members who advocate for greater academic integrity in athletic departments, have proposed that the term 'student-athlete' be replaced by either 'student' or 'college athlete' to emphasize one or the other roles, but not both simultaneously (Drake Group, n.d.). I elected to refer to them as athletes in part because of these concerns, but also because, in the context of this study, very few of those with whom I spoke discussed their role as students, the value of education, or the connection between athletics and education.

## 2

### Conceptual Framework

Some sport organizations are formally incorporating gender equity as a value in their mission statements and policy documents. Despite this espoused commitment, we know little about the meanings of this organizational value for organizational members and how it is enacted. In this chapter, I drew upon three bodies of literature, post-structuralist feminism, organizational values, and gender equity in sport, to inform my study about the meanings and practices associated with gender equity for athletes in a Canadian university.

First, I developed the need to examine gender equity from a post-structuralist feminist perspective. In this section I described and highlighted the fundamental characteristics of post-structuralist feminism, the advantages of using it, and recent research on gender equity from this perspective.

Next, I addressed the organizational values literature because I situated gender equity as an organizational value for this study. Although this literature was a subset of a larger body of literature on organizational culture, some of which has embraced perspectives similar to post-structuralist feminism, many studies continued to follow a positivist tradition. In this section, I argued that a post-structuralist feminist perspective was beneficial because it disputed the assumption of shared unitary meanings of values, it does not privilege the voices of upper administrators, and it focused attention on the connection between espoused and enacted values. In doing so, new ways of thinking and doing gender equity can be uncovered, created or developed (Fletcher, 1999a; Rao et al., 1999).

While there has been a significant amount of research devoted to examining gender equity in sport organizations. Many of the studies have identified individual and structural reasons for gender inequities in sport (cf. Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Hall, 1996), but most have overlooked explanations grounded in the organizational culture literature. Using a post-structuralist feminist perspective acknowledged that assumptions about gender are embedded and ingrained within organizational cultures in areas like organizational values, formal and informal practices, symbols, rituals, and social interactions (Acker, 1990; Alvesson, 1987; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000; Rao et al., 1999). These underlying assumptions provided valuable meanings because they reinforced guidelines and delineated boundaries

about what was normal or expected in the organization (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). To move beyond traditional notions of gender equity and avoid simplistic practices that reinforce inequities, conflict, and misunderstandings amongst organizational members, researchers must identify and contest those underlying assumptions and illuminate and analyze multiple meanings to more fully understand how the value can be enacted.

### ***Post-structuralist Feminism***

Post-structuralist feminism<sup>i</sup> is a theory about the complex relationships among knowledge, power, and gender (Kenway, Willis, Blackmore, & Rennie, 1994; Mumby, 1996; Weedon, 1997). It draws on both the philosophy of post-structuralism, particularly the work of Michel Foucault, with its critique of language and power and the political nature of feminist thought with its emphasis on social change (cf. Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2000; Calás & Smircich, 1996, 1999; Fletcher, 1998, 1999a; Fraser & Nicholson, 1990; Hearn & Parkin, 1993; Olesen, 2000; Rail, 1998; Scott, 1990; Weedon, 1997). While structuralists study the symbolic system of language and see it as a fixed or universal entity<sup>ii</sup>, post-structuralist feminists are interested in the use of language recognizing that it is socially constructed and relevant in the practices of knowledge production that contribute to the dominance of particular ideologies (Fraser, 1997). They recognize language as a tool that people use to establish meaning and determine a reality for themselves (Jacobson & Jacques, 1997; Scott, 1990; Weedon, 1997). Thus, post-structuralist feminist researchers analyze how meanings and knowledge are produced, contested, and changed (Kenway et al., 1994; Mumby, 1996). While feminist inquiry is focused on identifying examples of oppression, power imbalances, and inequities, as well as challenging and changing existing patriarchal structures in society (Calás & Smircich, 1996), post-structuralist feminist inquiry involves challenging “inequitable relationships of power which involve gender” as evidenced through meanings and discourses and hidden in organizational practices and cultures (Kenway et al., 1998, p. xviii). As Weedon (1997) pointed out, researchers who use it analyze “the relationship between language, social institutions and individual consciousness which focuses on how power is exercised” (p. 19). Since this study concerned the meanings of gender equity and how it is played out in organizational practices, post-structuralist feminism was an appropriate lens to guide the analysis.

### *Key Features of Post-structuralist Feminism*

There are many defining features of this perspective and many ways to interpret it (Kenway et al., 1994). For my research, I was interested in the meanings individuals associated with gender equity, the influence of institutional conditions on the production of meanings and practices, how gender equity was espoused and enacted, and the potential for alternative understandings of it. To address these issues the identification and analysis of discourses and gendered power relations was central. The idea that discourses provide “competing ways of giving meaning to the world and organizing social institutions and processes” (Kenway et al., 1998, p. xvii) suggests that there is a tight relationship between meanings and power. Using post-structuralist feminism as a lens encouraged me to look for multiple meanings, to recognize the subjectivity of the participants and myself in the production and analysis of these meanings, and to use deconstruction as an analytical tool to disrupt taken for granted assumptions.

#### *Discourses.*

According to Phillips and Hardy (2002, p. 3), a discourse is defined as “an interrelated set of texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception, that brings an object into being.” Similarly, Fletcher (1999a, p. 143) defined the term as “the social arena in which common understandings are manifest in language, social practices, and structures.” This understanding of discourses is contested. Some researchers conceptualize them more narrowly by focusing on the words, phrases, and statements in verbal and written texts (cf. Weedon, 1997). In contrast, others, like Phillips and Hardy (2002), considered discourses more broadly, in that texts, or where the practice of knowledge production occurs and meanings surface, included a variety of forms such as the spoken word, written texts, artifacts, symbols, physical arrangements, gestures, and pictures. Phillips and Hardy (2002) also focused on how discourses take shape and are experienced in particular contexts. This is important because discourses are also connected to power through their “inscription in institutional structures and practices and in cultural products” (Kenway et al., 1998, p. xvii). For the purposes of this research, I relied on the broader understanding of discourses, recognizing that in order to understand gender equity, it would be important to consider the context and institutional conditions under which respondents make sense of this organizational value.

Discourses are socially constructed and are situated in complex social, cultural, and historical contexts that produce versions of truth that become the common sense way of doing things (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Scott, 1990; Weedon, 1997). Depending on the particular context, individuals are exposed to, draw upon, or adopt existing discourses to give meaning to their experiences, to act as representatives of their interests and values, and to communicate with others (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Weedon, 1997). These discourses produce meanings that make sense in a particular context and help individuals shape and frame their version of reality (Oswick, Keenoy, & Grant, 1997; Scott, 1990). For example, during an elite-level basketball game, the coaches, players, and officials engage in a particular discourse or way of making sense of the game. They communicate and generate meaning using particular words (e.g., foul, hoop), phrases (e.g., zone defense, pick and roll), and gestures (e.g., an official with both hands in the air and showing three fingers on each hand to indicate the completion of a three-point shot). In other settings, such as a hospital emergency room or a coffee shop, many of these same gestures and phrases would not have the same meaning. Post-structuralist feminists recognize that “times and places cannot be isolated from the wider politics of the state and civil society ... understanding the local is what is considered important strategically” (Kenway et al., 1998, p. xviii). Therefore, it was important to understand how the particular meanings of gender equity related to the institutional conditions of the sport programs and to the larger historical, political, social, and economic contexts of the athletic department and its governing body, the CIAU.

Discourses do not simply describe situations; they play a significant role in constructing reality (Oswick et al., 1997). They shape “what can and cannot be said; what constitutes the mandatory, the permissible, and the forbidden; and the boundaries of common sense” (Jacobson & Jacques, 1997, p. 48). They work to promote particular views and divert attention away from alternative versions of reality (Garnsey & Rees, 1996). As Fletcher (1999a, p. 22) stated, “the production of knowledge [is] an *exercise in power* where only some voices are heard and only some experience is counted as knowledge.” This implied that there is a relationship between discourses and power, with some discourses taking on “the status of objective knowledge” (Scott, 1990, p. 136), which becomes difficult to challenge. Fletcher (1999a, p. 22) added that:

The process of producing knowledge is an exercise in power that is especially potent because it is not open to question: What is “true” is so

consistent with the dominant ideology that it is supported by notions of common sense, nature, and divinely inspired order.

In her study, Fletcher (1998, 1999a) job shadowed and interviewed six female engineers in one organization and found evidence of four categories of relational job practices. These included preserving, where the well-being of a project was protected and maintained; mutual empowering that involved enabling others to accomplish tasks and objectives; achieving that required using relational skills to enhance one's achievements; and team building that was established by creating a positive and social work environment. She maintained that while these relational work practices were apparent in the organization she studied, they "disappeared as work because [they] violated the masculine logic of effectiveness" (1999a, p. 91). She (1999) argued that these practices lacked relevance because of the misattribution of motives and the limits of language. First, it was assumed that those who engaged in relational practices did so not because it was essential to the effectiveness of their work, but because of a personality trait such as naïveté or thoughtfulness. Second, engineers described relational practices using words and phrases (e.g., being nice, helping out, being approachable) that related to femininity or the private sphere, which in turn "diminish[ed] its organizational relevance and its ability to be perceived as work" (1999a, p. 106). As a result, these practices went unrewarded because they did not fit the dominant discourse of work where "autonomy, self-promotion, and individual heroics were highly prized" (1998, p. 175). Her research illustrated that the dominant discourse normalized a masculine view of work, and as a result, relational work was disregarded and marginalized. Fletcher (1998, 1999a) argued that as this view is challenged, work discourses will change to recognize alternative meanings of it.

Two aims of post-structuralist feminism are to identify dominant and marginalized discourses and to reveal the multiple meanings of them (Scott, 1990). These are particularly important because challenging the status quo requires listening to multiple interpretations so that new ideas or ways of thinking can be uncovered (Rao et al., 1999). To illustrate, in his study of the Australian Sports Commission's conceptualization and development of a gender equity policy, McKay (1994) uncovered three conflicting discourses. He labeled the dominant discourse "play by the rules," and this was touted by individuals who believed gender equity was unnecessary because sport was based on a fair and gender neutral system of merit based on achievements and dedication. The "change the rules" discourse was based



on liberal feminist notions and was espoused by some politicians, athletes, coaches, and administrators who recognized the inequities, but saw them stemming from women's inability to play by the existing rules, rather than as a function of "competitive practices, hierarchal structures and men's values" (McKay, 1994, p. 84). A third discourse, named the "change the game" discourse, was espoused by a few women who advocated radical changes to the patriarchal and competitive culture and structure of sport. This discourse was an example of a counter-discourse that resisted dominant discourses and provided an alternative version of reality that is obscured or discounted as knowledge (McDonald & Birrell, 1999).

#### *Power.*

Another prominent feature of post-structuralist feminism is the emphasis on the relationship between knowledge and power, particularly the recognition that power is exercised in the production of knowledge and operates through discourses (Weedon, 1997). Halford and Leonard (2001) identified three key components of Foucault's post-structuralist view of power: i) it is exercised and diffuse, meaning that all social actors have access to it and all are involved in constantly shifting and complex power relations; ii) it operates through discourses, and iii) the exercise of it shapes understandings of what is considered to be the truth. Adding a feminist perspective extends these ideas to consider the implications of gendered power relations.

The first component argues that power is exercised and is not possessed or invested in someone, which is a critique of a traditional view of power (Kearins, 1996; Kenway et al., 1998). Power is diffuse in that all organizational members are "subjects and bearers of power relations" (Halford & Leonard, 2001, p. 33), but the context will dictate whether it is exercised. Since the post-structuralist feminist view suggests that no one is simply oppressed or dominant (Halford & Leonard, 2001), researchers must pay attention to who exercises power, particularly in regards to the construction, implementation, and dissemination of meaning.

Second, power "operates through the construction of 'truth' through language and discourse" (Halford & Leonard, 2001, p. 32). Researchers must pay attention to how power is exercised in relation to language and the production of knowledge (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2000). This process of constructing meanings is "influenced by and influences shifting patterns of power" (Kenway et al., 1994, p. 189) and involves the selection of particular

vocabularies and the exclusion of alternative meanings (Calás & Smircich, 1999). Power is used to establish “truth rules” that are grounded in ideology and are used to define and establish what is true or false, legitimate or illegitimate, natural or deviant, acceptable or unacceptable (Fletcher, 1999a; Hardy & Clegg, 1996). The strength and power of these discourses when put into action is that they appear to be natural, obvious, and free from scrutiny (Fletcher, 1999a; Martin & Meyerson, 1998). This suggests that there will be dominant discourses that are given more legitimacy and marginalized discourses that are ignored; yet, there is always the potential for the meanings to be disrupted and contested (Green, Parkin, & Hearn, 2000). Even though to those in power discourses may appear fixed which makes them hard to change, they are contextually based and the potential exists for their meanings to be challenged and altered over time or across various settings (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Kenway et al., 1994; Linstead & Grafton-Small, 1992; Scott, 1990). Calás and Smircich (1996, p. 244) argued that the “politics of knowledge” contributes to gendered power relations and the naturalization of truths.

Third, researchers who employ a post-structuralist feminist perspective pay attention to the way that power is exercised “through discourses of truth [that] shape how each of us perceives ourselves, others, and the world around us” in relation to gender (Halford & Leonard, 2001, p. 32). Revealing discourses that are embedded in the deep structure of organizations, including practices, informal norms, and cultural manifestations (Fletcher, 1999b; Kenway et al., 1998), helps to disrupt the notion of gender neutrality by demonstrating how women have been marginalized (Martin & Meyerson, 1998). For example, the processes of hiring and promotion have long been deemed as gender neutral by employers who argue that their decisions are based on the merit of the applicants. Yet researchers like Acker (1990), Fletcher (1999a), and Hovden (2000) have demonstrated that these practices are underpinned by gendered assumptions, such as the willingness to work long hours, which compromises some women’s and men’s commitment to their families. From this perspective then, researchers consider the impact of discourses to produce, develop, and reinforce gendered power relations in the culture of organizations and question the gender categories that have been viewed as sacred, stable, and taken for granted (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000; Calás & Smircich, 1996; Martin & Meyerson, 1998).

Rao et al.’s (1999) conceptualization of power is useful as it provides more detail on the ways that it is exercised to shape versions of truth and to marginalize other meanings of

gender equity in organizations. They envision power as “empowering and infinite, and practiced as inclusionary [that] is conducive to a gender-equality agenda” (p. 6), but they also recognize it is still exercised in an exclusionary manner to perpetuate gender inequities. In other words, power can be exercised to secure meanings or it can be used to make available alternative meanings (Weedon, 1997). This conceptualization is consistent with a post-structuralist feminist perspective because it acknowledges that power can be “positive and productive, not simply repressive” (Kearins, 1996, p. 9).

Exclusionary power refers to the idea that not all organizational members have access to it or can exercise it (Rao et al. 1999), because power relations are gendered. They argued however that “power exercised to dominate or exclude needs to be effectively countered” (p. 9) in order for meaningful change to happen. They described five key ways that exclusionary power is employed: positional power, agenda-setting power, hidden power, power of dialogue, and power of conflict, each of which has an impact on the production of knowledge and the influence of gender equity discourses. Although power can be used to maintain discourses that serve the interests of privileged men in sport organizations, it can also be used to destabilize them and pressure for changes to existing systems to foster gender equity. The literature suggests that in sport power is most often used to maintain the status quo (cf. Blinde, Taub, & Han, 1993, 1994; Greendorfer, 1998; Hall, Cullen, & Slack, 1989, 1990; Kay, 1996; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1997, 1999; Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998; Taylor, 2001). The implication is that the direction gender equity takes in organizations depends on who has access to sources of power and how it is exercised.

Positional power relates to one’s formal status and title in an organization. Post-structuralist feminists are not interested in the possession of power because of one’s position, but rather are concerned about the influence of one’s position on the production of knowledge. This is particularly important because in male-dominated cultures, those in upper management positions have greater access to forums and mechanisms (e.g., formal decision making processes) that allow them to influence dominant understandings of gender equity. For example, it has been demonstrated that executive directors and other top administrators in national sport organizations, most of whom were male, claimed that their organizations were already gender equitable, denied the existence of gender inequities, or suggested that it was an irrelevant issue to them (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1997, 1999;

Shaw, 2001). Recognizing this, one could reasonably presume that they would not direct much attention towards gender equity, even though they had the authority to do so. Rao et al. (1999) argued that since everyone has power over their role and function in an organization, positional power “resides in every position” (pp. 6-7) and thus is diffused throughout the organization. From this view, it would be important to recognize that athletes and coaches have some power to resist current practices by drawing public attention to them through protest or public awareness campaigns for example (Clarke, Smith, & Thibault, 1994; Jacob & Mathes, 1996).

In organizations, there are boundaries about acceptable and unacceptable topics and these are established by those who exercise agenda-setting power (Rao et al., 1999). McKay (1994) alluded to this when he found that certain topics such as glass ceilings and informal networks were not on the agenda during discussions over gender equity policy development for the Australian sport system. Denying that gender inequities existed, which rendered them invisible, permitted many male administrators of national sport organizations to effectively remove it from the agenda thus closing the dialogue on it and dismissing the need to take action (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1997, 1999; Shaw, 2001). It is apparent that if issues are not considered to be problematic by upper managers, it is unlikely that they will be openly and frequently discussed. In contrast, Rao et al. (1999) suggested that disrupting current modes of thinking helps to expand the agendas of organizations.

Hidden power is apparent when those who are oppressed do not recognize their situations and fail to question dominant discourses or practices, even when there are apparent inequities and discrimination (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Lukes, 1974; Rao et al., 1999). Benschop and Dooreward (1998, p. 790) referred to this as hegemonic power which is manifested in “(non)verbal expressions of common sense, identifications, consensus and legitimizing rationalities.” Thus, hidden power is at work when people accept dominant discourses or current practices as ‘just the way things are.’ Research in sport has shown that some female athletes and administrators who recognized their secondary status in sport and were aware of gender inequities indicated they had not personally experienced discrimination (Blinde et al. 1993, 1994; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1997, 1999). Furthermore, some women were critical of gender equity initiatives assuming that they reflected special treatment for women (McKay, 1997). Others indicated a lack of support for such initiatives because they were reluctant to be associated with feminism (Blinde et al.,

1993, 1994; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1999), which may not be surprising given that sport is a “highly conservative institution” (Hall, 1997, p. 234). These findings echo similar sentiments from women in non-sport organizations who were hesitant to champion gender equity issues and thus be labeled feminists because of possible negative repercussions to their careers and public image (Ashford, 1998). Hidden power works because it is difficult to advocate for change if those who are marginalized or oppressed accept their situation in spite of contrary evidence (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998). As Fletcher (1999b, p. 1) stated, “Both those who do and those who do not benefit from the status quo are active agents in maintaining it.”

Fraser (1997) suggested that hegemony is a useful concept because it highlights the “intersection of power, inequality, and discourse” and exposes the ways in which “the sociocultural hegemony of dominant groups is achieved and contested” (p. 154). She drew on Gramsci’s theory of hegemony that focused on the relationship between social classes, specifically how dominant groups maintain their control over subordinated groups (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Donaldson, 1993; Fraser, 1997). Hegemony occurs when dominant social groups regulate the distribution of, and persuade others to accept, their ideologies, or values and ideas, as normal and common sense (Donaldson, 1993). In this type of relationship, power is maintained not through the use of force, but because those who are subordinated consent to conditions that appear to be reasonable, ordinary, or inevitable (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Donaldson, 1993).

In exercising their power, dominant groups reinforce their ideologies in discourses, by imposing their understandings of situations, events, and issues (Donaldson, 1993; Fraser, 1997). To illustrate, groups such as male administrators, coaches, and sports reporters continue to call attention to an idealized form of sport and athletes that is referred to as hegemonic masculinity (cf. Connell, 1987). The relevance of hegemonic masculinity to sport is discussed later in this chapter. From a feminist perspective, hegemony does not assume that dominant groups have complete control of meanings or that “women are passive victims of male domination” (Fraser, 1997, p. 154). Instead, it recognizes that meanings are disrupted, negotiated, and challenged, and that individuals can draw up multiple discourses and positions (Donaldson, 1993; Fraser, 1997).

The power of dialogue considers not only whose voices are consulted, included, and heard in discussions and meetings, but also whose voices are silenced and ignored (Rao et

al., 1999). In athletic departments, although athletes are deemed the primary beneficiary of organizational efforts (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a), their collective voices are rarely included in the formal decision making processes. Instead, it is typically upper administrators who are consulted and interviewed because of their direct involvement in policy and decision making (Hoeber & Frisby, 2002). For meaningful change to occur and new truths and knowledge to be developed, many voices must be included in the dialogue (Fletcher, 1999a; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999). Previous research has shown, however, that dialogue surrounding gender equity is often characterized as a 'battle of the sexes', with men overtly opposing gender equity because they are most threatened by potential changes to the status quo and with women advocating for change (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). Staurowsky (1996a) noted that some of the 'loudest' voices in the gender equity debate in the United States are those held by men in 'big-time' sports, particularly football, who maintain they should be exempt from compliance with Title IX legislation because revenues from their sports subsidize women's sports. She also noted that men who are involved in non-revenue generating sports argue that they are victims of reverse discrimination because women's teams are provided with preferential treatment. These same individuals characterize women who advocate for gender equity as irrational, militant, and irresponsible (Staurowsky, 1996a). It appears that there is little room in these dialogues for men who advocate for gender equity, for women who oppose it, or those who are indifferent to it.

Paying attention to the power of dialogue also exposes the truth rules that influence how gender equity is understood in sport organizations (Fletcher, 1999a). Fletcher added that "using these rules is an exercise in power because it maintains the status quo and silences any serious challenges to it" (1999, p. 22). Through the power of dialogue, certain meanings or definitions take on the status of "transcendent or universal truth[s]" (p. 22), and other meanings are resisted or ignored. In sport, the truth rules suggest that men are privileged and the masculinity is valued, and consequently, "the language of sport also favors men" (Parks & Robertson, 1998, p. 481). For example, women's sporting events, products, and services are identified with a gender marker to separate them from the 'real' ones devoted to the men (e.g., The Sports Network and Women's Television Sports Network<sup>iii</sup>). Attempts to change gendered language in sport (e.g., first base player instead of first baseman) have been met with some resistance (Parks & Robertson, 2002), which shows the masculine vocabulary has taken on the status of objective knowledge.

Although Rao et al. (1999) indicated that the power of conflict refers to the ability of individuals to pressure for change, much of the literature on gender equity in sport suggests that power has been exercised in this manner by the privileged groups who feel threatened by policies and initiatives involving a redistribution of opportunities, resources, or power. In her study of the development of a gender equity policy for the English amateur sport system, Kay (1996) uncovered incidents of passive resistance from those in positions of decision making power who demonstrated superficial support for gender equity, but were concerned about the impact of the policy on their existing privileges. This is an effective form of resistance because “one of the privileges enjoyed by those with power is the privilege to not see the systemic sources of privileges” (Acker, 2000, p. 630). Despite resistance from some men, women have capitalized on the power of external societal pressure and legislation to get gender equity on the agenda and to advocate for changes (Rao et al., 1999), which is an example of exercising power in various forms. In the United States, female athletes and coaches have relied on the legal power of Title IX legislation in the education system to advocate for better locker rooms and practice facilities, more operating funds, and more scholarships to name a few of the areas in which women’s teams have been disadvantaged (Greendorfer, 1998; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). By examining the meanings associated with gender equity, the impact of power from various sources on the development and maintenance of dominant meanings will become more visible.

#### *Multiple meanings.*

Given that much of the research on organizational values highlights the meanings espoused by upper administrators and assumes that these are widely shared amongst organizational members (cf. Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Dobni, Ritchie, & Zerbe, 2000; Gamble & Gibson, 1999; Pant & Lachman, 1998), I turned to a post-structuralist feminist perspective, which emphasizes multiple and overlooked meanings and the need to hear from multiple voices, including those who are marginalized (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Kenway et al., 1994; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999). Fletcher (1999b, p. 4) stated that listening to more voices “surfaces new information and uncovers assumptions that are rarely questioned by those who are currently benefiting from the status quo.” As well, “the power of adding a marginalized voice to the discourse is that it forces a recognition of the arbitrary nature of what is considered true” (Fletcher, 1999a, p. 22). It is important to investigate multiple

meanings because “the appearance of completeness and closure leads us to overlook both the politics in and of construction of and the possibilities for understanding that are hidden behind the obvious” (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996, p. 208). For example, Shaw and Slack (2002, p. 87) demonstrated that by examining multiple historical discourses of gender relations in national governing bodies of sport (NGBs), alternative views of femininities and masculinities or “the socially constructed behaviours that are considered to be ‘appropriate’ for women and men” could be uncovered. In two NGBs, traditional understandings of masculinities and femininities were protected in documents describing the organizations’ histories. The leadership traits of male presidents such as their vision and vigour were highlighted, while the only mention of a female president focused on her “elegance, calm, and dignity” (Shaw & Slack, 2002, p. 93). In a newer NGB, historical discourses demonstrated more appreciation of femininities and discussions on equity were given regular focus in their organizational publications. This study showed that discourses of masculinities and femininities are unstable and can be challenged or resisted to create different meanings and practices.

Even though the articulation of organizational values has been found to reflect the distribution of power in organizations as upper administrators usually define or endorse them (Enz, 1988; Voss, Cable & Voss, 2000), it is often assumed that they and other key stakeholders share common understandings of espoused organizational values (cf. Agle & Caldwell, 1999; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Rao et al. (1999, p. 2) argued that recognizing the multiplicity of meanings, even among seemingly coherent groups like upper administrators, helps to expose the hidden gendered assumptions of the “deep structure” of organizations or the “collection of values, history and practices that form the unquestioned, ‘normal’ way of working in organizations.” Post-structuralist feminist inquiry emphasizes the need to open up discussions and understandings to a variety of voices, but in particular to marginalized voices in organizations such as lower-level employees or women because they have traditionally been left out of research (Frost & Stablein, 1992; Martin, 1994). Rather than assuming there are single shared understandings, post-structuralist feminists seek out and examine multiple interpretations “to allow new voices, new perspectives and new alternatives to surface ... new meanings to be created” (Fletcher, 1999b, p. 3).

Recent work by Martin (1992, 2002) has resulted in the development of alternative perspectives for studying organizational cultures and values, some of which acknowledge



multiple meanings. She suggested that actors interpret organizational cultures from at least three different perspectives: integration, differentiation, and fragmentation. The integration perspective is characterized by assumptions of consensus, clarity, and consistency in understandings and meanings (Schein, 1985; Wilson, 2001) and mirrors much of the research conducted on organizational values (cf. Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Dobni et al., 2000; Enz, 1988; McDonald, 1991; Voss et al., 2000). From this perspective, it is assumed that values are widely shared or commonly held throughout the organization, and as a result they are clearly understood and adopted by all organizational members (Enz, 1988; Schein, 1985). It is also assumed that organizational values are consistent with other manifestations of organizational culture like symbols, rituals, and physical arrangements (Frost, Moore, Louis, Lundberg, & Martin, 1991). McDonald (1991), in her study of the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, illustrated how the organizational value of the “Olympic Spirit” was consistent with rituals like eating at the Café de Coubertin, a restaurant named after the founder of the modern Olympic Games, and the building of a merchandising outlet to sell Olympic paraphernalia. She concluded that this consistency encouraged a coherent image around the Olympic ideal and the development of a strong unified organizational culture, which were integral to the success of this short-term organization.

Martin (1992, 2002) acknowledged that shared meanings are possible, but warned that the integration perspective ignores evidence of difference, ambiguity, and contradiction. The presumption of one shared culture overlooks inevitable diversity within organizations (Beyer, 1981; Wilson, 2001), because “complex organizations reflect broader societal cultures and contain elements of occupational, hierarchical, class, racial, ethnic, and gender-based identifications” (Meyerson & Martin, 1987, p. 630). Linstead and Grafton-Small (1992) accepted that shared meanings are assumed in organizational cultures, but argued that the level at which the meanings are shared is subcultural rather than organizational. The differentiation perspective recognizes that smaller subcultural groups in an organization may have conflicting meanings of key organizational values and that there are likely discrepancies between espoused and enacted values (Martin, 2002; Martin & Frost, 1996).

Meyerson and Martin (1987, p. 637) pointed out that in most organizations “individuals share some viewpoints, disagree about some, and are ignorant of or indifferent to others,” disputing the idea of shared understandings that underpin both the integration and differentiation perspectives. The fragmentation perspective addresses this limitation by

suggesting that ambiguities are inevitable within organizations and subcultures because there usually are tensions, contradictions, and silences around the meanings of organizational values (Martin, 1992, 2002). In their examination of sport administrators' understandings of gender equity, Hoeber and Frisby (2001) found that most of them initially indicated that the athletic department was gender equitable, yet three of them later pointed to examples, such as some men's teams receiving more funding than women's teams, illustrating how this was not the case. This example illustrates a contradiction in their meanings. There was also an example of silences in regards to their meanings because, for the most part, administrators did not mention issues of respect and fairness. Of Martin's (1992, 2002) three perspectives, fragmentation is the most consistent with post-structuralist feminism as it considers the complexities and inconsistencies of socially constructed meanings.

### *Subjectivity.*

Subjectivity refers to the "conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world" (Weedon, 1997, p. 32). A post-structuralist feminist view suggests that an individual's sense of oneself, her experiences, and the reality around her is influenced by the discourses she has been exposed to (Weedon, 1997), which contrasts sharply with the idea of an "autonomous, self-determining individual with a secure unitary identity" (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996, p. 206). Weedon (1997, p. 33) stated that "the individual is always the site of conflicting forms of subjectivity." Drawing upon a post-structuralist feminist perspective encourages attention to different points of view, recognizing that individuals rely on various discourses to make sense of themselves and their worlds (Bartunek, 1994).

This idea of subjectivity has implications for how researchers understand research participants. For example, with liberal feminism, one underlying assumption is that women are a homogeneous group who has experienced oppression in the men's world (Calás & Smircich, 1996; Crotty, 1998; Rail, 1998). This is problematic because it creates a dualism that presumes all women and all men share the same experiences and identities. In contrast, post-structuralist feminists recognize the diversity of women's and men's lives and position them as having interests, needs, and viewpoints that shift over time and in different situations (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Flax, 1987; Fraser & Nicholson, 1990).

When I applied this to university sport, I could think of examples where this was the case. To illustrate, a female athlete who is lobbying for additional playing opportunities and

funding in a sport that has traditionally been dominated by males may come to understand gender equity in a particular way because of exposure to feminist theories in course work and discussions about gender equity with her coach and other athletes. In contrast, a male athletic director who must contend with budget cuts and external demands may come to understand it differently because of his awareness of how gender equity has been operationalized in other departments and how it is defined in policy manuals. Thus, it is likely that various members of an athletic department will have different understandings because of their social locations and exposure to various discourses. Previous research on gender equity in sport has overlooked the diversity of interests, backgrounds, and experiences of women and men as athletes, coaches, and administrators (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990). Using a post-structuralist feminist perspective underscores the importance of the researcher being aware of her own subjectivity (e.g., stemming from her background, experiences, stances, values) and how that influences her interaction with participants and her analysis of the data (cf. Meyerson & Kolb, 2000; Ristock & Pennell, 1996; see chapter 3 for a further discussion of this issue).

#### *Deconstruction.*

One critique of the liberal feminist perspective is that it does not provide researchers and practitioners with the tools to challenge the taken for granted assumptions underlying structures, practices and cultures that perpetuate gender inequities. I was drawn to post-structuralist feminism because it offered a lens for destabilizing assumptions, universal truths, and grand narratives that have been free from scrutiny (Acker, 1990; Hearn & Parkin, 1993; Martin, 1990a; Mumby, 1993; Weedon, 1997). Deconstruction is an analytical tool used by researchers to question and disrupt the socially constructed and unstable meanings assigned to discourses, and to expose underlying assumptions about the superiority of one gender over the other (Kenway et al., 1994; Linstead & Grafton-Small, 1992; Scott, 1990). Fletcher (1999a, p. 24) added that “just as the construction of a text is a way of creating social reality, deconstructing the text is a way of disrupting this reality to reveal it is just one of many possible constructions.”

Meanings are often constructed as binaries where the definition of one term depends on and is positioned as the polar opposite of another term (Scott, 1990). For instance, the meaning of ‘woman’ is constructed on the basis that ‘woman’ is the opposite of ‘man’. Black / white and coach / athlete are other examples of binaries that are problematic because one

term is often deemed superior or hierarchical to the other (Rail, 1998; Scott, 1990). Researchers who employ deconstruction seek to expose and confront binaries and the hierarchies associated with them through close examination of the discourses and revealing the silences, contradictions, and discrepancies associated with their use.<sup>iv</sup>

Post-structuralist feminists deconstruct not only the masculine or male, but also that which is considered feminine or female (Hearn & Parkin, 1993). Martin's (1990a) deconstruction of a male executive's story about his organization's commitment to helping female employees balance family-work responsibilities is a good example of how symbolic elements like stories are gendered. Her analysis of his speech illustrated that while he claimed his company was committed to employees' health concerns and reproductive choices and made concessions for a female employee's pregnancy, the hidden meanings of his account demonstrated a greater concern for the organizational values of product development and employee efficiency. Thus, in this example deconstruction was used to "reveal silences and circumlocutions that hide what an author does not want to reveal" (Martin, 2002, p. 289). Post-structuralist feminists rely on deconstruction to avoid building upon or reaffirming privileged knowledge and discourses (Rail, 1998). It offers a way of "challenging accepted practices and conventional wisdom" (Staurovsky, 1998, p. 22).

#### *Examples of Post-structuralist Feminist Studies of Gender Equity in Organizations*

There is a growing body of literature analyzing discourses and practices that reproduce gender inequities in organizations (cf. Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Benschop, Halsema, & Schreurs, 2001; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Fletcher, 1998, 1999a; Gherardi, 1994, 1995; Gherardi & Poggio, 2001; Martin, 1990a; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000; Rao et al., 1999; Shaw, 2001). Two examples were particularly salient for my research.

First, a series of action research studies on The Body Shop by Meyerson and associates (cf. Coleman & Rippin, 2000; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000) challenged the assumption that organizational performance is adversely affected when gender equity policies and practices are implemented. The Body Shop is a manufacturing and retail company of bath and beauty products. Its founder, Anita Roddick, developed the company on a values-based approach whereby guiding principles, including social responsibility, justice, compassion, and activism, were integrated with traditional concerns of cost-effectiveness (Roddick, 2000). In spite of the company's public commitment to gender equity, there were few women in senior management roles. The

purpose of the action research was to employ “a ‘gender lens’ to experiment with ways that the organization could strengthen its performance while eradicating gender inequities” (Kolb & Meyerson, 1999, p. 129). The researchers operated from a post-equity frame where “gender is an axis of power ... that shapes social structure, identities, and knowledge” (p. 563). Based on this frame, organizations are viewed as gendered since structures, practices, and norms were defined and shaped by men’s experiences and masculine values. Their aims were to illustrate that fundamental and taken for granted ideas about work were gendered and they strove to uncover new ways of working that would demonstrate it is possible to decrease inequities without compromising organizational performance (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000).

Although The Body Shop publicly advocated for gender equity, the researchers found that within one of their manufacturing plants there were gendered role stereotypes that were rooted in historically taken for granted assumptions about work. For example, ideal supervisors were characterized as those who worked overtime and had an imposing demeanor (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). This characterization, although viewed as being gender neutral by organizational members, privileged men because women employees usually had more domestic and family responsibilities that conflicted with the expectation of working overtime (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). Throughout their project, the researchers worked with organizational members to identify how various work processes were gendered and how they could be changed in order to create a more gender equitable work environment. Even though some organizational members, who were actively involved in the project, deemed it necessary to examine and change the “deep assumptions about work and gender” (Kolb & Meyerson, 1999, p. 153), they recognized that resistance to change was inevitable because other members saw it as a distraction from their ‘real work’.

Second, Shaw’s (2001) case studies of gender relations in three English NGBs of amateur sport was one of the few examples of post-structuralist feminist research in the sport management field. Based on the work of Foucault, she conceptualized gender relations as a reflection of power relations, in which the construction of knowledge was influenced by prevailing historical and deeply entrenched discourses. She found that gender relations, as reflected in the establishment of gender roles, the creation of organizational histories, the development of gender equity policies, and networking, differed in the three case study NGBs. In NGB A and C, two organizations with longer histories, traditions of

discrimination were deeply embedded in the organizational structure and practices. For example, her respondents believed that teaching was an appropriate woman's role because it required feminine characteristics such as nurturing and care giving. In contrast, coaching was viewed as a masculine role because it involved encouraging athletes to succeed. Coaches were more highly valued than teachers, in part because it was assumed that women would only work for a few years before leaving to start a family. In these two NGBs, competition and aggression (discourses of masculinity) were generally more valued than empathy and support (discourses of femininity), and it was believed that women lacked loyalty and commitment due to their domestic responsibilities. This established a form of truth about the acceptability of roles for men and women, which in turn limited the options for both of them.

In NGB B, a newer organization, Shaw (2001) found a more conscious effort to establish an equitable environment by including women's voices, highlighting women's accomplishments and participation, and discussing equity in the organization's magazine. In this way, members were exposed to a counter-discourse on a more regular basis. Shaw's work illustrated that gender relations were reified in discourses as evidenced in organizational histories and policies about gender roles. Her work also showed that these discourses, which tended to favour masculinities over femininities, can be altered.

Researchers are beginning to use a post-structuralist feminist perspective, and variations similar to it, to examine gender equity in the culture, structure, and practices of organizations. Nevertheless, there is a need for more research using this perspective to study organizational values. Since values are supposed to represent widely held beliefs about what is important and thus are a window into the deep structures of organizations (Schein, 1985), studying them is a way to understand the "unobtrusive ways that gender inequity is sustained and reproduced in organizations" (Fletcher, 1999b, p. 2). In the next section, I discuss the literature on organizational values and highlight how employing a post-structuralist feminist perspective can contribute to our understanding of gender equity.

### ***Organizational Values***

Interest in organizational values continues because they are thought to influence the decision making processes (Beyer, 1981), provide a normative system of behaviour for organizational members (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998), and underpin the development of

organizational cultures (Schein, 1985). However, there are limitations with current research on organizational values that have been largely positivist in nature. As mentioned earlier, researchers rarely consider or analyze multiple meanings of organizational values. A second shortcoming is the assumption that the meanings held by upper management are consistent with those of other organizational members, even though there is evidence that this is not always the case (cf. Martin, 1992, 2002; Martin & Meyerson, 1998; Meyerson & Martin, 1987; Meyerson, 1991a, 1991b; Young, 1989). Third, even though a growing number of organizations espouse gender equity as a value, it has seldom been included in studies on organizational values. Finally, very little research has considered the relationship between espoused and enacted values (cf. Martin, 2002; Stackman, Pinder, & Connor, 2000). This study aims to address these limitations.

### *Questioning Unitary and Shared Meanings of Organizational Values*

Past research on organizational values has been guided by the assumption of unified and widely shared meanings, in part because value congruence is thought to contribute to clarity of communication, greater job satisfaction and commitment, decreased ambiguity and conflict, increased productivity, and more efficient interactions (cf. Agle & Caldwell, 1999; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). As a result, managers are encouraged to strive for value congruity by recruiting new organizational members whose personal values coincide with organizational values or by consistently referring to the same organizational values in organizational communications (Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Dobni et al., 2000). While these studies have examined the extent of value congruence between new recruits and organizations (Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Chatman, 1991), organizations and external stakeholders (Pant & Lachman, 1998; Voss et al., 2000), or departments or units (Buenger, Daft, Conlon, & Austin, 1996; Enz, 1988), they are based on the assumption that if organizational members espouse the same values, they also share the same meanings of each value. Thus, they fail to consider the possibility of multiple meanings and stifle alternative viewpoints, which in turn contributes to misunderstandings or simplistic solutions to complex issues like gender equity (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Linstead & Grafton, 1992; Martin, 1992, 2002; Young, 1989).

Overlooking these complexities can result in confusion, displaced work efforts, conflict, and reduced productivity because there is a lack of clarity as to what should actually be driving organizational practices (Agle & Caldwell, 1999; Martin & Frost, 1996; Meyerson,

1991a). As well, the premise of unified understandings makes organizational members complacent about change (Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980) and could actually act to cover up dubious organizational practices (Sinclair, 1993). Looking more closely at the meanings associated with one organizational value from the perspectives of different organizational members will shed light on the underlying inconsistencies and complexities.

#### *Destabilizing the Voices of Upper Management*

Another weakness of the organizational values literature is that the interpretations of organizational members located at lower levels in the hierarchy are not often elicited. Researchers in this area draw attention to the values held by elite members and upper management because they guide and direct organizations and they influence the behaviours of others by encouraging adherence to espoused values (cf. Gamble & Gibson, 1999; Hinings et al., 1996; Pant & Lachman, 1998; Voss et al., 2000). Additionally, it is assumed that the meanings top managers assign to values are consistent with and accurately reflect the rest of the organizational members, thus, there is little or no consultation with organizational members with lower status (Alvesson, 1987). The propensity to believe that their interpretations are consistent with the rest of the organization contributes to the tenuous notion of consensus concerning the meanings of gender equity. Furthermore, it perpetuates the role of the dominant ideology within the organization where one interpretation prevails and "new meanings ... are constantly being worked out and struggled for" (Hargreaves, 1990, p.297). By asking only those in the top level of a hierarchy what their understandings of organizational values are, these studies reinforce existing power relations by privileging the voices of upper managers and overlooking the voices of those who lack status and power (Martin, 1992, 2002; Martin & Frost, 1996).

Meyerson and Martin (1987) have argued that ambiguity and confusion may be more common than shared and unified understandings. Martin (1991) and Meyerson (1991b) attributed this, in part, to the multifaceted identities of organizational actors. Individuals have many identities stemming from their roles in the public, private, community, and voluntary sectors and in each of those roles they are exposed to various ideologies, discourses, and experiences that shape their interpretations. These knowledge claims are also reinforced in larger institutions, such as the media, government policies, and the educational system.



Recent studies of perceptions of gender issues and gender equity policies in university athletic departments (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; McClung & Blinde, 2002; Sanger & Mathes, 1997) have demonstrated the importance of speaking to individuals with different backgrounds, experiences, status, and power. Fink and Pastore (1997) compared the perceptions of gender equity, as operationalized by the Office for Civil Rights, of three groups of athletes at an American university: male football players, female athletes, and male athletes on non-revenue generating teams.<sup>9</sup> To determine compliance with Title IX, the Office of Civil Rights within the United States Department of Education, assesses athletic departments on various program components: accommodation of interests and abilities, equipment and supplies, scheduling of games and practices, athletic scholarships, travel and per diem allowances, assignment of coaching and academic tutoring, medical and training facilities and services, housing and dining facilities and services, publicity, locker rooms, and practice and competitive facilities. Fink and Pastore (1997) surveyed the athletes' perceptions of equity in relation to these components. They found that athletes on revenue generating teams perceived a higher level of equity than those on non-revenue generating teams. They also suggested that since historically female athletes have been exposed to university sport programs of lower quality, their expectations of equity were lower, which explained their general satisfaction with the inequitable conditions at that university.

In a similar study, Sanger and Mathes (1997) demonstrated that various stakeholder groups (i.e., athletic directors, faculty representatives, and women's basketball coaches) of American university athletic departments have multiple understandings of their department's compliance with Title IX regulations. They found that coaches were most cognizant of specific regulations of the policy that were not being met. In contrast, athletic directors, who exercised the most power and influence in the department, assumed that their department were generally compliant. While these studies revealed multiple perceptions of gender equity policies, they did not examine underlying meanings of it to determine if they were widely shared.

Post-structuralist feminism encourages listening to multiple voices and paying attention to dominant and marginalized voices even within apparently cohesive groups (Rail, 1998; Rao et al., 1999). This de-privileges the status of upper management's voices, offers different understandings of reality, challenges the universality of truths, and provides a more

accurate understanding of the meanings associated with values, which in turn can shed light on how to affect change (Fletcher, 1999a; Martin, 1992, 2002). Essentially this perspective aims “to open up the discussion in order to envision something new” (Fletcher, 1999b, p. 3).

*Studying Gender Equity as an Organizational Value*

Empirical research has examined organizational values including corporatism, fiscal responsibility, and professionalization in the public sector (Frisby, Thibault, & Kikulis, 2004; Hinings et al., 1996; Ranson et al., 1980; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Thibault, Kikulis, & Frisby, 2004), efficiency, cost reduction, and growth in the market in the private sector (Dobni et al., 2000), accessibility of services to the community, financial stability, and volunteerism in the non-profit sector (Voss et al., 2000). Recent research on leisure service departments in local government has suggested that current values are influenced by the new public management ideology espoused within the public sector (Frisby et al., 2004; Thibault et al., 2004). This ideology has evolved in industrialized countries because of declining public sector resources and an emphasis placed on the values of financial accountability, cost-recovery, and efficiency (Davies & Thomas, 2001; Phillips & Orsini, 2002). As a result, organizations are choosing to stick to their core business and are seeking out alternative forms of operating and delivering non-essential or peripheral functions, such as partnership with the private sector and contracting out (Phillips & Orsini, 2002). One consequence for leisure services managers is that tensions are created between the demands of politicians for financial accountability, the emphasis on profit margins from private sector partners, and the traditional departmental concerns of social good and ensuring accessibility for all citizens (Frisby et al. 2004; Thibault et al., 2004). A similar situation existed in some Canadian universities where non-academic departments, such as athletics, functioned independently and self-sufficiently in order to ease the financial burden on the university and allow them to focus on their core businesses of providing an education and conducting research (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995b; Schneider, 1997; Taylor, 1986). This shift to an ancillary enterprise coupled with the rise of the new public management ideology shifts attention and resources in athletic departments to fundraising, marketing, and promotion and rewards sport programs that generate needed resources or demonstrate self-sufficiency.

Two studies in sport (Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe et al., 2002) have contributed to the knowledge of organizational values held in athletic departments. Putler and Wolfe (1999) examined stakeholders' perceptions of effectiveness of university athletic departments.

Representatives from six stakeholder groups at one American university including faculty members, university athletes, prospective students, current students, athletic department employees, and alumni were sent a survey of 45 hypothetical scenarios facing athletic departments and were asked to assess if they were indicative of success. They found that ethics and winning, and education and revenue generation were viewed as competing priorities in the determination of success. Gender equity was deemed one of the least important priorities for departments, along with attendance at games and the numbers of teams that were supported. Similarly, Wolfe et al. (2002) conducted in-depth interviews with 10 stakeholders at an American university to better understand their perceptions of effectiveness. An analysis of data from these interviews revealed six themes that were grounded in their perceptions of important values including: performance on the field, education, ethics, external profile, institutional enthusiasm, and resource management. They found that stakeholders had competing conceptions of the priorities, as some stressed performance on the field and resource management, while others emphasized education and ethics. They also found that stakeholders prioritized these values, suggesting that there was hierarchy. Values, like performance on the field, external profile, and resource management were given greater priority and could be viewed as core values that were fundamental to the effectiveness of the athletic department, while values like education and ethics were given less priority and thus could be seen as peripheral values (Collins & Porras, 1996; Pant & Lachman, 1998).

Rao et al. (1999) argued that many organizations espouse a monoculture of instrumentality that stresses the accomplishment of narrow quantitative values, such as economic prosperity or operational effectiveness, without considering the need to attend to broader, social values like gender equity. One limitation with this approach is it positions values in a zero-sum manner, as emphasizing one value presumes that attention is diverted away from an opposing value. This is problematic because managers often assume that gender equity can only be implemented at the expense of organizational performance, an assumption that Meyerson and associates (2000) have critiqued. They provided a counter argument that ignoring gender equity negatively impacts organizational effectiveness because “the same assumptions, values, and practices that compromise gender equity often undermine effectiveness as well” (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000, p. 555). The implication was that organizations should attend to both gender equity and effectiveness as they are intimately

tied to one another. They proposed a dual agenda of linking gender equity to productivity, so that organizational members, particularly upper managers, would not ignore it. The dominant organizational logic is that “organizations are seen as instrumental, goal-oriented, no-nonsense arrangements for getting things done” (Acker, 2000, p. 630) and rewards are tied to seemingly objective and fair criteria such as job demands or to one’s performance or seniority, but not to one’s gender. Gender equity has been identified as one of many values that sport organizations should attend to (cf. Danlychuk & MacLean, 2001; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000; Wolfe et al., 2002). Yet, with the exception of Hoeber and Frisby’s (2001) examination of administrators’ narratives of gender equity, it has rarely been studied in-depth and in isolation from other organizational values.

*Examining the Connection between Espoused and Enacted Values*

Organizational values are commonly portrayed in a rationalistic manner, which assumes that if the values are espoused, they are also reflected in individual behaviours and organizational processes and outcomes (Agle & Caldwell, 1999; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). Most of this research fails to tap into the political or social dimensions underpinning their social construction (Gagliardi, 1986; Hill & Kikulis, 1999; Hoeber & Frisby, 2001; Martin, 2002; Young, 1989). While the underlying assumption in much of this literature is that organizational members internalize organizational values that are then reflected in their decision making and behaviours, Willmott (1993, p. 541) argued that “the enactment of values [is] based upon instrumental compliance rather than internalization or even identification.” Schein (1985) and Martin (2002) alluded to the political dimension when they suggested there were two sets of values: espoused values or what people say and enacted values or what people do. Espoused values describe ideal and desired behaviours, practices and outcomes (Gagliardi, 1986; Martin, 2002; Schein, 1985), are used to gain favour with influential groups (Enz, 1988), and serve as corporate propaganda to create positive public impressions of organizations and their members (Martin, 2002). Enacted values are those that are put into practice (Gagliardi, 1986; Martin, 2002). Martin (2002) declared that espoused organizational values are not always widely shared or understood by organizational members and they are not always implemented. To illustrate, Frisby (1995) suggested that in leisure organizations, social responsibility and service quality were commonly espoused values, while resistance to change and inequality more accurately reflected what occurred in practice. Little research has examined the relationship between espoused and enacted values

(Gamble & Gibson, 1999; Stackman et al., 2000) and one goal of this study was to determine if the espoused meanings of one organizational value were implemented into organizational practices.

### *Post-structuralist Feminism and Organizational Values*

In summary, the organizational values literature is characterized by an assumption of shared values, a tendency to privilege the voices of upper management, a lack of focus on gender equity as a value, and an under-emphasis on the manner in which espoused values are put into practice. Post-structuralist feminist perspectives have rarely been used in studies of organizational values, as the literature has largely adopted a positivistic perspective. One aim of this study was to address these gaps in the literature, while building on the existing sport literature as elaborated upon below.

### **Gender Equity in Sport**

Much of the research on gender equity in sport has adopted a liberal feminist perspective that is based on the belief that there are few, relevant biological differences between men and women, therefore they should be recognized and treated as equals in our society (Calás & Smircich, 1996; Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Theberge, 2000a; Vertinsky, 1992). However, there are many barriers in sport that have prevented women from having the same access to opportunities and resources as men, including a historically narrow view of what sports are deemed appropriate for women, men controlling access to sporting facilities and the allocation of human and financial resources, and few women in decision making positions (Hargreaves, 1990; Hall, 1996; Inglis, 1988; Vertinsky, 1992). From this perspective, gender inequities are understood as a result of personal deficiencies in specific traits or abilities, or structural barriers such as limited access to opportunities (Calás & Smircich, 1996; Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). For example, explanations for the under-representation of women in managerial positions in sport organizations point to a lack of loyalty, determination, positive reputation, and strong networks in the community (cf. Hall et al., 1989; Hovden, 2000; Inglis, 1988). By challenging, addressing, or removing those barriers through the provision of more programming opportunities and greater financial assistance, or implementing quotas through affirmative action initiatives, it is assumed that women will gain the necessary skills and

experiences to be 'on the same footing' as men (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Inglis, 1988; McKay, 1994; Nilges, 1998).

Although the liberal feminist perspective has led to some improvements to the sport system, such as the expansion of programming opportunities for female athletes (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990), gender inequities continue to exist. Several researchers have pointed to disparities between male and female athletes with respect to media coverage and promotions, allocation of scholarships and budgets, access to facilities and high-calibre coaching (cf. Acosta & Carpenter, 2000; Blinde & Greendorfer, 1992; Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996). One explanation for the continuation of gender inequities is that the solutions advocated from a liberal feminist perspective do not confront or critique the existing knowledge structures of sport organizations and thus have not resulted in substantial, transformative changes (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Nilges, 1998). Historically, sport has been based on prevailing societal discourses that applaud and celebrate men's involvement and competitive spirit in sport along with their physical strength, muscularity, and domination. These same discourses have devalued women's involvement in sport and feminine traits like grace, flexibility, and cooperation (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Shaw, 2001; Theberge, 2000a). In a gendered system where men are privileged and women are encouraged to assimilate to the existing male-defined structures and cultures, ensuring that women have the same opportunities as men does not guarantee that their accomplishments will be equally valued by men who largely occupy positions of power (MacDonald, 1992; Vertinsky, 1992). As Hargreaves (1990) simply stated, "Far from challenging male sport, liberalism endorses it" (p. 290).

#### *Conceptualization of Gender Equity in Sport*

In the sport literature, gender equity is studied most often as a policy – a legislative principle guiding other organizational practices. A significant body of research in the United States has studied key stakeholders' perceptions of Title IX legislation (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Sanger & Mathes, 1997) and the discourses underpinning the debates of this piece of legislation (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1995, 1996a, 1998). In Canada and the United Kingdom, researchers have also examined gender equity as a policy (cf. Bell-Altenstad & Vail, 1995; Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Kay, 1996; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990). Most of these policies are based on liberal feminist ideals of ensuring that women have the same access as men to programming opportunities (e.g., competitive

schedules), resources (e.g., facilities, equipment, budgets, scholarships), and treatment and benefits (e.g., publicity, training services).

The lack of attention paid to gender equity as an organizational value is significant, because the pursuit of it by many Canadian sport organizations has been the result of social obligations rather than legal requirements (Hoffman, 1995). Research must re-examine and re-think how gender equity is understood as an organizational value by key stakeholders in the sport system before it can be fully enacted (Bryson & de Castell, 1993). These understandings inform practices, such as policy development, and we must recognize the strength of cultural resistance to changing attitudes about it (Hoeber & Frisby, 2002). As Hargreaves (1990, p. 290) stated that, "Gender inequalities are identified, but rarely are questions asked about where the values come from that perpetuate them and in whose particular interests they work."

According to Messner and Sabo (1990, p. 9), "sport ... is an institution created by and for men" as a means to support and reinforce male superiority. In that sense, sport is a hegemonic institution where it is taken for granted that there is a natural connection between men, masculinity and sport (Connell, 1987; Disch & Kane, 1996). Since men have long dominated sport organizations on the playing field, sidelines, and offices, their values have had a significant influence on the development of the sport cultures and structures (Hall, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Theberge, 2000a). Masculine-oriented values like assertiveness, strength, toughness, dominance, stoicism, aggressiveness, independence, commitment and competition dominate, while values historically and socially ascribed to femininity like cooperation, socialization, empowerment, and sharing are diminished, marginalized, or ignored (Connell, 1990; Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Donaldson, 1993; Green et al., 2000; Lenskyj, 1994; Theberge, 1987, 2000a). These masculine values are embedded in structures (e.g., the assignment of prestigious administrative positions to men and of lower-paying and less prestigious roles to women, the development of different rules for men's and women's sports) and processes (e.g., the exclusion of women from participating in certain sports, the unequal distribution of resources to men's and women's teams) and contribute to the ideology of hegemonic masculinity in sport (Connell, 1987; Kane, 1996; McKay, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Theberge, 2000a).

Hegemonic masculinity refers to a set of social norms or an idealized form of masculinity at a particular period in time, which is seen as separate from and superior to

femininity and other views of masculinity, such as effeminate masculinity (Connell, 1987, 1990). This ideology establishes a “structure of dominance and oppression in the gender order” by legitimizing and naturalizing the superiority of a particular view of masculinity (Connell, 1990, p. 94). This view of masculinity is based on the values mentioned earlier as well as on the emphasis of heterosexuality, physicality, heroism, homophobia, and subordination of women (Donaldson, 1993; Theberge, 2000a). In sport, men’s power over women has become naturalized, in that women are seen as physically different from men, and the dominance of hegemonic masculinity is maintained, because male administrators, coaches, and sports writers have significant influence over the understandings of what it means to be an athlete (Donaldson, 1993). In accepting hegemonic masculinity as normal, women, femininity, and men that do not conform to these norms are placed at a lower status and have less influence over knowledge production (Connell, 1990; Donaldson, 1993). Nevertheless, the involvement of women, gays and lesbians, and visible minorities in sport, has begun to challenge and erode the hegemonic masculinity ideology (cf. Messner & Sabo, 1990; Theberge, 2000a).

Staurowsky (1995) analyzed and deconstructed the 1993 final report of the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (NCAA) Gender Equity Task Force in the United States and uncovered gendered assumptions about the economic contributions of male and female athletes. She found that male athletes were often characterized as breadwinners, because of the dominant belief that “men’s big-time college sport make money” (p. 37). It was commonly understood that fans, corporate sponsors, and alumni were interested in the athletic careers and accomplishments of male athletes on these teams, which in turn translated into increased fan attendance and gate receipts for the departments and universities. It was also believed that the money generated from men’s big-time sports served to subsidize other university sports. In contrast, female athletes were depicted as dependent and passive consumers who did not economically contribute to the department. Since male athletes were seen as more valuable to the department’s economic bottom-line they were provided with more resources, even though not all men’s teams generated revenue while some women’s teams did.

We can also see that masculine values are embedded in the cultures of specific sports. In ice hockey, body checking is not allowed in the women’s game, but it is an integral part of the men’s game. Some suggest that this distinction provides a positive alternative to



the aggressiveness and violence witnessed in the men's game, however others see it as establishing a different style that is inferior to the 'real' one played by men (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Theberge, 2000b). A significant impact of this situation is that current agendas for gender equity will have limited success if dominant masculine discourses are not addressed or challenged (Acker, 2000; Gherardi, 1994, McKay, 1999). Staurowsky (1998) pointed out that despite the increased involvement of women in sport organizations, the masculine culture has not been significantly altered.

In spite of the emphasis on masculine values, many sport organizations contend they are meritocratic and gender neutral. It is widely believed that, regardless of their gender, individuals who work hard, are committed to their careers and demonstrate "superior abilities, dedication, and performance" (Acker, 2000, p. 630) are supported and rewarded in a fair manner. With respect to women's under-representation in management positions in sport organizations, men claimed that while their organizations were open to both men and women "providing they are qualified and willing to work" (Hall et al., 1990, p. 27), the underlying assumption was that women were often less qualified than men. Where the belief in gender neutrality is taken for granted, gender equity initiatives are dismissed because they are viewed as privileging women over men and this compromises and threatens the ideals of meritocracy (Acker, 2000; McKay, 1994, 1997, 1999). Despite the façade of gender neutrality, it is apparent that the criteria or standards for status, promotions, or rewards have been set by men and continue to favour them.

Rao et al. (1999) spoke about the influence of heroic individualism in many organizations where the types of individuals who are most influential and revered in organizations are those that "work day and night against tremendous odds to solve a crisis" (p. 4). Similarly, Davies and Thomas (2001) discussed the impact of competitive masculinities in the public sector where individuals who put in long hours, worked independently, were competitive, and sacrificed other public and private commitments were seen as heroic. Individuals who focused on relational work (Fletcher, 1998, 1999a) or a soft managerialist agenda, including an emphasis on equal opportunities and diversity (Davies & Thomas, 2001) or "who manage[d] her work smoothly, thereby avoiding such crises, [are] invisible and undervalued" (Rao et al., 1999, p. 4).

There is a need to examine gender equity as an organizational value because it highlights underlying assumptions and exposes other discourses that serve to perpetuate

inequities. It has been shown that some administrators of sport organizations place greater emphasis on elite-level performance, technical excellence, generating revenues, and publicity than on gender equity (Eitzen, 2003; Greendorfer, 1998; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Staurowsky, 1998; Wolfe et al. 2002; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990). These may be seen as competing values that undermine a department's commitment to and prioritization of gender equity. Bagilhole (2001) characterized this form of resistance as collusion, whereby men supported gender equity on the condition that it did not significantly disrupt the existing system. Whitson and Macintosh (1990) indicated that some administrators of Canadian national sport organizations believe the emphasis should be placed on enhancing opportunities for excellence, not on broadening the opportunities for women. The payoffs from pursuing the goals of excellence, such as increased publicity, endorsements, and revenue generation, far outweighed the perceived benefits of inclusiveness in participation that would result from a greater commitment to gender equity. In many university athletic departments, particularly those that must raise their own funds to cover operating expenses, revenue generation takes a higher priority (Eitzen, 2003; Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1998). The argument is often made that men's football should be exempt from gender equity standards because it generates a significant amount of revenue. Eitzen (2003) has argued that in the United States only a small portion of elite men's university football teams generate a profit. Given that the scope of university sport is much smaller in Canada, one could reasonably assume that few, if any, Canadian university football teams generate a profit to underwrite women's teams. Because of the current institutional contexts facing public and non-profit sport organizations, there is a greater emphasis on new public management and corporate managerialism where revenue generation, cost recovery, accountability, and efficiency are prioritized, while neglecting gender equity and other social justice values (Frisby et al., 2004; McKay, 1999; Thibault et al., 2004). Critically examining the culture of sport organizations forces organizational members "to hold open to scrutiny many of the most fundamental aspects of the organization – its language, meaning systems, values, norms, and practices" (Ely & Meyerson, 2000, p. 600).

#### *Meanings and Practices of Gender Equity*

Knowing that the meanings of gender equity are rarely openly discussed (Bryson & de Castell, 1993), it would not be surprising to find that sport managers assume there is a single common meaning of gender equity for athletes and that this organizational value has

been successfully put into practice once there are equal numbers of male and female participants. Because of their positional power and their ability to dictate agendas and to initiate and guide dialogues, there is a danger of sport managers taking for granted the meanings of gender equity and failing to recognize that some voices are privileged and that meanings are not shared. This is particularly important given the reluctance of some women to take up the gender equity cause and the resistance to it from men and upper administrators. Attention must also be directed at meanings of gender equity in sport because there is evidence to suggest there are inconsistencies between espoused commitments and organizational practices.

Some administrators and high-ranking volunteers in Canadian national sport organizations believed that their organizations were gender equitable because they had policies when such policies did not even exist (Hall et al., 1989, 1990). In their study of a leisure service gender equity policy that was ratified, Doherty and Varpalotai (2000) found resistance and barriers in the implementation phase. Similarly, Shaw (2001) found that while sport administrators believed that their organizations were gender equitable, their claims were largely based on numbers of participants and did not consider equity in relation to other organizational practices, such as resource allocations or decision making.

#### *Positioning Gender Equity as a Women's Issue*

Like organizational studies more generally (cf. Ashford, 1998; Ashford, Rothbard, Piderit, & Dutton, 1998; Martin & Meyerson, 1998), researchers and research participants in sport studies often position gender equity as a women's issue (cf. Bell-Altenstad & Vail, 1995; Blinde et al., 1993, 1994; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1994; Staurowsky, 1995). McClung and Blinde (2002) interviewed 20 female athletes at one American university to explore their sensitivity to gender issues. The researchers suggested that women's participation in sport could either facilitate or hinder their awareness of and identification with issues such as empowerment, feminism, discrimination, gender stereotyping, gender equity, and patriarchy. They found that although some female athletes were aware of these issues as a result of their coursework and involvement on sport teams, many of them showed limited sensitivity to gender issues and held negative beliefs about feminism. McClung and Blinde (2002) attributed female athletes' lack of identification to a lack of time to get involved, limited discussions on these issues with coaches and

administrators, negative stereotypes associated with feminism, and a reluctance to get involved in issues that did not directly affect them.

Because female athletes have brought the majority of gender discrimination lawsuits against university athletic departments in the United States, Jacob and Mathes (1996) asked 121 female athletes to fill out a questionnaire on their knowledge of the Title IX legislation. They found that women had limited awareness of it, but were generally satisfied with their program's compliance with it. However, they found the female athletes who were most knowledgeable of Title IX were more critical of program compliance and were more likely to use the legal system to contest injustices. Jacob and Mathes (1996) concluded that knowledge of the legislation contributed to athletes' action, while a lack of knowledge contributed to complacency. While it is important to hear from women, as their voices have traditionally been silenced in research (Martin, 1994), it can also be argued that the choice to include only women reinforces the notion that gender equity is the responsibility of women, perpetuating a myth that men do not have a gender and that they are not responsible for ensuring equity (Martin & Meyerson, 1998).

Respondents in studies of gender equity in sport have also positioned gender equity as a women's issue, even when the researchers did not explicitly do so. McKay (1997, 1999) concluded that respondents understood gender equity as a women's issue because such initiatives typically addressed barriers to women's involvement and advancement in sport. Generally, women attributed gender inequities to the masculine culture of sport and networking, while many men attributed gender inequities to natural outcomes of tradition and meritocracies in that women's abilities were inferior to those of men (McKay, 1999). Since women are viewed as the disadvantaged group in sport, it is commonly assumed they willingly act as or take on the role of the advocate for gender equity (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Inglis et al., 2000; McKay, 1997; Yule, 1997). Hall et al. (1989, 1990) found that male managers categorized it as a women's issue, because they themselves did not experience discrimination and did not think about it on a regular basis. Positioning gender equity as a women's issue has been identified in other research as doing something for women (Liff & Cameron, 1997) or a woman-centred ideology (Yule, 1997). This is problematic because there was little sense of shared responsibility for gender equity, or recognition that it requires a modification of men's involvement in and dominance of sport (Hall, 1996, McKay, 1997).

According to Stauirowsky (1996a, p. 206), this view persists because in “a patriarchal system, it is far easier to blame women than it is to take on the male power elite.”

Although gender equity is often positioned as a women’s issue, there is some literature to suggest that not all women in sport are supportive of or wish to champion for it (cf. Blinde et al., 1993, 1994; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1997, 1999). Much of the research rests on the assumption that women and men are homogeneous groups and thus fails to recognize the diversity of their interests, backgrounds, and experiences (Hargreaves, 1990; Martin, 1990a). Associated with this, because gender equity initiatives are usually directed towards women, there can be some resentment from men in part because the ideology of hegemonic masculinity is threatened and fear of reprisals from women (Stauirowsky, 1996a, 1998). Some researchers have proposed that policies, programs, and initiatives should be opened up to a broader notion of equity that respects and appreciates the range of differences between men and women (Alvesson & Billing, 1997), recognizing that gender is “no more a privileged site of difference than race, class, or any of a host of other possible differences” (Bryson & de Castell, 1993, p. 352).

A post-structuralist feminist perspective to gender equity goes beyond the simple ‘he-she’ dichotomies that characterize gender equity studies by encouraging the complexity and variations in the meanings of it be made visible and by questioning the process of knowledge production. This perspective questions dominant discourses, such as the idea that gender equity is a women’s only issue (Ely & Meyerson, 2000) and considers the “rich variation in the way organizations carry gender meanings” (Alvesson & Billing, 1997, p. 4).

### ***Summary of Relevant Literature***

In this chapter I examined literature on post-structuralist feminism, organizational values, and gender equity in sport organizations to develop a lens to guide my study and to demonstrate how it will address some knowledge gaps. I found that much of the mainstream organizational values and gender equity in sport literatures privilege the voices of upper management and assume there are shared meanings of organizational values. As a result, dominant discourses of organizational values are seen as fixed and unitary and go unchallenged because they are embedded in the structures, practices, and cultures of organizations and are reinforced through broader historical, social, and political forces. I also found that traditional thinking about gender equity in sport has been inadequate because

there have not been substantive changes to the system and culture of sport so that male and female athletes are equally valued.

Adopting a post-structuralist feminist perspective with its focus on the complex relationships between knowledge, power, and gender encouraged me to examine and unpack the taken for granted assumptions in the meanings and practices of gender equity and to search for new or alternative meanings of it that do not perpetuate inequities. By opening the discussion on gender equity to athletes, coaches, and women and by examining the practices associated with it in relation to other competing values that drive university athletics, this study provides a more accurate understanding of the meanings associated with it, which in turn can shed light on practices requiring change.

In the next chapter, I outline the data collection and analysis processes that were employed to address the research questions and discuss the ethical issues that arose during the research process.

---

<sup>i</sup> Some researchers refer to this paradigm as post-structuralist feminism or post-structural feminism, where the emphasis is on taking a post-structuralist perspective to achieve feminist ends (cf. Alvesson & Billings, 1997; Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Calás & Smircich, 1996). Others refer to it as feminist post-structuralism (cf. Fletcher, 1998), which emphasizes a post-structuralist outlook with a feminist agenda (Hearn & Parkin, 1993). Still others like Weedon (1997) interchange both terms in their work. I have chosen to refer to this paradigm as post-structuralist feminism, primarily because at that time my research interests were in the gendering of organizational values.

<sup>ii</sup> According to Fraser (1997, p. 155), structuralists focus on language or the “symbolic system or code” while ignoring the “social practice and social context of communication.” Post-structuralists view this approach as problematic because it overlooks issues of power and inequity in the production of knowledge and can not explain the processes that contributed to the dominance of particular discourses as common sense, natural, and legitimate (Fraser, 1997). This understanding of structure differs from the management viewpoint, which focuses on the complexity or differentiation of roles and responsibilities, formalization of rules and regulations, and centralization of power in organizations. For the purpose of this study, I was interested in the practices of knowledge production, which fits the post-structuralist view of structure.

<sup>iii</sup> The Sports Network (TSN) is a specialty cable channel in Canada dedicated to sports programming and owned and operated by CTV Specialty Television Inc. In September 2001, CTV Specialty launched Women’s Television Sports Network (WTSN), which was devoted to women’s sports programming. WTSN existed for two years, having gone off the air at the end of September 2003 due to “the result of lower-than-expected growth and limited access to advertising revenue, as well as the high cost of running a live event sports service” (CTV to close WTSN, 2003).

<sup>iv</sup> I describe the process of deconstruction in more detail in chapter 3.

<sup>v</sup> Male football players were included as a separate group because they often received special status in athletic departments.

### 3

#### The Research Project

In this chapter, I described the research design, the data collection and analysis processes, and conclude with a discussion of ethical issues.

#### ***Research Method: Collective Case Study***

This study was based on case studies of four sport programs situated in one athletic department at a large Canadian university (LCU).<sup>1</sup> This method is referred to as a collective case study in which “a number of cases [are studied] in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition” (Stake, 2000, p. 437). The case study approach is one in which a specific phenomenon is examined in-depth within a particular bounded system defined by a certain time and place, which in this study was the athletic department from 1999 to 2001 (Creswell, 1998; Stake, 2000; Yin, 1994). This approach relies on multiple methods to collect data, requires some time commitment from the researcher, and focuses on a phenomenon in detail (Creswell, 1998). In comparison to conducting an ethnography, case studies require a shorter time commitment and researchers are not as immersed in the setting they are investigating. Thus, I chose to conduct this research using this approach in order to ensure the project was manageable and could be accomplished in the time allotted for graduate work.

The case study approach was a suitable methodology for examining the meanings and practices associated with gender equity for athletes for three reasons. First, it was appropriate given the epistemological and theoretical framework informing this study. Post-structuralist feminism is based on a subjectivist epistemology, or “a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know” (Crotty, 1998, p. 3). Unlike an objectivist epistemology in which phenomena are believed to have intrinsic meaning or a single reality, the subjectivist epistemology rejects universal truths and suggests there are multiple realities or understandings (Crotty, 1998). From this viewpoint then, by using a case study approach that entailed interviewing a variety of individuals who were involved in various sports, I recognized there would likely not be one meaning of gender equity or one way of implementing it. Gender equity could be understood in different ways depending on one’s experiences and exposure to particular institutional conditions, such as the team’s operating

structure or level of programming opportunities for male and female athletes. Although constructionism also recognizes multiple realities in that individuals ascribe different meanings to objects and situations as a result of engaging with them, subjectivist epistemology suggests that individuals do not construct meanings in a vacuum (Crotty, 1998). Their understandings are influenced by their experiences, interactions with others, thoughts, and so forth. Based on subjectivist epistemology, one's understandings of gender equity and how it should be implemented are influenced by the way it was defined in policy documents, translated into practices in other athletic departments or universities, or verbalized in discussions. Using a case study approach I examined how the historical, political, social, and economic contexts surrounding this athletic department and the CIAU influenced the meanings ascribed to one organizational value and the manner in which it was put into practice (Yin, 1994).

Second, this approach was suitable for examining the organizational value of gender equity because it provided the researcher with a picture of the institutional conditions in a particular setting to reveal taken for granted or hidden assumptions that influenced how it was understood and enacted (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Rao et al., 1999; Schein, 1985). Information was gathered about the structure, physical setting, and institutional conditions of the four case study sport programs (Creswell, 1998; Stake, 2000), which allowed me to better appreciate gender equity within the bounded system of this department. Third, with its emphasis on multiple sources and methods of data collection, the case study approach fostered a more in-depth picture, by highlighting the commonalities, contradictions and gaps between the data collected from field notes, observations, documents, and in-depth interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Additionally, the use of multiple methods provided me with a significant volume and diversity of data on which to base my interpretations and analysis (Stake, 2000).

#### *Site Selection*

An important consideration in the selection of a research site was choosing one that was similar to others in order to foster transferability of findings (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Reinharz, 1992). Therefore, I selected an athletic department that was comparable to others in Canada in terms of the types of sports offered and the governance structure. The selected department supported all but two sports (men's and women's wrestling) that were part of the CIAU's sport contingent. A recent trend within Canadian athletic departments



was to operate as ancillary units as compared to a unit associated with an academic department (Schneider, 1997). Ancillary departments, like food services or the bookstore, provide goods or services, but do not receive operating funds from the university and are expected to operate in a more business-like manner to ensure revenues cover expenses (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). Recognizing this trend and assuming that expectations to break even financially conflict with social pressures to be gender equitable (Frisby et al., 2004), I selected a department that was run as an ancillary unit. I would expect to find similar meanings and practices in the same sports in other Canadian athletic departments that share similar contexts and institutional conditions.

### *Case Study Selection*

Time wise it was not feasible to include all 30 teams from the selected department; therefore, I identified institutional conditions that were used as criteria for the selection of the sport programs:<sup>ii</sup>

1. *Programming opportunities for men and women.* All but two university sports supported by this department were available to both men and women. Football and baseball were offered to one gender, men in both cases. Not discounting the historical masculinity associated with these sports, I narrowed the selection to those sports with balanced gendered offerings to facilitate comparisons of meanings and practices related to gender equity.
2. *Operational structure.* University sports functioned in either a segregated or integrated manner (Dryden, 1997; Matthews, 1974). An example of a sport with a segregated structure was basketball where male and female athletes practiced and competed on separate teams. The two teams had a separate coaching staff and operating budgets. In contrast, some sports, such as track and field, cross-country running, and swimming, functioned for the most part within an integrated structure, where male and female athletes shared coaching staff, training facilities, and operating budgets.<sup>iii</sup> On their web site, the CIAU labeled these as “combined sports.” I included one sport program that functioned in an integrated manner and three that operated in a segregated manner, assuming the structure may influence the participants’ understandings of gender equity.
3. *History of co-existence.* There were some sports, like swimming and basketball, where men and women had participated for similar periods of time. With other sports, like

wrestling and rugby, the opportunity to participate had only recently been extended to women. I selected sports with different histories of co-existence because in those with a recent or short history of co-existence I expected more discrepancies in meanings and practices, in part because initiatives geared towards improving gender equity are sometimes seen as a threat to the historical privileges and traditions afforded to men (Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1996a).

4. *Institutional designation.* In many Canadian universities sport programs are informally designated as “major” and “minor” sports (Dryden, 1997; Matthews, 1974). Teams identified as major sport programs<sup>iv</sup> competed for CIAU-sanctioned championships and were assumed to be of interest to the general public, media and sponsors, who were all key stakeholders of athletic departments. These programs were deemed valuable for their revenue generating potential. Minor sport programs included those that did not compete for CIAU-sanctioned national championships and those that were CIAU-sanctioned but drew few fans and generated little, if any, revenue. This distinction was significant because it was tied to the level of resource support from the department. I selected three major and five minor sport programs<sup>v</sup> because there seemed to be a gender order (Connell, 1987) related to the designation. At this institution only two women’s teams (basketball and volleyball) in the entire department were identified as major sports compared to four men’s teams (basketball, football, ice hockey and volleyball).<sup>vi</sup>

Based on these criteria, I selected the following sport programs: *basketball*, because there was a long history of co-existence and both teams were considered major sports; *ice hockey*, because the men’s team was a major sport and the women’s team was a minor sport; *rugby*, because the women’s program was recently added as a CIAU sport, while the men’s team was not a CIAU sport, but was the oldest university sport on campus; and *swimming*, because the program was run in an integrated manner (see table 1 for a detailed description of each of the sport programs in relation to the four selection criteria). I met with two upper administrators prior to data collection to ensure my assessment of the sport programs in relation to the selection criteria was accurate.

Table 1.

*Selection Criteria for the Four Case Study Sport Programs*

Selection criteria	Sport program			
	Basketball	Ice hockey	Rugby	Swimming
Programming opportunities	• teams for men & women	• teams for men & women	• teams for men & women	• teams for men & women
Operational structure	• segregated	• segregated	• segregated	• integrated
History of co-existence	• men's & women's teams in existence since 1915	• men's team in existence since 1915 • women's team existed from 1915-1922, 1979-1983, & 1995-current	• men's team started in 1906 • women's team established in 1991	• men's & women's teams established in 1915
Institutional designation	• both were major sports	• men's team: major sport • women's team: minor sport	• both were minor sports	• both were minor sports

**Data Collection**

For this study, I relied on four data collection methods, field notes, document analysis, observations, and in-depth interviews, realizing that there was not a best source of information about organizational values. I recorded field notes in research journals throughout the data collection and analysis processes to chronicle information relevant to the study and to note my assumptions and role as a researcher. Reflexivity is one strategy that qualitative researchers use to illuminate and confront their assumptions, emotions and reactions, realizing that they influence the interpretations of the researcher (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000; Ristock & Pennell, 1996). Espoused values can be identified in organizational documents, such as policy statements, mission statements, and internal and external communications, and compared with other sources of data to reveal consistencies, gaps, or contradictions (Frisby, 1995). Observations of team practices and competitions

helped me to appreciate the culture and institutional conditions of the sport programs and to witness firsthand if and how gender equity was manifested in organizational practices (Wilkins, 1983). Finally, in-depth interviews with administrators, coaches, and athletes associated with the four sport programs provided me with detailed insight into their understandings of the meanings and practices.

By drawing on information from various methods, sources, and sport contexts, I hoped to call attention to aspects of gender equity that might have been overlooked or de-emphasized through the use of only one method, source of data, or sport (Martin, 1990b; Reinharz, 1992, Richardson, 1994). For example, while I gained insight from the in-depth interviews into the meanings of gender equity as understood by key stakeholders, observations of competitions provided me with valuable information regarding organizational practices such as promotions and resource allocation.

#### *Temporal Order of Data Collection*

Data collection for this research project was conducted over a two-year period, and field notes were kept throughout the data collection and analysis period. Documents were collected from October 1999 to July 2001, observations were conducted from February 2000 to June 2001, and interviews were carried out from March 2000 to May 2001 (see table 2 for a schedule of data collection). Although data were collected from the four methods concurrently, I speak to these methods in the order in which I started utilizing them: field notes, documents, observations, and in-depth interviews.

Table 2.

*Time Frame and Sequence of Data Collection*

Month / year	Data collected	Sports	Details
October 1999	document (1)		document – athletic department mission statement
February 2000	observations (5)	basketball	observation – women's basketball practice observation – women's basketball practice observation – basketball games (men & women) observation – men's basketball practice observation – men's basketball practice
March 2000	interviews (2) document (1)		interview – male administrator (A5) <sup>vii</sup> document – LCU policies interview – female administrator (A1)
April 2000	interview (1) documents (2)	basketball	interview – female coach (B6) documents – national & regional conference policies media releases for 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 seasons
May 2000	interviews (2) document (1)	basketball hockey	interview – female athlete (B2) document – financial statement 1998-1999 season interview – male coach (H6)
October 2000	interviews (4) observation (1)	hockey basketball	interview – female athlete (H1) interview – female athlete (H2) interview – female administrator (A3) observation – women's hockey game interview – female athlete (B3)
November 2000	interviews (2)	hockey	interview – female athlete (H3) interview – male administrator (A4)
January 2001	observations (3) interviews (2) document (1)	hockey swimming rugby	observation – men's hockey game observation – swim meet (men & women) interview - male coach (H7) interview - female administrator (A2) document – department policy observation – women's rugby game
February 2001	interviews (4)	basketball swimming rugby	interview - female athlete (B1) interview – male coach (S5) interview – male coach (B7) interview – female athlete (R2)
March 2001	interviews (4) observation (1)	hockey basketball rugby	interview – male athlete (H4) interview – male athlete (H5) interview – male athlete (B4) interview – male athlete (B5) observation – men's rugby game
April 2001	interviews (3)	rugby swimming	interview – female athlete (R1) interview – male athlete (R3) interview – female athlete (S1)

Table 2 - Continued

Month / year	Data collected	Sports	Details
May 2001	interviews (4)	swimming rugby	interview – male athlete (S3) interview – male coach (R4) interview – male athlete (S4) interview – female athlete (S2)
June 2001	observation (1)	swimming	observation – swim practice (men & women)
July 2001	document (1)		financial statements for 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 seasons

Note:

I did not include the field notes in this table as they were written on regular basis starting in October 1999. News releases for the 2000-2001 season were collected on a weekly basis.

### *Field Notes*

Grace (1997) stated, “[t]he research process is neither value-free nor objective, because there are always assumptions shaping the research design whether these are made visible or not” (p. 26). Reflexivity is one strategy that qualitative researchers use to illuminate and confront their assumptions, emotions, and reactions, realizing that they influence the interpretations of the researcher (Ristock & Pennell, 1996). I addressed the issue of reflexivity by writing detailed and regular field notes in a research journal (Hughes, 1994; Richardson, 1994; Sanjek, 1990). During data collection and analysis, I kept four types of field notes described by Richardson (1994): i) methodological notes on issues and decisions pertaining to the research process, such as the sampling criteria and assigning coding labels; ii) observational notes collected during my observations of practices, competitions, and interviews; iii) analytical notes in which I documented my assumptions and the process of data analysis and interpretation; and iv) general field notes that included anecdotal information relating to changes in the organization, such as the hiring of a new men’s basketball coach.

Although time consuming, I found it most convenient to record all four types of field notes in a research journal that I carried around with me at all times, which gave me the opportunity to record ideas, thoughts, questions, new information or data while they were still fresh in my mind. In total I ended up with three journals of notes and periodically reviewed them, which allowed me to identify some of my assumptions, to be aware of my changing analytical interpretations, and to remind myself of decisions that influenced the

direction of the study. To illustrate, at one point I jotted the following assumptions that I had made:

- women would notice many inequities and be pissed off about them
- men would be reluctant to talk about gender equity
- athletes would know about other athletes' situation
- gender equity would elicit some strong emotions either way
- male coaches are not supportive of female athletes and women's teams. (analytical notes, June 2001)

In looking back at these notes, I realized that many women did mention examples of preferential treatment of male athletes, but some women justified the differences as being 'just the way things are.' I expected more women to be upset by the inequities, but many accepted them without much question. None of the men I interviewed were openly hostile or defensive to discussions of gender equity. I had hoped that athletes would be aware of the inequities in sports other than their own, thus reinforcing the notion that they were widespread and systemic rather than isolated and limited to one team or one sport. However, I should not have been surprised by their limited awareness as they led busy lives, and many of them did not interact with other university athletes outside of their own sport. Reflecting on these assumptions, I had stereotyped how men and women would react. Reviewing these field notes helped me to identify and challenge these assumptions and to understand how they influenced my analysis of the data.

Comparing these assumptions to the emerging data forced me to question why I made these assumptions and helped me to address why these assumptions were not always evident in the findings. Some of my assumptions were explained in that my critical perspective to the research made me more inclined to focus on examples of inequity than on examples of equity (analytical notes, April 2000). As a result, I often paid attention to the worst (e.g., denial of gender inequity from men and women) and the best (e.g., men and women as advocates of change), but overlooked something in between. In other situations, I made assumptions based on my experiences, which not everyone shared. I also realized that men and women have a variety of interpretations and experiences. For example, one interview with a man felt like I had interviewed myself as he voiced ideas and interpretations

very similar to the way I was thinking (analytical notes, February 2001). I had expected these thoughts from some women, but was surprised to hear these understandings from a man.

### *Documents*

For this study I obtained and analyzed copies of the athletic department's mission statement, policy documents, news releases, and operating budgets. These documents were helpful in that they provided information on the historical, political, social, and economic contexts of the site and the institutional conditions of the sport programs. As well, they indicated what was formally written about gender equity for athletes and contributed to my appreciation of meanings and practices associated with it (Hodder, 2000). Since documents possess naturalistic and noninteractive qualities, I was able to explore and analyze this organizational value without having to work directly with those who produced or provided access to the documents (Reinharz, 1992).

Organizational values are often revealed or explicitly stated in the organization's mission statement (Collins & Porras, 1996; Halford & Leonard, 2001; Sinclair, 1993). A framed copy of the mission statement was symbolically posted at the entrance to the athletic department's offices and served as a public symbol of their commitment and dedication to it (observational notes, 2000). Since two upper administrators (one male, one female) indicated that gender equity was part of the department's mission, I examined it for evidence of gender equity as a formally stated value.

As a unit of LCU and a member of regional and national athletic conferences, the athletic department was responsible for abiding by policies set out by those organizations. These policies directed and guided their practices and procedures, including how gender equity for athletes was implemented. I collected policy documents, including the operations manuals of the regional and national conferences and LCU's policy guidelines. As Reinharz (1992) indicated "documents ... shape norms; they do not just reflect them" (p. 151). Thus, policies reflect the prevailing norms and through legislation they contribute to the construction of norms by defining key concepts and identifying acceptable practices. Operations manuals were obtained directly from the regional and national conferences and the university. I requested a copy of the athletic department's policies but was told by the male athletic director and the female intercollegiate coordinator they did not exist. According to the athletic director, they followed LCU's policies and those of the athletic conferences, which negated the need for separate department policies. In addition, the



intercollegiate coordinator (A1) indicated they were not “a policy making kind of department,” and added gender equity had not been a problem, therefore there was no need to develop policies for it. Yet, the community development officer provided me with a copy of a written departmental policy that she had authored for the purpose of demonstrating to the university senate the department’s stance on gender equity and scholarships (see appendix A for the complete version of the policy). I was surprised that neither of the upper administrators explicitly mentioned or appeared to know about that policy, especially since it was one of the few formal departmental policies.

To more fully understand the department’s commitment to promoting male and female athletes, I obtained and examined their news releases over three seasons: 1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001. News releases are a public relations and communications tool to highlight and promote athletes. They often consist of season previews of teams, announcements of new recruits, information about upcoming athletic events, results from competitions and notices of significant accomplishments and awards. News releases and other forms of media communications have been critiqued because they privilege particular values and taken for granted assumptions, such as men’s teams are more valued in society (Kane, 1996; Snyder, 1986). I obtained copies of the news releases for the 2000-2001 season directly from the department’s web site. News releases from the two previous seasons had been compiled into binders and were kept in the assistant communications coordinator’s office. I contacted him to borrow them and to photocopy what I needed (methodological notes, April 2000).

I examined the department’s operating budgets for the seasons 1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001 to better understand the distribution of financial resources among the selected men’s and women’s sports. These budgets revealed how much money was allocated to those teams overall and for what purposes, which allowed for detailed comparisons. I obtained these documents from the comptroller’s secretary.

### *Observations*

Observational data were collected to gain firsthand knowledge about how gender equity was enacted in organizational practices and to situate myself in the culture of university athletics (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). With observations, I was able to collect a large amount of data in a short period of time (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). As well, personally observing the contexts in which athletes practiced and competed gave me

additional information to compare to the information collected from other sources (Merriam, 1991; Ristock & Pennell, 1996). For example, both the male athletic director and female communications coordinator implied that the department provided the men's and women's hockey teams with adequate equipment. Yet, at the two games I attended it was apparent that the quality of equipment differed dramatically, with the men's team having coordinated uniforms and equipment and the women's team being outfitted in mismatched uniforms and equipment (observational notes, October 2000, January 2001).

Over two seasons (1999-2000 and 2000-2001), I attended four team practices (two for basketball; two for swimming) and seven competitions (two for basketball, two for ice hockey, two for rugby, and one for swimming).<sup>viii</sup> Because of my strategy of attending one competition per team, my interpretations were only partial.

One of the difficulties of carrying out observations was determining what to concentrate on, as it was easy to become overwhelmed by the detail and to lose focus on what was potentially valuable for my study (Boomstrom, 1994; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Thus, I took detailed observational notes on four areas of cultural manifestations: physical surroundings, artifacts, people, and rituals (cf. Martin, 2002) (see appendix B for a full list of observation categories). For example, I observed the *physical surroundings* and layout of facilities and how that related to access to the facilities for male and female athletes, and examined artifacts such as the placement of banners or plaques, which could be indicative of the department's commitment to celebrating accomplishments. I documented evidence of *artifacts*, such as posters advertising upcoming games, to assess the department's approach to marketing men's and women's teams. As well, I noted the quality and quantity of equipment and uniforms and evidence of sponsorship, such as logos on uniforms and equipment. During the competitions and practices, I recorded the presence of various types of *people*. For example, I observed if the athletes and teams had access to support staff like trainers and managers and if there were game-day staff such as announcers and ticket takers at competitions, which implied a level of resources allocated to the men's and women's teams. At competitions, I recorded the presence of media and fans, as an indication of the level of interest from other stakeholders. *Rituals*, like opening and closing ceremonies, are common within the sports world so I paid attention to them at games and practices and noted the similarities and differences in them between teams.

It was possible that some participants took their sport's culture, including physical surroundings, artifacts and rituals, for granted and thus overlooked obvious or mundane details, which nonetheless might be quite revealing (Boomstrom, 1994; Martin, 2002). Therefore, it was important for me to observe and record observational notes on these cultural manifestations of the selected sport programs and then discuss some of these details with interviewees. For instance, before interviewing the swimmers I attended a swim meet, during which I noticed male and female swimmers standing together on the pool deck and cheering on their teammates (observational notes, January 2001). I found this demonstration of support between male and female teammates to be particularly interesting given my experience with university basketball where male basketball players rarely came out to watch and support the women's team, but female basketball players often stayed following their game to support the men's team. This could be explained as a game preparation issue, in that the men needed to prepare for games that were scheduled after the women's game, but it could also indicate that women's role of supporting men was reinforced. The example from swimming suggested that male and female athletes in that sport support each other, but this was likely due to the integrated structure that facilitated closer contact between the two teams.

The researcher's role during observations can vary from complete observer or observer as a non-participant to complete participant depending on whether or not individuals know they are being studied and on the extent to which the researcher participates in the activities being studied (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Merriam, 1991; Reinharz, 1992). Generally, I took on the role of a partial participant during the observations, with my participation being as a spectator or a student (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). My choice to act in this role was to observe the settings in which athletes practiced and competed without having these athletes know what I have observed (Reinharz, 1992). This way I was able to check my understandings with what they were willing to share with me during their interviews, and I was able to gather data in an unobtrusive manner because my attendance did not require the cooperation or permission of others (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). As a member of the public, I could freely attend events and 'hang out' in the athletic facilities on campus. During competitions I situated myself near other spectators. During basketball and swimming practices it was common practice, at this university, for students or other individuals to sit in the bleachers and do homework, study, read, visit, or

sleep. For those two sports, it was easy for me to blend in by pretending to read or do homework, while actually observing the practices (observational notes, 2000, 2001). The ice hockey arenas and rugby pitches were open to the public as well, but students did not frequently hang out in those facilities during practices. My presence then at those practices might have been disruptive or suspicious. Therefore, I chose to only attend competitions for ice hockey and rugby. Overall I found that observing competitions was more meaningful than observing team practices, because there were more cultural details to observe.

### *In-depth Interviews*

Researchers often rely on surveys and questionnaires to study organizational values (Martin, 2002). Although these methods allow them to efficiently collect opinions, the participants are usually responding to pre-determined or researcher-driven meanings of the values that appear as items on a scale (Martin & Frost, 1996). Additionally, because of the limited nature of questionnaires, researchers are not able to probe into the deeper understandings of values (Trice & Beyer, 1993). Interviews, however, permit respondents to provide and elaborate on their own interpretations of organizational values and often reveal multiple or contradictory understandings (Martin, 2002; McKay, 1994). As well, they are typically conducted in a natural setting and are useful in understanding complex phenomena such as organizational values (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

As indicated in the next section, I interviewed each respondent once for a total of 28 interviews. If I had interviewed each person twice I could have asked additional or follow-up questions, but some athletes were graduating, thus making it difficult to guarantee I could schedule a second interview with every respondent. A second interview would have privileged the administrators and coaches who had more permanence in the department. The interviews ranged from 35 to over 100 minutes, depending on the participant's interest in and knowledge of the topic. All participants consented to having the interviews audiotape-recorded.

I used an interview guide to ensure that all participants were asked common questions (Marshall & Rossman, 1999); however, the interviews proceeded in a conversational manner. I did not always ask the questions in the same order, and participants framed their responses in a manner that suited them (e.g., brief answer, anecdotal response) (Bernard, 1994; Fontana & Frey, 2000; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Wolf, 1996).

The interview guide was developed based on the research questions:

- RQ1: What meanings did administrators, coaches, and athletes associate with gender equity for athletes?
- RQ2: Which meanings of this organizational value were implemented into organizational practices related to four different sport programs?
- RQ3: How did the administrators, coaches, and athletes explain any uncovered gaps between meanings and practices?

To start the interviews, I asked all the interviewees about their involvement with the athletic department. These questions allowed participants to become comfortable with the interview and provided me with background information about them. Each participant was asked to define gender equity with respect to athletes (RQ1), reflect on it as an organizational value (RQ1), and speak about how that value had been implemented (RQ2). I asked about their individual impressions of the current situation of gender equity, which was aimed at understanding the relationship between meanings and practices (RQ3). I was also interested in the influence of individuals, particularly vocal advocates of gender equity, in shaping the meanings and practices. I assumed if there were vocal advocates in positions of power, they would take on an active role to police the practices and ensure they were in line with espoused commitments (RQ3). Finally, I asked them to consider alternative or new meanings and practices of this organizational value in the context of Canadian university athletics (RQ1 & RQ2). This question allowed participants to draw upon new or different discourses to envision possibilities for change (Rao et al., 1999). I used probes to encourage respondents to elaborate on their responses, clarify their statements, and uncover more in-depth responses (see appendix C for the interview guide).

While the interviews primarily functioned as a means for me to gain insight into meanings and practices associated with gender equity, in some situations they also served as an opportunity for participants to reflect on their experiences. A number of respondents, both male and female, indicated they had not thought about gender equity in much detail until the interview. After being asked to define it, one female administrator (A1) remarked, "I've never really put it into words before. You sort of had it in the back of your head." A male athlete (S4) noted, "I only had a look at the questions this morning. It got me thinking about it, and it'll kind of make me a little more aware of things relating to gender equity." Similarly, when I asked one male athlete (B5) if it was relevant to his athletic experience, he

responded, "I've never really thought of it until I read the questions." Although his statement could be indicative of male privilege, it also underscored the importance of including organizational members, particularly men, in the study who may not regularly think about gender equity. For others, it appeared that the interviews were cathartic and therapeutic, serving as a time for them to be heard (Opie, 1992). For example, near the end of an interview with one female athlete (S1), during which she touched on the difficulties of balancing academics and athletics, communication problems with coaches, and a recent shift to more respectful interactions between male and female athletes, she said, "I guess it's our time to just vent to you and have you listen." I appreciated that I was able to provide a reciprocal service for some respondents.

#### *Selection of interviewees.*

Organizational research tends to emphasize the interpretations of a few select stakeholder groups, usually male upper-level executives, because they determine the direction of the organization and the behaviour of the organizational members (Frost & Stablein, 1992; Wiener, 1988). In particular, a majority of empirical research on organizational values has been built on the viewpoints of upper-level executives (Agle & Caldwell, 1999). Similarly, much of the current literature on Canadian university athletics has centred on the viewpoints of athletic administrators because they are considered to be the primary decision makers (cf. Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999; Hoeber & Frisby, 2001; Inglis, 1988, 1991).

Martin (2002) has criticized researchers for putting too much faith in upper management's interpretations of organizational values because it reinforces the assumption of shared meanings and presumes that they are a homogenous stakeholder group that can and do speak for all members of the organization. A post-structuralist perspective on organizational research, in contrast, searches for the "voice[s] of displaced, marginalized, exploited and oppressed people" (Rail, 1998, p. xv), as well as including dominant ones, thus recognizing the diversity in organizations. I interviewed various members of the department to determine whether there were different viewpoints from the dominant, male upper management position (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Ferguson, 1994; Gergen & Gergen, 2000; Reinhartz, 1992). Rao et al. (1999) argued that disrupting the status quo and uncovering alternative meanings of gender equity can be accomplished by incorporating and including multiple voices.

I sought out, listened to, and incorporated the voices of representatives from three internal stakeholder groups in university athletics: administrators, coaches, and athletes, as it was possible that there would be differences in their understandings based on their status, roles, and experiences in the department. I selected administrators who dealt with gender equity at a strategic decision making level (Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999) and because of their roles might have considered it with the interests of the entire department in mind (Hoeber & Frisby, 2001; Sanger & Mathes, 1997). Coaches were included because they acted as intermediaries between the administrators and the athletes. Because they had more direct contact with athletes, they might have a better understanding than would administrators of this organizational value as it related to athletes. As well, coaches were involved in some decisions, such as determining facility access and scheduling of practices that impacted the implementation of this value. I included athletes because they were the direct recipients of organizational decisions and practices in athletic departments (Malloy & Taylor, 1999; Riemer & Chelladurai, 2001). Despite their designation as “the prime beneficiaries of the [varsity] program” (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, p. 88) and their function as human capital for the department (Malloy & Taylor, 1999), athletes’ views were rarely solicited because they typically had little input or decision making power in sport organizations (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a; Blinde & Greendorfer, 1992). As a result, their interests were often overshadowed by the concerns expressed by other potentially more influential stakeholder groups including university administrators, media, and alumni (Hoeber & Frisby, 2001; Riemer & Chelladurai, 2001).

*Description of interviewees.*

I conducted interviews with 5 administrators (3 women, 2 men), 6 coaches (1 woman, 5 men), and 17 athletes (10 women, 7 men) for a total of 28 interviews (14 women, 14 men) (see table 3).<sup>ix</sup> Five administrators - the athletic director, intercollegiate coordinator, communications coordinator, development officer, and event management and promotions officer - were purposely selected from a total of 14 administrators based on their job titles and responsibilities. I selected them assuming they had the most knowledge of and experience with gender equity as a result of their direct involvement with implementing it into organizational practices, such as programming, promotions, budget allocations, and staffing. The male athletic director, who oversaw the competitive and recreational programs, and the female intercollegiate coordinator, who was specifically responsible for the

competitive, university sports, had been in their respective positions for over five years. The female communications coordinator, who managed all advertising, marketing, and media relations for the university sports, was recently appointed to this position but had worked for the department in other capacities for over five years. The female development officer had held her position for less than three years and was responsible for alumni fundraising. The male event management and promotions officer had been employed full-time on a ten-month contract to coordinate game day events, but also had prior part-time experience with the athletic program as a game day staff member.

Table 3.

*Profile of Participants Based on Stakeholder Group, Gender and Sport Program*

Stakeholder group	Sport program				Total
	Basketball	Ice hockey	Rugby	Swimming	
Administrators - women	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
Administrators - men	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2
Coaches - women	1	0	0	0	1
Coaches - men	1	2	1	1	5
Athletes - women	3	3	2	2	10
Athletes - men	2	2	1	2	7
Total	7	7	4	5	28 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> This number represents the total number of interviewees and includes the five administrators who were not affiliated with a particular sport program.

The primary criterion for selecting coaches was that they were affiliated with one of the selected sport programs - basketball, ice hockey, rugby, or swimming. I contacted eight coaches and six agreed to participate. One male coach, who later resigned from the department, declined to participate on the grounds that he did not “have strong feelings on gender equity” (observational notes, April 2000). The male coach of the men’s rugby team did not respond to my repeated requests for an interview. His lack of response could have reflected a disinterest or reluctance to speak on the topic, or a lack of time to participate. Of the six coaches who agreed to participate, four were full-time head coaches and two were part-time coaches. At the time of the interviews, two full-time coaches had been in their positions more than five years, two coaches (one full-time, one part-time) had been



employed by the department for five years or less, and the two coaches (one full-time, one part-time) had been employed for less than one year.

In total I interviewed 17 athletes: 5 basketball players (3 women, 2 men); 5 ice hockey players (3 women, 2 men); 3 rugby players (2 women, 1 man); and 4 swimmers (2 women, 2 men). Despite the variations in roster sizes in the selected sport programs (e.g., basketball teams usually consisted of 12 to 15 players, while the women's rugby program supported between 35 to 50 athletes), I elected to interview two male athletes and two female athletes per team to be consistent. Generally, I included the first two male and female athletes per sport who agreed to participate. However, in two situations I deviated from this principle and included additional athletes because their understandings, knowledge, and experiences would be particularly useful for this study. I interviewed a third female basketball player because she was one of the few athletes identified as having 'strong feelings' about gender equity. I included a third female hockey player because, as president of the athletic council, she was privy to conversations with athletic administrators about decisions and practices relating to gender equity. The athletes varied in their education and responsibilities with the department. Their education ranged from first year undergraduates to a graduate student and a medical student. Eight of them were working towards a degree in kinesiology and six were enrolled in an arts program. The remaining three athletes were enrolled in commerce, engineering, and health sciences. Nine athletes had taken on additional responsibilities with the department. Two students (one man, one woman) had recently finished their athletic eligibility and were involved as assistant coaches with the athletic department. Four athletes (three women, one man) served on the athletic council. One male athlete served on a hiring committee for a new coach, one female athlete organized fundraising initiatives for her team, and another female athlete was responsible for all the administrative matters for her team.

#### *Contact process.*

Contact information for the selected administrators and coaches was obtained from the athletic department's web site. Most interviews with the athletes were arranged through referrals from one of three sources: a coach, teammates or the president of the athletic council. When I contacted individuals or asked for referrals, I indicated that I was interested in a variety of understandings of gender equity and I did not just want to speak to those who supported or advocated for it. In doing so, I hoped to alleviate the concerns of those who

felt they had a viewpoint that differed from mine or who felt they had little to say about this issue. My intention was to ensure that people realized I was sincerely interested in what they had to say and in turn, they felt comfortable enough to provide lengthy responses to my questions.

Although the referral strategy worked well, in my attempts to set up interviews with male rugby players, I exhausted all sources and ended up only interviewing one player.<sup>x</sup> As a result, my understandings of gender equity in relation to men's rugby were limited to his understandings and experiences. Another drawback with this strategy was my limited control over who was referred to me. Despite my requests to speak to athletes with different viewpoints, in a few instances I was referred to individuals who held similar views to the referent, appeared to be supportive of gender equity, or were expected to not say anything controversial. In one instance, after scanning a list of approximately 25 players, one male, full-time head coach provided me with just two names saying they would be the most thoughtful and helpful (observational notes, January 2001). Another time when I asked one male athlete for names of other athletes to contact, he said "he knew other [athletes] but wanted to give me names of people who would actually do it" (observational notes, May 2001). Although they were probably trying to be helpful by not referring me to people who were unlikely to participate, I might have drawn additional insights from interviewing athletes who were less interested, opposed to, or even resentful of this value. Overall it appeared that gender equity was not a usual or frequent topic of discussion in the department and as a result, I doubt that people knew how others interpreted it.

An interesting trend developed in negotiating the location of the interviews. My primary concern was to schedule them at the most convenient time and place for the participants. I interviewed most administrators and coaches in their offices or at a location near where they worked. Essentially I was in their space. I sat in the visitor chair and looked around at their furnishings in their office. I was unable to control interruptions like people stopping by or telephoning. In contrast, most of the athletes did not have space on campus aside from access to a practice facility or locker room. As a result, most of them agreed to meet at a public space like a cafeteria or an empty seminar room. I interviewed the other one-third of the athletes in a space near where they trained. I had intended to interview more of them in their training or competition facility, but was not willing to risk poor sound quality from audiotape-recording in a large gymnasium or hockey arena.

### *Reflections on Data Collection*

My research plan for this study consisted generally of collecting documents first to get some background information on the selected sports, then conducting some observations of team competitions and practices. In doing so, I had some information about the institutional conditions and was able to ask the interviewees to comment on them where applicable. If I were to repeat this study again, this is how I would sequence the data collection:

1. I would collect documents first as this would allow me to gain some grounding about the sport programs and the site, such as how gender equity was formally enacted.
2. Next I would conduct preliminary observations of team competitions and practices to provide me with some sensitivity and insight to the structure, institutional conditions and cultural elements of the sport programs.
3. Then I would conduct in-depth interviews with stakeholders in which they would be asked to comment on the structure, institutional conditions or cultural elements of the sport programs or about aspects of the documents that I have already analyzed.
4. After the interviews I would carry out follow-up observations whereby I would focus on cultural elements or organizational practices that are mentioned during the interviews, but not observed initially. These observations would also be useful in confirming if the data collected from the previous round of observations are typical or unique.
5. Finally, I would conduct follow-up interviews, which would allow me to check their understandings of meanings and practices and to clarify any discrepancies between the various data collection methods.

Like much qualitative research, this study proceeded in a nonlinear manner, with data analysis going on concurrently with data collection. I analyzed data as soon as the first interview was transcribed, the first document was obtained, and the first observation was completed in my field notes. Nevertheless, I chose to write about these two processes separately for the ease of the reader, and I now turn the reader's attention to the data analysis process.

## **Data Analysis**

Strauss (1994) described qualitative data analysis as on-going and concurrent processes, including organizing, managing, reading, reviewing, memoing, reflecting, describing, coding, categorizing, making comparisons, and developing the final account. My analysis of the data followed similar processes. Initially I analyzed the data by converting documents (i.e., mission statement, athletic department policy document), field notes, and interview transcripts to electronic documents and reviewing them. Analyzing data early on in the research process allowed me to build on and revise emergent patterns and themes as I continued to collect additional data and review the literature (methodological and analytical notes, 2000). After I had collected most of my data, I analyzed them through the formal processes of deconstruction, content analysis, coding, and categorizing.

I analyzed data collected from four different methods using a combination of analysis techniques. The data in field notes were compared to data collected by other methods through the process of deconstruction that consisted of uncovering hidden meanings and silences and challenging dominant understandings. The documents (mission statement, policy documents, news releases, and operating budgets) were separately analyzed using content analysis and deconstruction. Observational notes were content analyzed and themes were developed as to the extent to which gender equity was observed in various cultural manifestations. Finally, interview transcripts were coded and categorized.

### *Deconstruction*

Many qualitative researchers, including post-structuralist feminists, use deconstruction to examine the hidden or gendered meanings of texts, including written documents, verbal accounts, and body language. Deconstruction rejects the premise of fixed, finite or universal meanings of texts, but acknowledges overlooked meanings along with obvious or literal meanings of texts (Bradshaw, 1996; Crotty, 1998; Fletcher, 1999a; Martin, 1990). For example, by paying close attention to texts, obvious gaps in logic that signal contradictions and discrepancies are identified and can be analyzed. Another way to deconstruct texts is to recognize that they include oppositions (e.g., 'male' and 'female') in which one term in the opposition is "presented as hierarchically superior" (Bradshaw, 1996, p. 99). Through challenging and disrupting the idea of hierarchical meanings, the devalued terms or phrases are exposed and challenged. For example, in news releases some men's teams were identified without a gender marker (e.g., basketball team instead of men's

basketball team). In contrast, women's teams were never identified without a gender marker. This practice implied that women's team required a label to distinguish them as 'other' than and inferior to the 'real' men's teams (Parks & Robertson, 2002).

Deconstruction encourages researchers to "see beyond the obvious" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 92) in the data by analyzing contradictions, critiquing instances of shared assumptions and challenging the neutrality claimed by taken for granted terms and phrases. To illustrate, a significant pattern that developed early on was that individuals defined gender equity simply as 'equal opportunities' without much elaboration (analytical notes, May 2000). As a result of my background in university sports, I assumed I shared the same understanding of 'equal opportunities' as them, in that it referred to the same numbers of teams. In doing so, multiple understandings of it were left unsaid. After some reflection, I realized there might be other understandings of it, including equal chances to travel, to compete, or to be coached by a qualified individual. In subsequent interviews I explicitly asked respondents to expand on their understandings of equal opportunities. By questioning my own understandings and those of the respondents I engaged in the process of deconstruction.

Deconstruction is often applied to one particular text, for example, Martin's (1990a) deconstruction of an executive's story; Peterson and Albrecht's (1999) analysis of a maternity policy, or Stern's (1996) deconstruction of a single advertisement. Martin (1990a) used deconstruction to 'read between the lines' of a story told by a company president about how his company was responsive to the needs of women employees. She employed various deconstructive techniques such as paying attention to contradictions, revealing the underlying assumptions of metaphors, examining silences and reconstructing the text using a substitution of phrases. In the original story, the executive spoke about his company's efforts to support a pregnant employee. Martin reconstructed the story by showing how the company would have reacted in a different manner had the employee been a man undergoing a heart bypass. Through the application of these techniques she revealed that the language the executive used actually favoured the interests of the company over the concern for the woman's family life. Deconstruction provided a means for illustrating how "in a text, dominant ideologies suppress conflict by eliding conflicts of interest, denying the existence of points of view that could be disruptive of existing power relationships, and creating myths of harmony, unity, and caring that conceal the opposite" (Martin, 1990a, p. 340).

Reinharz (1992) discussed feminist intertextual deconstruction whereby the researcher searches for contradictions, silences, and gaps between various texts (e.g., Bradshaw, 1996). While I deconstructed specific documents in isolation (e.g., silences in the mission statement), I also used the intertextual deconstruction technique to 'make the familiar strange' (Foley, 1992) and to challenge organizational rhetoric that was often passed off as truths or facts (Martin, 2002). I periodically re-read the raw data and analyzed them by paying particular attention to contradictions, alternative meanings, gaps, or what was left unsaid (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Reinhartz, 1992). For example, through deconstruction, I identified that respondents made little mention of gender equity policies, yet there was evidence of departmental and conference policies. These situations were noted as memos in Atlas.ti, a computer software data analysis program, and were instrumental in the development of the final themes.

#### *Analysis of Field Notes - Memos*

Methodological, analytical, and general field notes were typed into Atlas.ti and saved as memos, which are defined as written accounts of the analytic process (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). I periodically went back to these memos to check for patterns and connections with the other sources of data. As well, once codes, categories and themes were developed, I re-read the field notes to check if these were plausible given the field notes that were taken during the process of data collection (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

#### *Analysis of Documents - Content Analysis*

The mission statement, policy documents, operating budgets, and news releases were content analyzed. I analyzed them quantitatively by counting particular phrases or incidents (e.g., the number of lines devoted to women's basketball in a news releases, or the number of lines dedicated to gender equity policies) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1999), qualitatively by noting significant silences, meanings, gaps, or contradictions (e.g., definitions of it in policy documents, or the absence of season highlights in the news releases) (Reinharz, 1992). While the data from the documents could have been entered into Atlas.ti, it was more convenient to keep it in appendices that could be easily referred to (see appendix E for the analysis of the mission statement, appendix F for the analysis of the policies, appendix G for the analysis of the operating budgets, and appendix H for the analysis of the news releases). This information was periodically reviewed in conjunction

with the analysis of the data from the interviews and significant connections or discrepancies were noted in memos.

*Mission statement.*

The department's mission statement consisted of a one-page document. The purpose of analyzing this document was to ascertain if gender equity was formally identified as an organizational value by the department. I summarized the content of the three paragraphs of the document and scanned for references to this value. Since there were no specific references to gender equity, I deconstructed the content of the mission statement and paid particular attention to the silences in it (see appendix D).

*Policy documents.*

Content analysis of the policy documents consisted of visually scanning the documents and noting if and how gender equity was defined in them. I also noted the location, length, and context of these policies within relevant manuals and handbooks (see appendix F for the analysis of policy documents). Finally, I deconstructed the content of the policies in light of data gathered from other sources. For example, many respondents assumed there were broad policies similar in scope to Title IX legislation in the United States. In reality, the operations manual of the CIAU outlined four policies that directly related to gender equity for athletes, while the Regional Conference identified three gender equity policies (see appendix F). With the exception of the CIAU's detailed harassment and discrimination policy that was over six pages long, these policies were between one to five lines in length (see appendix F), which suggest they were not comparable in scale to Title IX legislation.

*Operating budget.*

The content analysis of the department's operating budget entailed a comparison of budget figures over 3 seasons (1998-1999, 1999-2000, and 2000-2001). I focused on the level of funding to men's and women's teams for travel, coaches' salaries, facility rentals, and other operating expenses. I summarized the budgets for each of the sport programs and broke down the figures by gender when possible.<sup>xi</sup> Discrepancies in the budget figures are documented in tables (see appendix G and chapter 6). This information was indicative of the department's allocation and prioritization of financial resources to the four men's and women's sport programs.

### *News releases.*

I analyzed over 420 pages of news releases by examining the order of stories and the number of lines devoted to each of the basketball, ice hockey, rugby, and swim teams. From that information I inferred the department's prioritization of particular teams. I designed a cover sheet on which I summarized the content of each release and specifically highlighted information pertaining to the selected sport programs. For each news release I recorded:

- *location of story*

I noted the page number and location (i.e., top, middle, or bottom) of every story pertaining to the four sport programs. I also identified the lead story, which was the top priority of the news release and noted if it was a shared lead story.<sup>xiii</sup> I interpreted this information as indicative of the prioritization of the teams.

- *number of lines per story*

I presumed that the length the story correlated to the importance of it and the particular team or sport. Realizing there were certain times during the competitive season when a team has a long story written about them (e.g., season preview, hosting a tournament), I calculated the longest and shortest story for each team and the average number of lines per story per team.

- *unusual or particular information for one team*

Unusual or particular information included mentions of attendance figures, announcements of recent recruits, previews, or athlete profiles. Being aware of not only what was included in the news releases, but also what was not written or mentioned was a way of paying attention to the silences and deconstructing them to determine if certain pieces of information were typically only mentioned for some teams (Reinharz, 1992) (see appendix H for a summary of the content analysis and chapter 6 for analysis of news releases for particular teams).

### *Analysis of Observations – Content Analysis*

Observational notes were typed into word documents. Since the volume of data from these notes (30 pages) was much smaller than the volume of data from interview transcripts (over 600 pages), I manually analyzed them rather than coding them through Atlas.ti. I did this by noting examples of gender equity for athletes in relation to the surroundings, artifacts, people, and rituals at competitions and practices and compared the examples between the men's and women's teams in each of the selected sport programs.



After I analyzed the interview data and identified dominant organizational practices, I re-analyzed the observational data, identified examples that related to those organizational practices, and determined if the practices, based on observational notes, were equitable. Additionally, I engaged in deconstruction by comparing the observational notes with the data from the interviews and identified examples of gender equity relating to organizational practices that were not discussed or contradicted by statements from interviewees. This information is identified in appendix I.

### *Analysis of Interviews - Coding and Categorizing*

I transcribed the interviews verbatim into word documents, which resulted in approximately 600 pages of transcripts that were subsequently converted to rich text files and linked to Atlas.ti. To analyze these data, I coded and categorized every interview transcript. Coding required first organizing data into smaller, manageable sections and then assigning words or phrases to those chunks of meaningful data (Strauss, 1994). Categorizing consisted of conceptualizing the data into an organized system of themes (Strauss, 1994). Throughout the process, the interview transcripts were deconstructed by paying attention to inconsistencies, omissions, and ambiguities within and between interviews. I relied on Atlas.ti to assist with the analysis process by keeping track of codes and storing memos. It was also beneficial in that it allowed me to apply multiple codes to sections of data, easily change code labels, and facilitate the retrieval of quotations (Côté, Salmela, Baria, & Russell, 1993).

The transcripts were coded using two stages of coding: open coding and axial coding. Open or descriptive coding consisted of summarizing sections of data (e.g., sentences or paragraphs) and assigning a label to that section (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). I re-read and re-coded the transcripts a number of times before settling on a set of codes that were meaningful without being overly specific and detailed. Open coding consisted of indexing data with two labels: a first-order code and a second-order code.<sup>xiii</sup> The first-order code was a phrase or word that represented a broad analytical topic and served as an organizing mechanism. They evolved following many readings of the transcripts in which I developed some familiarity with the data and began to see patterns. The second-order codes were subsets of first-order codes and were more descriptive in nature. In some situations, second-order codes were derived directly from key words taken from the transcript (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) (analytical notes, 2000).<sup>xiv</sup> The following was an example of the open

coding stage used when I asked respondents to define gender equity for athletes. The first-order code for their responses was labeled *DEFINITIONS* in order to group all their definitions of gender equity. The second-order codes depicted the various definitions. I ended up with eight codes second-order codes relating to definitions, including *equal opportunity* and *equal resources*. In total there were 16 first-order codes and 222 second-order codes (See appendix J for a full list of first-order and second-order codes).

In the next stage of coding I searched for connections and relationships between the open codes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Strauss and Corbin (1990) labeled this axial coding, whereby the data are re-examined and reconfigured to find new relationships beyond those related to basic, descriptive first-order codes. Axial codes were used to create tighter, more meaningful, and broader categories from the second-order codes. Additionally, I re-examined the raw and analyzed data from the documents, observational notes, interviews and other field notes, including the memos that highlighted connections and patterns between the different sources of data, in light of the analytical categories emerging from the interview data.

#### *Development of Themes*

Connections between categories led to the development of sub-themes, followed by the identification of four main themes (see appendix K for a list of themes, and their related sub-themes, categories, and second-order codes). I relied on Strauss' (1994) framework to identify the final themes. He suggested (p. 36) the most relevant themes should exhibit at least three of the following five characteristics:

- centrality: Was the theme central to the understanding of gender equity as an organizational value?
- frequency: Was the theme mentioned by many of the respondents?
- interrelatedness: Was the theme connected to other categories or themes?
- theoretical implications: Was there theoretical support for the findings?
- allowance of maximum variation: Did the theme encompass positive and negative cases?

#### *Reflections on Data Analysis*

Given the large volume of raw data, I chose to initially analyze them separately based on their source. Once all the data were analyzed, I went back and manually searched for

connections between the sources. If I were to re-analyze them, I would also code the data from field notes, documents and observations using Atlas.ti. These codes would include a tag denoting the source of the data, which would alleviate concerns that the interview data would overshadow the other sources of data. If all the data had been analyzed in the same manner and using the same system, it was likely the connections and patterns would have been easier to identify. Additionally, illustrative quotations and examples would have been easier to retrieve if all the raw data were linked to Atlas.ti.

Following the analysis it was apparent that some sources of data were more relevant, revealing, and helpful than others for particular research questions. In-depth interviews were particularly valuable for gaining insights into meanings (RQ1), organizational practices (RQ2), and explanations for the gaps between meanings and practices (RQ3). Data from news releases, operating budgets, and observational notes were helpful in understanding how gender equity was implemented (RQ2). Other sources, like the mission statement and policy documents, provided limited knowledge of meanings (RQ1), but nonetheless were revealing in what was missing or not included. Although the analytical and general field notes were somewhat insightful in providing some explanations for the gaps between meanings and practices (RQ3), they were particularly useful in documenting the creative and ever-changing data analysis process and my role as a researcher. This was important because the qualitative researcher should strive to be reflective and recognize the circumstances under which knowledge is created (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2000). As Alvesson and Sköldbberg (2000) argued, data collection and analysis “does not take place in neutral, apolitical, or ideological-free space” (p. 9). In qualitative research, the researcher is the instrument when she enters the lives of participants to collect and analyze data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999), and the researcher’s personal life and experience are part of the research process because they influence how the data are interpreted (Reinharz, 1992). The last section of this chapter is a discussion of ethical issues in the research process, including my role in the production of knowledge.

### ***Trustworthiness***

Trustworthiness refers to the soundness of qualitative research, which can be judged on four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Credibility is concerned that “the reconstructions that have been arrived at via

the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 296). I established credibility by spending over two years in the natural setting, by clarifying and comparing the findings from different sources, by listening to a diversity of viewpoints, and by checking my interpretations during the interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Transferability refers to the extent to which the readers of this study can apply the findings to other subjects or sites. In qualitative research, the responsibility of the researcher is to provide “sufficient descriptive data to make such similar judgments elsewhere” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 298). I addressed this criterion by including thick descriptions of the historical, political, social, and economic context of the department and the institutional conditions of the four sport programs so readers can decide if the findings are applicable to other similar situations.

The third criterion, dependability, deals with the consistency and quality of the research process so that “the findings of an inquiry [could] be repeated if the inquiry were replicated with the same subjects in the same context” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290). Keeping detailed methodological notes that included my rationale for making decisions ensured that others could judge the quality of the research process and could replicate the steps taken to conduct the same study with similar subjects in a similar site.

Confirmability emphasizes the importance that the “findings are grounded in the data [and] that the inferences based on the data are logical” (p. 323). In particular, this criterion is concerned with the role and impact of the researcher in interpreting the results. I relied on multiple sources of data to crystallize the findings. I kept numerous analytical and general field notes of my assumptions and ongoing interpretations. As well, I periodically went back to the raw data (i.e., the transcripts, observational notes, documents) to check that my interpretations reflected the data.

## ***Ethical Issues***

### *Consent*

Before collecting the data, I obtained ethical approval from the Research Ethics Board (a pseudonym) (see appendix L). Next, I met with the athletic director to secure agency consent, which formalized my entry into the organization and validated my access to the department, its members, and sporting events (Stake, 2000). Initial communication with

the administrators and coaches was done by telephone and with the athletes via email. Following this initial contact, the consent form, letter of introduction, and interview questions were then faxed or emailed to the participants (see appendix M for a copy of the letter of introduction and consent form). Prior to each interview, I went through the ethical consent form to ensure that each participant understood his or her participation was voluntary and that he or she could withdraw from the study at any time. I also emphasized their responses were confidential and their identities and that of the university and athletic department would be kept anonymous.

### *Gaining Trust*

Gaining trust and establishing rapport with respondents contributes to successful and meaningful interviews (Fontana & Frey, 2000). Developing trust was also important because respondents can have concerns about their organization affiliation, especially if they were critical of it in any way. Assurances of anonymity and confidentiality contributed to the development of trust. Participants were told that their names, along with the names of the university and the athletic department, would not be used in any papers, publications or presentations resulting from this study. Instead, participants were identified in two ways. Sometimes I mentioned them by their gender, position, or sport (e.g., male athletic director, or female basketball player). In other situations, I referred to them by an identifier label that signified their gender, job title, or sport (e.g., B1 = the first female basketball player I interviewed) (see table 4). With respect to confidentiality, I conducted all the interviews and transcribed each interview myself. The tapes and transcripts were not shared with other individuals and are kept in a locked office. I also established some level of trust with the interviewees by providing a brief introduction of myself and an explanation of how my previous involvement in university athletics and my master's work contributed to my interest in gender equity and organizational values as research topics (Wolf, 1996).

Table 4.

*List of Identifier Labels for the Respondents*

Respondents' labels	Description	Total
B1 – B3	female basketball players	3
H1 – H3	female hockey players	3
R1 – R2	female rugby players	2
S1 – S2	female swimmers	2
<b>Total female athletes</b>		<b>10</b>
B4 – B5	male basketball players	2
H4 – H5	male hockey players	2
R3	male rugby player	1
S3 – S4	male swimmers	2
<b>Total male athletes</b>		<b>7</b>
<b>Total athletes</b>		<b>17</b>
B6	female basketball coach	1
<b>Total female coaches</b>		<b>1</b>
B7	male basketball coach	1
H6 – H7	male hockey coaches	2
R4	male rugby coach	1
S5	male swimming coach	1
<b>Total male coaches</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>Total coaches</b>		<b>6</b>
A1	intercollegiate coordinator	1
A2	development officer	1
A3	communications coordinator	1
<b>Total female administrators</b>		<b>3</b>
A4	event mgmt & promotions officer	1
A5	athletic director	1
<b>Total male administrators</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Total administrators</b>		<b>5</b>
<b>Total women</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>Total men</b>		<b>14</b>
<b>Total respondents</b>		<b>28</b>

Providing the respondents with the interview questions beforehand was an effective strategy to make many of them more relaxed for the interview (methodological notes, 2000, 2001). This strategy addressed their apprehension about the focus and content of the interview or their anxiety about being unprepared to respond to the questions. Some individuals came to the interview with prepared notes. Others mentioned they had not thought about the topic until they read the interview questions, which suggested that this

strategy prompted some of them to reflect on gender equity before the interview (methodological notes, 2001). One drawback was that it was difficult to guide some interviews because a few respondents responded to questions before I had asked them, as they were already aware of them (methodological notes, October 2000).

### *My Identity*

An important aspect of reflective research was acknowledging that my identity, emotions, and feelings shaped my interpretations of the data (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000; Fine, Weis, Wesen, & Wong, 2000; Richardson, 2000; Wolf, 1996). Fine et al. (2000) criticized researchers who 'simply insert themselves into the text' by providing limited biographical information believing that adequately demonstrated an open and reflective approach to research. In response to their criticism, I address my identity and experiences throughout subsequent chapters, in addition to describing and analyzing how I saw myself and how others reacted to me.

The most salient facets of my identity in this study were that I am a woman, a graduate student, a former participant in the Canadian university athletic system, and a researcher drawing upon a post-structuralist feminist perspective. As a woman, I presumed I would easily connect with the female participants and would readily understand and appreciate their views. Additionally, I expected women to confide in me and men to be cautious around me. In some instances that did happen: I related to women who described experiences of being less privileged than many men. Nonetheless, I was caught off guard by alternative and non-stereotypical views that sometimes matched my own views being expressed by some men, and by the rationalizations used by some women to justify and normalize gender inequities. Contrary to my expectations, some women were reserved and cautious about discussing gender equity, while some men talked about it in an open and frank manner.

During the interviews, I did not label myself as a feminist. I expected that if I had done so respondents would have been reluctant to discuss gender equity. Participants in sport have often been characterized as conservative in their thinking and resistant to alternative views such as those espoused by feminists (Hall, 1996). I stand by that decision especially considering that a few of the women I interviewed revealed that they were reluctant to identify themselves as feminists. My feminist perspective of course played a role in the analysis. A post-structuralist feminist perspective that requires sensitivity to gender

relations and gendered understandings without assuming all women or all men shared the same experiences or understandings of gender equity underpins my interpretations of the findings (Alvesson & Billing, 1997). Additionally, my interpretations were based on challenging taken for granted meanings and practices, as well as my initial assumptions.

I introduced myself as a graduate student with the expectation participants would see me as less threatening than a tenured professor. By emphasizing my student status, some athletes seemed to open up with me as a peer (observational notes, 2000, 2001). I purposely introduced myself as a former participant in the university athletic system in order to establish credibility and create a sense of shared lived experience with some participants (Neuman, 2000). At times I drew upon my own experiences as an additional perspective to interpret the data and develop conclusions. With some respondents, my experience and awareness of university athletics worked to my disadvantage as they assumed I was aware of specific details of their sport involvement. For example, some ice hockey players gave few details about their practice schedules assuming I was aware of their time commitments. My experiences were limited to the sport of basketball, and therefore I had limited knowledge of what it was like to be a swimmer, ice hockey player, or rugby player.

### *Representation*

Consideration of my identity is especially important in post-structuralist feminist research where the aim is to listen to multiple voices (Ristock & Pennell, 1996). Underlying the analysis of these data was the issue of representation in the final analysis, particularly who was heard and who was left out or silenced in the findings. Representation is a frequent and important topic of discussion in the qualitative research area, particularly with feminist researchers (cf. Fine & Weis, 1996; Fine et al., 2000; Gergen & Gergen, 2000; Millen, 1997; Opie, 1992; Reinharz, 1992).

One aspect of representation is ensuring that the researcher's transcriptions of the data match that of the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A common method to accomplish this is to have respondents review the transcripts or the data analysis. I did not choose to follow this practice as I felt most interviewees would not have the time nor be interested in undertaking such a tedious task. However, I did check my interpretations by periodically asking them during the interviews if my understandings reflected what they intended to say and by repeating or rephrasing what they said in the interviews. I also



encouraged them to contact me if there was anything they wanted to add, clarify or delete from the interviews.

One area of particular concern is when there are differences between the researcher's and respondents' understandings of a situation (Fine & Weis, 1996; Millen, 1997). In her study of female academics, Millen (1997) interpreted comments from female participants as obvious examples of gendering, discrimination, and hegemonic relationships, while they did not characterize them as such. I found some participants accepted inequities in organizational practices, such as inadequate facility access, as natural or as being 'just the way things were,' whereas I labeled them as examples of gender inequities that needed to be challenged through deconstruction. I paid closer attention to the possible reasons why we would have different understandings, recognized that a single, shared interpretation was unnecessary and undesirable, and acknowledged that the findings were based on my interpretations of the data (Opie, 1992). Participants maintain their interpretations of experiences independent from the ones ascribed to it by the researcher (Millen, 1997). Essentially then, I analyzed my interpretation of the interviews and it is the one that is presented here.

Interwoven with the issue of representation was a concern for multiplicity. Even though the resonance of qualitative research stems from the inclusion of quotations from many respondents, thus allowing the reader to 'hear' their understandings about the research topic, it was neither possible, nor desirable, to represent all voices equally (Fine et al., 2000; Nilges, 2001; Ristock & Pennell, 1996). In their work on poverty, Fine and Weis (1996) noted they often looked for the unusual, exciting, and shocking stories or quotations, while Opie (1992) selected quotations that highlighted contradictions because they "challenge the notion of rationality" (p. 60). I looked for and included quotations with 'punch' such as those describing inequities, those from individuals with influence, as their understandings impact decisions and practices, or those that included clearly articulated ideas. Following the precedent set by feminist researchers who emphasize the voices of those who have been historically marginalized (Fine et al., 2000), I did, to some extent, emphasize the voices of women over men and the voices of athletes over administrators and coaches, especially in situations of contradictory evidence. So while I paid attention to all voices, some were more prominent than others in the written document.

### *Interviewees' Roles*

Issues of power between the researcher and the researched are not often discussed when publishing or presenting findings (Ristock & Pennell, 1996). When it is acknowledged it is usually from the perspective of the researcher who controls the formulation of the research questions, the research methods, and the analysis of data, with limited or no involvement from the participants (Frisby, Reid, Millar, & Hoeber, in press). Discussions about power relationships must also acknowledge that in some situations the researched can and do exert power (Ristock & Pennell, 1996). In this study, interviewees exercised power through their referrals, refusals and hesitations to participate and through gatekeeping. In setting up the interviews, a few administrators and coaches expressed they were not 'the right person' to speak to and referred me to an administrator they identified as the 'gender equity expert' (methodological notes, February & March 2000). While they might have believed I was only interested in the expert viewpoint, in fact I was interested in a diversity of interpretations. The combination of the participants' rights to refuse to participate and to drop out and my reliance on referrals meant that setting up interviews took much longer than I expected. In response to this setback, I decided to give all athletes a small honorarium as an incentive for participating. Since I interviewed coaches and administrators in their roles as paid employees of the athletic department, providing athletes with an honorarium legitimized their role as representatives of the department as well.

Some participants acted as gatekeepers who controlled and limited my access to sources of information (Neuman, 2000). In one situation, I asked a head coach to refer me to athletes I could contact to participate. After numerous unanswered requests, I called the assistant coach and asked for names of athletes, but he did not get back to me (methodological notes, April 2001). Although most coaches were helpful and readily provided names, in this situation the coaches indicated that they were protecting their athletes from unnecessary distractions.<sup>xv</sup> Another explanation could be that my research topic was not valued enough by the coaches to involve their athletes. Gatekeeping also occurred when I asked an upper administrator for a copy of the department's current operating budget. After over two weeks and numerous requests, I was eventually given a copy of their budget for the 1998-1999 season (methodological notes, April 2000). I had also requested a copy of the operating budget for the 1999-2000 season. In addition, the 'salaries and benefits' budget line was omitted from my copy. The administrator said that the salary

figures were deleted to maintain privacy, which was ironic given that the university published an annual financial report that stated the salaries of all LCU employees, including coaches and department administrators, who earned more than \$50,000 (LCU, 1999, 2000b; observational notes, May 2000).<sup>xvi</sup> I subsequently asked again for the budgets for the three seasons of interest for this study, hoping to get a complete copy of the first budget statement I obtained. It took a couple of weeks to receive the documents, which included the budgets for the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 seasons, but I did not receive another copy of the budget for the 1998-1999 season (methodological notes, October 2001). As a public institution, the public can access financial statements from universities and their departments. Despite this, it was possible some administrators were hesitant to let the information out because they were afraid of criticism of their budgeting process. While many discussions of power centre on the researcher's location and position in the research process, these examples illustrate situations where the researched exercised power as well (Wolf, 1996).

### ***Summary of the Research Project***

This study was based on case studies of four sport programs in one Canadian athletic department. I collected data about gender equity from four sources: field notes, documents including policy statements, news releases, mission statement, and operating budgets; observations of competitions and practice sessions; and interviews with administrators, coaches, and athletes. Data analysis consisted of coding, categorizing, and content analysis, along with deconstruction to reveal silences and hidden meanings. Ethical issues included obtaining consent, establishing confidentiality and anonymity, ensuring trustworthiness of the research, and acknowledging my identity and role in the research process. In the following chapters I described the historical, political, social and economic contexts of the athletic department and the structure and institutional conditions of the selected sport programs, which provided some grounding for the analysis of findings related to the research questions.

---

<sup>i</sup> LCU (Large Canadian University) is the pseudonym for the university in which the case studies were situated.

<sup>ii</sup> Detailed descriptions of the institutional conditions of the four sport programs are provided in chapter 4.

<sup>iii</sup> While these teams operated in an integrated manner for training purposes, officially male and female participants competed on separate teams and events. For example, male and female swimmers competed in

---

separate gendered events (e.g., men's 100m butterfly, women's 4x100m relay) and vied for separate gendered titles, awards, and championships.

<sup>iv</sup> Other common designations for major and minor sports were: i) gate and non-gate sports, referring to the ability of teams to generate revenue from gate receipts; ii) revenue generating and non-revenue generating sports; and iii) big and small sports, referring to the level of resource support from the athletic department.

<sup>v</sup> See table 5 in chapter 4 for the department's designation of sports.

<sup>vi</sup> The distinction of major and minor sports also reflected regional interest in certain sports. For example, volleyball has a significant following in Western Canada, but little following in Eastern Canada. Men's and women's basketball, men's ice hockey, and men's football were commonly considered major sports in universities across Canada.

<sup>vii</sup> These codes refer to the identifier labels that I assigned to the respondents. See table 4 of this chapter for further information.

<sup>viii</sup> The swim meet ran in an integrated manner with events for male and female swimmers alternating throughout the meet.

<sup>ix</sup> Men and women were included in each of the three stakeholder groups so as not to perpetuate assumptions that gender equity was primarily a concern for women or that the views of males in upper management positions represented others in the organization. I interviewed only one female coach, but this was a function of the current gender structure among coaches in the department. When I started collecting data in 1999, there were 21 head coaches in the athletic department and only 5 of them were women. Of those five women head coaches, only two were associated with the four case study sport programs and one of them resigned before I contacted her to be a participant in my study.

<sup>x</sup> The coach of the men's rugby program did not respond to my requests for information. Despite repeated requests and reminders the one male rugby player I did interview did not provide me with names of other male rugby players. The president of the athletic council could not help me because there were no male rugby players on the council. In hindsight, I could have approached the entire team after practice and asked for volunteers, but at the time I had not considered that as an option.

<sup>xi</sup> It was not possible to provide a gender breakdown for the swim program because, unlike the three other sport programs, the athletic department did not provide a separate operating budget for the two swim teams.

<sup>xii</sup> For example, the first story of a news release could be entirely devoted to the men's basketball team, while the lead story of another news release could focus on both the men's and women's basketball teams.

<sup>xiii</sup> The terms 'first-order code' and 'second-order code' are derived from Labianca, Gray and Brass's (2000) analytical concepts of 'first-order themes' and 'second-order concepts'.

<sup>xiv</sup> When the raw data text serves as an appropriate name for the code this is also referred to as *in vivo* codes (Atlas.ti, 1997).

<sup>xv</sup> I relied on another source, the president of the student athletic council, to obtain names of athletes from that particular sport (methodological notes, April 2001).

<sup>xvi</sup> Some of the coaches or administrators did not make more than \$50,000 per year in salary. Therefore, I was not able to fill in all the deleted information.

## 4

### Situating the Four Sport Programs

In this chapter, I situated the athletic department at LCU within its larger setting and describe the institutional conditions of the four selected sport programs, as it was important to understand the impact of broader contexts on the local production of discourses. Theberge (2000a) argued, “the gendering of sport occurs within particular historical contexts and institutional conditions” (p. 331). Post-structuralists often focus on the impact of historical and social contexts on the production of knowledge (cf. Scott, 1990; Weedon, 1997). While understandings of gender equity are shaped by these contexts, I argue that one must also consider the impact of others like the economic and political contexts. To illustrate, the meanings and practices associated with gender equity can shift with changes in legislation or decisions to cut back financial resources to athletic departments. Therefore, I focused on the historical, political, social, and economic contexts of the CIAU and the athletic department. Because analysis within the collective case study requires detailed descriptions of each case and discussions of themes within each case (Stake, 2000), I provided a description of the institutional conditions of the sport programs to situate the findings.

My knowledge and appreciation of these contexts were based on a review of literature on Canadian university athletic departments (cf. Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, 1995b, 1996; Danylchuk & Chelladurai, 1999; Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Hill, 1996; Hill & Kikulis, 1999; Hums et al., 1994; Inglis, 1988, 1991; Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 1996, 2000; Matthews, 1974; Moriarty & Holman-Prpich, 1987; Schneider, 1997; Taylor, 1986). My knowledge of the structure and institutional conditions was gleaned from departmental communications and publications, campus newspaper articles, university reports, as well as data collected specifically for this study, including interview transcripts, observational notes, and documents.

## **The CIAU**

### *Historical Context*

The early development of university athletics in Canada occurred between 1906 and 1919 and was primarily focused on the establishment of playing rules and regulations (CIS, n.d.; Moriarty & Holman-Prpich, 1987). However, some sport-specific, university orientated organizations such as the Canadian Intercollegiate Rugby Union and the Canadian Intercollegiate Hockey Union were established prior to that time (Matthews, 1974). All of these organizations were located in central Canada and mainly served the interests of male athletes.

The modern CIAU was established in 1961 and included universities from across Canada. In 1969, a separate administrative body for women's university athletics was created – the Canadian Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CWIAU) (Keyes, 1974; Matthews, 1974). It was formed to establish and organize national championships for women's university sports and to promote and support female athletes, because “women's sport in Canadian universities was neither being encouraged, developed nor supported” (Keyes, 1974, p. 22).

In 1978, the CWIAU and CIAU amalgamated to streamline funding requests to the federal government and to more efficiently manage university athletics (CIS, n.d.; Hums et al., 1994). Following the merger, opportunities for women as athletes increased, but opportunities for them as administrators and coaches did not increase to the same extent (Inglis, 1988; Pomfret, 1986). The CIAU undertook a number of actions to rectify this situation including adopting policies to ensure equal gender representation in voting and establishing apprentice programs for women in administration and coaching (Inglis, 1988). In 1999, the CIAU published results from a study on the numbers of male and female coaches and administrators in Canadian universities (CIAU, 1999). For the 1998-1999 season, it was reported that there were 107 female head coaches (full-time and part-time) compared with 434 male head coaches (full-time and part-time) for a ratio of approximately one woman for every four men in these positions (CIAU, 1999). In comparison, within the department studied, the ratio was approximately 1 female head coach for every 11 male coaches. Even though there was an increase in the number of female athletic directors, from 6 to 11, the increase was greater for male athletic directors, from 22 to 32 (CIAU, 1999). Although opportunities for women at the participant, coaching, and administrative levels in

the CIAU have increased over time, the opportunities for men also continued to increase at similar rates.

The period between the late 1970s to the late 1990s saw the expansion of the CIAU's national championship roster. Championships in track and field and soccer were added for men, while national championships for women were added in track and field, cross-country running, soccer, ice hockey, rugby, and wrestling, with the last three being the most recent additions (CIS, n.d.; Inglis, 1988; Pomfret, 1986). At the time of data collection there were 10 national championships for women (basketball, cross-country running, field hockey, ice hockey, rugby, soccer, swimming, track and field, volleyball, wrestling) and 9 for men (basketball, cross-country running, football, ice hockey, soccer, swimming, track and field, volleyball, wrestling) (CIS, 2002a).

### *Economic Context*

In the 1970s, debates over governance models of athletic departments in Canada were closely tied to funding issues (Matthews, 1974; Schneider, 1997; Taylor, 1986). Some administrators believed athletics should remain under the control of an academic department to ensure access to funds from university operating budgets, while others argued they should operate separately to increase their autonomy and ease the financial burden on universities (Schneider, 1997). Many departments have followed the latter route and established themselves as ancillary, autonomous units (Schneider, 1997). In response to their status as self-sufficient units on campuses, administrators looked for alternative sources of operating funds or made difficult decisions about financial cutbacks (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995b; Schneider, 1997).

To meet athletes' demands for expanded programming, especially for women, the search for new sources of funds became even more of a priority (Mohr, 1986). Athletic departments now devote much of their time marketing their programs to sponsors and fans, encouraging alumni, corporations and community members to contribute to fundraising efforts, and lobbying for increases in athletic fees, all of which are significant sources of revenue (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, 1995b; Schneider, 1997). Fundraising has become a major concern not only for departments as a whole, but also for individual teams as they are encouraged to assume responsibility for raising money to cover operating costs (Author A & Author B, 1997). Some teams, primarily men's teams, are able to rely on financial assistance from their alumni and corporate sponsors to support their fundraising efforts. Newly

created teams, such as women's ice hockey, experience more difficulties because their alumni cannot yet be well established. Additionally, Canadian departments devote more promotions and marketing to men's sports, in particular football, basketball, and ice hockey, in part because of the belief that their investments are recouped in terms of greater interest from fans, the media, and corporate sponsors (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). A counter-argument was that more marketing should be directed to women's sports to raise their profile and advance their revenue generating potential instead of promoting the already popular sports (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001).

### ***The Athletic Department***

The athletic department was situated in a large Canadian university with a student population<sup>i</sup> of approximately 35,000 where female students accounted for 56.9% of it (Author C, 2001<sup>ii</sup>). They provided opportunities for over 500 students to participate on 30 competitive university teams (16 teams for men, 14 teams for women) in 16 different sports. The majority of the teams competed in the CIAU, while others competed against local community teams or university teams from the United States. Approximately 40% of athletes were female and 60% were male, which was not representative of the female-male ratio in the entire student body, but was similar to the situation at many other Canadian athletic departments where men outnumbered women (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). In total there were 297 athletes from LCU registered in CIAU sports: 161 male athletes (54%) and 136 female athletes (46%) (CIS, 2002b). The remaining athletes participated in non-CIAU sports or as non-registered members of the CIAU.<sup>iii</sup> The greater number of men could be partially attributed to the fact that there were two more sports for men, with men's football and baseball having particularly large rosters and no female team counterpart.

The athletic department at LCU operated under the guidance of the male athletic director who answered directly to the vice-president of students (Author C, n.d.). He was responsible for four areas: university athletics, campus recreation, fitness programs, and community sports. There were 14 administrators (7 men, 7 women) and 22 head coaches (20 men, 2 women) involved with the university athletics area (Athletic Department, 2000-2001).<sup>iv</sup> Although the focus of this study was on gender equity for athletes, the gender balance of administrators and coaches was noteworthy. One female administrator (A3) indicated one of the athletic director's priorities was to ensure a gender balance among his



four assistant directors, which at the time of data collection consisted of two male and two female assistant directors. Additionally, an unofficial mandate of the department was to illustrate equitable gender representation with respect to the top two administrative positions with university athletics (athletic director and intercollegiate coordinator). At the time of the data collection, a man occupied the athletic director position and a woman was the intercollegiate coordinator. The decision to maintain this gender balance was based on a CIAU bylaw that stated each member university must send two delegates to CIAU meetings, with one representative being male and the other one female (CIAU, 1998). This situation suggested that gender was a consideration in hiring upper administrators. However, gender did not appear to be a factor in the hiring of coaches. Of the 14 teams for women, 12 were coached by men, and in the entire department only 2 head coaches out of 22 were women.

Prior to the start of the data collection, I met with the female intercollegiate coordinator to discuss the current context of the organization. One significant aspect was the philosophy of broad-based programming, which was evidenced by the large number of teams (30) they supported as compared to other Canadian universities in their region. The department also focused on being competitive and was proud of the 49 national championships won by their competitive teams since the inception of LCU in 1915. Despite the broad-based programming philosophy, the athletic director indicated they did not have the resources to support each of the 30 competitive university teams at the same level. Instead, as mentioned in chapter 3, teams were classified as either major or minor sports based on their revenue generating potential and level of competition. These classifications determined the level of funding, promotion, coaching staff, and other resources with major sports having full-time coaches, adequate equipment, a competitive schedule, and so forth (personal communication, October 1999). In comparison, minor sports were not guaranteed full-time coaches, regular promotion, or substantial operating budgets. Categorization of the sport programs on major-minor status is indicated in the following table.

Table 5.

*Description of Sports by Gender and Major-Minor Designation*

Women	Sport and designation	Men
x	alpine skiing (minor)	x
	baseball (minor)	x
x	basketball (major)	x
x	cross country (minor)	x
x	field hockey (minor)	x
	football (major)	x
x	golf (minor)	x
x	ice hockey (major for men; minor for women)	x
x	nordic skiing (minor)	x
x	rowing (minor)	x
x	rugby (minor)	x
x	soccer (minor)	x
x	swimming (minor)	x
x	track (minor)	x
x	ultimate (minor)	x
x	volleyball (major)	x
<b>TOTAL: 14</b>		<b>TOTAL: 16</b>

*Historical Context*

Opportunities for male and female athletes to be involved in competitive sports existed since the inception of the university (Athletic Department, 2000-2001). Male athletes participated on football, basketball, ice hockey or rugby teams, while women participated in basketball, field hockey, swimming, and ice hockey.

Segregation of men's and women's teams was evident at LCU for some time. Both male and female athletes used one gymnasium, built in 1929, until the current gymnasium was opened in 1951. This facility was built expressly for men's sports, and as a result, the administration of women's sports and competitions and practices for women's teams continued to be housed in the old gymnasium until 1970 when it was demolished (Author D, 2001). At that time, men's and women's sports were brought back into the same facility again. Administratively, men's and women's athletics were run separately, with a men's athletic director in control of men's sports and a women's athletic director in charge of women's sports, a practice that continued until the mid-1980s (Author E, 2001).

### *Political Context*

Regional and national athletic conferences as well as the university have significant influence on the production of meanings and practices of gender equity because of their rule making status and authority (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a; Inglis, 1991). For example, in order to maintain membership in those organizations, these departments should demonstrate congruency between their values, behaviours and philosophies and those of the conferences (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a).

As a member of a regional and a national conference, the department was responsible for following policies, objectives and codes of ethics outlined in relevant operations manuals. While gender equity was not explicitly identified in the mission or the constitutional objectives of the CIAU, a commitment to equity and equality, more broadly, was mentioned (see appendix F). Policy statements regarding gender equity, especially for athletes, were few in numbers and lacked detail and definition (see appendix F). For example, as a condition of membership, the CIAU required each athletic department to offer "CIAU competition in one or more sports for men and one or more sports for women" (CIAU, 1998, p. OM/1). At a minimum, a department was obligated to provide opportunities for women and men to compete nationally in only one sport each, so hypothetically they could support 10 teams for men and only 1 for women and still comply with CIAU regulations. In addition, the CIAU supported an Equity and Equality Committee who addressed systemic and structural barriers to participation and education (CIAU, 1998; Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). This committee developed a list of 13 equity goals, three of which directly pertained to athletes (CIAU, 1998; see appendix F). These goals focused on increasing the marketability, profile, and allocation of resources to women's sports, ensuring equitable portrayal of male and female athletes in promotions and communications, and encouraging a safe and welcoming competitive environment for women (CIAU, 1998). While these goals were beneficial for identifying areas requiring attention, the operations manual did not outline any formal mechanisms to guide the implementation or evaluation of those goals.

The wording of gender equity objectives and policies was equally vague and minimal at the Regional Conference level. Gender equity was identified in their operations manual as the last of 12 constitutional objectives: "To ensure gender equity and equality of opportunity through progressive action, program development and delivery and [Regional Conference]

organizational and decision making structure” (Regional Conference, 1999, p. 2 - constitution).<sup>y</sup> In this statement, gender equity was not defined; however, it was related to programming and the formal organizational structure. It was unclear what ‘progressive action’ entailed and the process for implementing and monitoring gender equity was not identified. In the rest of the operations manual gender equity was only linked to programming opportunities (see appendix F). There were no policies with respect to resource distribution, promotions and publicity, or access to facilities.

Gender equity in programming was expressly identified as one condition of conference membership and participation in a new sport (Regional Conference, 1999). To qualify as a member of this conference, a university must provide opportunities for athletes to participate in at least two CIAU sports for men and at least two CIAU sports for women and that they “should attempt to operate with gender equity” (Regional Conference, 1999, p. 1 - bylaws). There was no further elaboration as to what ‘operating with gender equity’ meant or how that should be implemented in organizational practices. Additionally, the phrase ‘should attempt’ permitted leeway for universities to appear committed to gender equity, but not actually implement it. Departments that wished to participate in a new sport were required to provide “evidence of a commitment to gender equity” (Regional Conference, 1999, p. 2 - bylaws). Again, there was no indication of what evidence was needed to demonstrate this commitment. Without explicit guidelines, definitions, and directions, administrators were free to decide how to interpret this clause, which in turn could result in a lack of consistency in practices.

With the exception of a policy outlining the department’s strategy for achieving gender equity in scholarship allocation (see appendix A), they did not have any other formal policies pertaining to it. When asked about departmental policies, the athletic director indicated they followed LCU policies. LCU had formal policies regarding equity and hiring and the harassment and discrimination of students and university employees (see appendix F). As indicated in the harassment and discrimination policy, the university was committed to guaranteeing students’ right to work and study free from harassment and discrimination (LCU, 2000a). There were no policies that addressed students’ rights to play and compete in extra-curricular, competitive, or recreational activities like university athletics. As well, sport and recreation were not specifically mentioned in any of their policies or guidelines (see appendix F).

Hoffman (1995) noted that the pursuit of gender equity in sport organizations in Canada can be attributed to social obligations as opposed to legal requirements. For Canadian universities, there was no federal government policy like Title IX in the United States to ensure compliance. Title IX is thought to be effective because it is tied to federal government funding, whereas in Canada universities receive money directly from provincial rather than federal government (Inglis, 1988). Although the CIAU does receive some funding from Sport Canada (a unit of federal government) that does have a Women in Sport policy, Sport Canada does not enforce that policy and therefore it has had little influence on ensuring gender equity (Bell-Altenstad & Vail, 1995; Hall, 1996). Because policies from national and regional conferences, universities, and the federal government are ill-defined and not enforced, Canadian athletic departments are not penalized if their practices do not reflect a commitment to gender equity or if their practices deviate from the accepted norms.

#### *Social Context*

Allocation of funds and other resources to sports was partially tied to spectator and media interest. As mentioned in the previous chapter, teams were informally categorized as either major or minor sports. Because of the significance that fan and media interest play in the determination of the revenue generating potential, it was important to understand and acknowledge their level of interest in the teams.

An indication of the level of interest in women's sports was that one of the campus newspapers published an annual special issue devoted to them. While it was admirable that an entire issue focused on the accomplishments of and issues related to female athletes, it also reinforced the fact that regular attention was not devoted to them and they required 'special' circumstances to gain attention from the public. Interestingly, the editor of that particular paper commented that gender equity was not a problem, because of the high numbers of women athletes who were "participating alongside men" at LCU (Author F, 2000, p.12). In stark contrast, in a different campus newspaper, it was noted that despite the successes of many women's competitive university teams, their achievements and presence were "under-recognised and under-supported" (Author E, 2001, p. 12). These articles beg the question, if women were on an equal playing field with men, why devote a special edition to highlight their achievements?

The lack of recognition of the accomplishments of female athletes was confounded by an apathetic attitude toward university athletics in Canada and in this community

(Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Dryden, 1997, Author E, 2001). Two female athletes (B2 & H2) suggested that local and national media coverage was greater for men's than women's university sports. According to one of them (H2), The Sports Network (TSN), a Canadian specialty television channel devoted to sport, televised the playoff and final games for the men's national CIAU basketball and ice hockey championships. In comparison, only the final championship games for women's ice hockey and basketball were televised. At the local level, a female coach (B6) suggested, "the coverage in general is very poor", while a male athlete (B4) stated, "university athletics doesn't get a lot of media attention here anyways." Consequently, the male athletic director indicated that the local media's general lack of interest in university athletics made it difficult to lobby for more attention on women's sports. Despite this apathetic attitude, administrators still regarded many men's sports, such as football and basketball, as more likely than women's sports to garner adequate levels of fan attendance and in turn needed revenue.

#### *Economic Context*

The department has functioned as an ancillary unit since 1994, which required it to operate on a break-even basis (Author A & Author B, 1997; LCU, 2000a). As a result of the change in operational status, it focused much of its energies on financially-driven business practices, a point that was emphasized by the athletic director in a campus newspaper. He said, "It's very much a business now. ... We spend a lot of time trying to be marketable" (Author G, 1997, p. 5). The intercollegiate coordinator indicated that despite having to cover more of their operational expenses, the department was focused on maintaining current levels of financial support for their university teams. She stated:

Right now we're trying to maintain sports we have. We've had major budget implications with downloading heat, light, maintenance, sewers, facility costs, capital costs [and] it's wiped out our budgets. ... [but] we've tried to find ways to raise money and do what we do better. (female administrator A1)

The department derived its income from athletic fees paid by students, donations and sponsorship from alumni and community supporters, and revenue generated from gate receipts, sport camps, facility rentals, and recreation programs (Author G, 1997; Author H, 1998; Author I, n.d.).

For the 2000-2001 season, the entire annual budget for university athletics was \$2.6 million CDN with approximately 11% directed to combined sports, 16% to women's sports, and 35% to men's sports. The remainder of the funding (38%) covered support services (i.e.,

travel to national championships, purchasing equipment, training supplies) and administrative costs (e.g., communications, administration salaries) (see table 5). These percentages were similar for the 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 seasons, with men's sports receiving the largest portion of the budget and two times the financial resources allocated to women's sports (see table 6). Historically, men's sports have had larger budgets than women's sports (Matthews, 1974) and from this analysis of the budgets it was apparent that this trend has continued.<sup>vi</sup>

Table 6.

*Operating Budgets Figures for the Athletic Department over Three Seasons*

Season	Operating budgets			
	Total department <sup>a</sup>	Men's teams <sup>b</sup>	Women's teams <sup>c</sup>	Combined teams <sup>d</sup>
1998-1999 <sup>e</sup>	1,045,024	391,307 (37%)	198,067 (19%)	168,230 (16%)
1999-2000	2,502,792	908,111 (36%)	420,455 (17%)	306,484 (12%)
2000-2001	2,620,529	910,778 (35%)	420,255 (16%)	297,433 (11%)

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the entire budget.

<sup>a</sup> Total budget for the department included operating budgets for university teams, general administration, equipment, game management, national championships, promotions, training services, and communications.

<sup>b</sup> Men's sports included basketball, field hockey, football, golf, ice hockey, rugby, soccer, and volleyball.

<sup>c</sup> Women's sports included basketball, field hockey, golf, ice hockey, rugby, soccer, and volleyball.

<sup>d</sup> Combined sports included alpine skiing, cross-country running, nordic skiing, rowing, swimming, and track.

<sup>e</sup> The budget for the 1998-1999 season did not include coaching salaries and benefits.

*Summary of the Context of the CLAU and the Athletic Department*

The historical, political, social, and economic contexts surrounding the CLAU and the athletic department influenced the current situation regarding gender equity in the selected sport programs. While historically, there were relatively few opportunities for women to participate in Canadian university athletics, in recent years the number of playing opportunities has increased with the addition of rugby, ice hockey, and wrestling teams for women. Politically, departments were accountable to various stakeholders, including the university and athletic conferences; yet, these governing bodies had few explicit gender equity policies and there were no enforcement mechanisms. At the societal level, there was a general lack of interest in university athletics, and the media and spectators who did follow them focused on the accomplishments of male athletes. This disinterest in women's sports had economic consequences since the department operated as an ancillary unit and could

not rely on operational funding from LCU. As a result, administrators were primarily concerned with generating revenues and controlling costs, which meant they often put more money into men's teams who were assumed to be more profitable.

I now turn my attention to specific details regarding the structure and institutional conditions of the four case study sport programs, basketball, ice hockey, rugby and swimming.

### ***The Four Sport Programs***

Even though opportunities were offered to male and female athletes in each of the four selected sport programs, other institutional conditions, such as the level of access to facilities, extent of competitive schedules, and degree of administrative support, varied substantially. In this section, I describe the institutional conditions of each sport program including the history and significant accomplishments, roster sizes, coaching and support staff, facilities, schedules, resource support, interest from fans and media, promotions, and representation on the athletic council. I focus on these elements because they informed my understandings of the meanings and practices of gender equity and respondents frequently mentioned them. Additionally, these details provide information about the local setting in which those meanings and practices were produced. Even though some elements like promotions, scheduling, and resource allocation are organizational practices and are discussed further in subsequent chapters, it was necessary to introduce them here to situate other findings.

#### *Basketball Program*

##### *History and accomplishments.*

LCU's men's and women's basketball teams made their first appearance in 1915 (Athletic Department, 1992-1993). Since that time, the women's basketball program has won 1 world championship (in the 1930s), 4 national championships (all in the 1970s), and 10 regional conference championships (with the last being in 1994) (Athletic Department, 1999-2000; CIS, 2001b; observational notes, 2000<sup>vii</sup>). As well, members of the women's program have been honoured with 2 CIAU All-Canadian awards and 15 CIAU Academic All-Canadian awards (Athletic Department, 1999-2000).<sup>viii</sup> The men's basketball program has won 5 national championships (the last one in 1972) and 13 regional conference championships, most recently in 1996 (Athletic Department, 1999-2000; CIS, 2001b;



observational notes, 2000). Members of the men's program have been recognized with the following distinctions: 16 All-Canadians; 2 CIAU men's basketball player of the year award; 1 Academic all-Canadian; 3 CIAU men's basketball coach of the year; and 16 university male athlete of the year (Athletic Department, 1999-2000; CIS, 2001b).

#### *Roster sizes.*

Roster sizes for the two teams ranged from 10 to 18 players (Athletic Department, 2000a; Author J, 2000). For both men's and women's basketball, a maximum of 12 players could be listed on the line-up for regular season and championship games (CIAU, 1998; Regional Conference, 1999). However, the roster varied throughout a season because players became injured, were red-shirted (see footnote iii), were added part way through the season, or left the team. For example, during the 2000-2001 season the women's team carried less than 12 players because of injuries and players who left for personal or academic reasons.

#### *Staff.*

Since individual members of the coaching and support staff changed from year to year, comparisons of the staff were only for one season (1999-2000). The men's basketball program was coached by one full-time male head coach and four male assistant coaches and was supported by two trainers (one male, one female), two managers (one male, one female), and a male strength and conditioning coach, for a total of 10 staff members (Athletic Department, 1999-2000). The women's team was coached by one full-time female head coach and two assistant coaches (one male, one female) and was supported by a male trainer, two managers (one male, one female), and a female strength and conditioning coach for a total of six members, four fewer than the men's team.

For the 1999-2000 season, the male coach of the men's team was paid a salary of \$66,571, while his female counterpart was paid \$54,109 (LCU, 1999). This discrepancy can be explained by seniority, as the male coach had been at that university for 13 years, the female head coach for 4 years. Yet, the female intercollegiate coordinator (A1) mentioned that the "men's basketball [and] women's basketball coaches are paid the same salary range." There were two salary ranges for coaches at this university, an A level where the salaries ranged from \$31,032 to \$46,584 and a B level where the salaries ranged from \$41,388 to \$62,424 (LCU, 2002). Based on this information, the two coaches were paid in the same salary range, but the male coach's salary was higher than the university standard. I was not

able to compare their salaries to national figures because the upper range for the national data was set at \$50,000 and over.

Another area of comparison was the coaching salaries budgets, which included the salary for the head coach and honoraria for the assistant coaches. Other support staff member positions, like managers and trainers, were typically handled by athletes on a volunteer basis. Coaching salaries for the men's team remained around \$82,000 for the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 seasons. In comparison, the budget for the women's coaching staff during the same seasons was around \$68,000, roughly \$14,000 less (see table 7 for exact figures). One explanation for the difference was that the men's program employed two additional assistant coaches. Nevertheless, it was interesting that the overall coaching budget for the men's team remained the same over the two seasons even though a new male full-time head coach was hired for the 2000-2001 season.<sup>ix</sup> With his hiring, I had expected that the coaching salary budget for the men's team would have decreased to account for the lack of seniority, but that did not appear to be the situation.

#### *Facilities.*

Both basketball teams regularly practiced and competed in the main gymnasium, which seated approximately 4000 people and was located on campus (Athletic Department, 1992-1993; observational notes, February 2000). Banners signifying national and regional championships won by various university teams were displayed on the walls and from the rafters in this facility (observational notes, February 2000). Since the basketball teams shared this facility with the volleyball program, they occasionally practiced in a newer, but smaller gymnasium located in the student recreation facility.

The locker rooms for both teams were situated on the lower levels of the main gymnasium. When I interviewed the women's head coach, I asked her to compare the facilities available to the men's and women's basketball teams. She noted that while the men's team room was larger, more functional, and more secure, the women's team room was newer and in better condition. She said:

The men have a bigger room but it's old. Kind of grungy. We have a newer room. I think it's only been there ... maybe eight years or something like that. And it's decent. It's not ... your dream one. But it's okay yah. But ... because theirs is bigger they're able to have a tv, vcr in theirs. It can be locked up. We don't have space for that in ours. (female coach B6)

### *Schedules.*

Basketball season ran from late September, when tryouts were held, to late February or mid-March depending on how far the teams advanced in the post-season. Regular season competitions for the men's and women's teams were scheduled against the same opponents, on the same night, in the same gymnasium. The women's game started at 6:15 pm, followed by the men's game at 8:00 pm. Both teams practiced two hours a day, four to five times a week, with practice sessions running from 4:30 pm to 6:30 pm (the early session) or from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm (the late session). From my experience as a manager of a women's competitive university basketball team, the late session was the least desirable because it often meant I stayed at the university all day and did not arrive home until late in the evening. The two teams switched practice times during the week so that one team did not have the late practice time every night.

Comments from some respondents highlighted competing interpretations of the current situation with scheduling games. A male basketball player believed that the men's team was privileged because they had a 'better' schedule: "We get the good practice times and ... we get the late Friday night and Saturday night games. ... those are things the men's basketball team enjoys" (male athlete B4). His comments supported the historical privileges that some men's teams have received with respect to game and practices times (Sanger & Mathes, 1997; Vertinsky, 1992). In contrast, another male basketball player (B5) felt that despite different start times for games, the schedules were fair because both teams played against the same opponents on the same night in the same place. He, along with a few other members of the two basketball teams, indicated that both time slots have advantages and disadvantages. The women's basketball coach felt their 6:15 pm start time was closer to the ideal start time of 7:00 pm than was the men's start time of 8:00 pm and it meant they are finished earlier in the evening. Some members of the women's basketball team (B1 & B3) added they would rather have fans come early for the men's games and watch their game than have their team play the later game and have fans leave after the men's game.<sup>x</sup>

### *Resource support.*

Excluding the significant differences in budgets for the coaching staff, the operating budgets for the two basketball teams were comparable to each other and remained fairly consistent over three seasons (see table 7 for a breakdown of operating expenses for the men's and women's basketball teams). The extra money required for hiring a third official

for the men's games partially explained the slightly higher operating expenses for the men's team. Playing regulations from the Regional Conference (1999) dictated that three officials be hired for men's games, compared to two officials for women's games, thus institutionalizing a difference in operating costs between these teams. The hiring of a third official for the men's game implied that the action was more intense and the pace was faster, and therefore required the assistance of an additional body.

Table 7.

*Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons*

Season	Team	Operating expenses						
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	OE	Tel
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	men	n/a	51,575	n/a	45,520	n/a	4,700	1,355
	women	n/a	47,677	n/a	44,185	n/a	2,037	1,455
1999-2000	men	139,361	56,600	82,761	46,145	4,500	4,500	1,455
	women	121,327	53,077	68,250	46,547	4,500	575	1,455
2000-2001	men	133,430	51,269	82,161	41,638	3,900	4,150	1,581
	women	117,244	49,594	67,650	41,638	3,950	2,525	1,481

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget; SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> The operating budget was not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season as compared to the two other budget statements, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

Over and above the financial support from the department, the men's team generated additional support (e.g., finances, uniforms, and equipment) from external sources including community supporters, alumni, sponsors and family members. For the 2000-2001 season a prominent businessman endowed a significant amount of money to the men's team, which covered all players' tuition and provided for a scholarship to each player for a number of years (Author K, 2000a). Additionally, one of the male basketball players mentioned that their team has an organized alumni committee who raised funds through such events as hosting golf tournaments.

No members of the women's team I interviewed identified any significant endowments or alumni support for their team, but all of them were aware of the additional resource support available to the men's team. One of the female basketball players stated the men's team received significant support from family members who served food to the team and supporters following games:

They have this thing called the Sixth Man club. And at the end of every home game on Saturday night, they have all these people that [sic] bring food and make food. ... Athletics doesn't pay for it. I think the coach's wife and a bunch of the moms or other involved people used to make it. ... I mean we tried to get it going and it doesn't sort of work. (female athlete B1)

With respect to sponsorship, the men's team was sponsored by Nike and the women's team by adidas (observational notes, February 2000). These sponsors provided each team with merchandise including clothing and shoes. Specifically, a male basketball player (B5) noted that Nike provided each member of the men's team with "two pairs of shoes a year. And we get some clothes from them." From my observations I also noticed the Nike logo displayed prominently on the players' scrimmage tops, warm-up jackets, and uniforms and on the assistant coaches' bags, lapel pins, and clothing (observational notes, February 2000). According to members of the women's team (B1, B2, & B3), they received two pairs of shoes and socks from adidas and were also provided with bags, which were returned at the end of the season. Although both teams received some clothing and shoes, the common feeling among the female basketball players was that the men's team was better supported by Nike. The women's team did not receive "new uniforms and warm ups this year" (B2) from adidas, but the men's team did from Nike, along with additional t-shirts, practice gear and hats. Her comments reflected the taken for granted assumption that men's teams were more valuable commodities to sponsors and thus were better supported (Shaw & Amis, 1999).

### *Visibility.*

Upcoming games for the men's and women's basketball teams were regularly advertised on an outdoor billboard, sandwich boards, and posters across campus. Likewise, both teams were consistently mentioned in the department's news releases (see appendix H and chapter 6 for a comparison of the promotion for the two teams).

According to the female communications officer, up until the 1999-2000 season, the department published a multi-page program, which included team rosters, athlete profiles,

statistics, historical records, and advertising for each of the basketball teams. In my experience, the men's team was typically featured first, with the women's team included at the back of the program, implying they were less of a priority. Yet, the printed program for the 1999-2000 season provided equal coverage and promotion of the two teams. Both teams were prominently displayed on the front covers and were promoted on the same numbers of pages.

*Fan support.*

Attendance at basketball games was difficult to accurately measure because the number of people fluctuated throughout the evening. Nonetheless, it was readily apparent there were more people for the first half of the men's game than for the first half of the women's game. There were approximately 75 people in attendance for the opening tip-off of the women's game and by half time there were close to 200 people, including university students, older adults, and families with elementary-aged girls (observational notes, February 2000). There were around 300 people for the start of the men's game (observational notes, February 2000), which was lower than the estimate provided to me by one male basketball player, who suggested, "if we play [our rivals] on a weekend or something, we can get probably a thousand people. But usually I'd say it's probably around five or six hundred people that are out" (B4). At the men's game, the crowd included university students, adults, and elementary and high school-aged boys (observational notes, February 2000). As was the situation when I was involved in university athletics, the difference in attendance between the women's and men's games was attributed to the scheduling of game times and to the preferred level of physicality of the men's game. The women's game started at 6:15pm, which was an inconvenient time for some fans because it conflicted with traditional supper times and the end of the workday. One female athlete thought more fans attended the men's games because they were interested in witnessing their strength, jumping ability, and quickness - masculine traits that are deemed exciting and important in our society (Hargreaves, 1990). She said, "maybe people going to the games are more apt to go to a guy's game than a girl's game, just because ... they can dunk and they're really fast. It's totally a different game" (B3).

*Athletic council.*

Every university team was encouraged to appoint one or two representatives to sit on an athletic council, which primarily functioned to promote upcoming games on campus,

to further community relations, and to nominate athletes for players of the week. Although most athletes agreed that the council served as a place for them to interact in a social setting, there was some disagreement about whether it also served as a lobby group for athletes to raise concerns about issues like gender equity and to advocate for change. Administrators often point to these councils as examples of places where athletes can voice their opinions (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a, 1996), yet from my experience, these same administrators limit the power and influence of these councils, thus diminishing their capacity to be involved in strategic decision making. Generally, these councils end up being apolitical in nature.

For the 1999-2000 season, there were no representatives from either the women's or the men's basketball teams on the council. A member of the women's team explained that "because it's like extra meetings and extra time" (B2) no one wanted to take on that responsibility. However, two female basketball players I interviewed sat on the council for the following season.

*Summary of the basketball program.*

In general, most individuals who commented on the basketball program felt that the structure and institutional conditions were comparable for the two teams, with only minor differences in the scheduling of game times and resources available to male and female basketball players. While they interpreted them as minor differences, I saw them as collectively being symbolic of the value of men over women in this sport. Based on my previous experience in university athletics, I recognized that some of these 'minor' differences such as the scheduling of playing times continued to exist and there appeared to be little questioning of them. This sentiment was reflected in the following quotation from a member of the women's basketball team:

We always promote our stuff together because we always play [on the same night]. Our schedules [are] exactly the same. But otherwise like it's true ... the men's basketball team gets more money than the women's basketball team. They get Nike to sponsor them and we've got adidas. But other than that I think it's pretty, like pretty equal. We get the same gym times. Like it's not like they get the good gym every day of the week. And we're at [the student recreation facility] or something. It's not like that. It's pretty good from what I know. (female athlete B2)

As I discuss in more detail in the following chapters, even though the structure and conditions of the two teams appeared equitable, men's basketball was considered a better

draw for fans, media, and sponsors, which indicated that the historical and traditional privileges afforded to men's sports continued to exist (Kane, 1996; Shaw & Amis, 1999).

### *Ice Hockey Program*

#### *History and accomplishments.*

Men's ice hockey existed on campus as a club team from 1915 to 1960 and competed in local men's hockey leagues (Athletic Department, 1992-1993). Since 1960, when they were elevated to varsity status, they had won two regional conference championships (the last one in 1972), advanced to the national championships three times, and boasted seven CIAU All-Canadians (CIS, 2001b).

Prior to the recent re-introduction of the women's ice hockey team, first as a club sport for the 1994-95 season and then as a varsity sport starting in the 1997-98 season, there was a hockey team for women between 1915-1922 and then again from 1979-1983 (Author D, 2000). Some current female hockey players characterized their team as a 'new' team, which suggested they were unaware of the previous incarnations of women's ice hockey on campus.

#### *Roster sizes.*

Playing regulations dictated similar sized rosters for women's and men's ice hockey. For regular season games a maximum of 18 players can be listed for women's ice hockey and 19 players for men's ice hockey (Regional Conference, 1999). For national championships, both the men's and women's teams can list a maximum of 20 players (CIAU, 1998). Despite these regulations, there were significantly more men on their practice roster, which ranged from 24 and 30 players (Athletic Department, 2001a; Author L, 1999). In contrast, the roster for the women's team was smaller in number, with 15 to 21 players listed on their rosters (Athletic Department, 2000b; Author K, 2000b; Author L, 1999). One explanation for the smaller roster size for the women's hockey team was that during the 1999-2000 season many players graduated from the previous year (Author M, 1999a). Also, the athletic director indicated that women's ice hockey was not popular in the local area and there were few ice hockey facilities, thus resulting in a smaller pool of skilled athletes from which to recruit. Historically, ice times at arenas have been dominated by men, making it difficult for women to become involved (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Theberge, 2000b). Another possible explanation for the smaller roster size for the women's team was that the budget for the men's program was substantially larger, and they could support more athletes.



### *Staff.*

For the 2000-2001 season, the coaching and support staff situation for the women's team consisted of one male part-time head coach and three assistant coaches (three men, one woman) for a total of four staff members (Athletic Department, 2000b). The female assistant coach also acted as the trainer for the team. The coaching and support staff for the men's team included one male full-time head coach, one male assistant coach, two male trainers and two male managers, for a total of six staff members.

According to the department's operating budget, \$10,250 was allocated for the women's coaching staff for the 1999-2000 season and \$9,000 for the following season. In contrast, the men's ice hockey team was budgeted \$73,230 and \$70,230 in the same seasons for coaching salaries, a difference of more than \$60,000 per season (see appendix G). One explanation for the large discrepancy in budgets was that the coach for the men's team was hired on a full-time basis and was paid a salary of around \$54,000 (LCU, 1999; 2000b). The head coach for the women's team was employed on a part-time basis and was paid less than \$10,000 per year for coaching. These figures were in line with national figures where 16 out of 24 (67%) male head coaches of men's ice hockey teams earned more than \$50,000. Only 2 male head coaches of women's ice hockey teams made between \$30,000 to \$35,000, and 10 other head coaches made less than \$15,000 (CIAU, 1999). Additionally, national data indicated that only 14% of coaches (3 out of 22) associated with women's ice hockey were employed on a full-time basis (CIAU, 1999). While this did not justify the considerable difference (nearly \$60,000) in coaching budgets, it did highlight the fact that less money was invested in the women's program, which was in line with the practice of hiring full-time head coaches for the men's ice hockey teams and part-time coaches for the women's teams.

The majority of the full-time coaches, along with all of the administrators, had offices located in the same facility as the main gymnasium, placing them in close proximity to each other and to the decision makers in power. Although the full-time coach of the men's team had an office there, his part-time counterpart did not. The coach of the women's team was employed part-time as a coach and as a community sports director. The department's community sports division was housed in the ice arena facility where his office was located. Because his office was situated away from the other coaches and administrators, he was less often involved in daily conversations or decisions relating to university athletics.

Typically, competitive teams were assigned undergraduate students who volunteered as athletic trainers to work with injured players. However, one female hockey player (H2) indicated they were not assigned one and so asked an alumnus of their program to volunteer in this role. She said that one of the trainers for the men's program had worked with a professional hockey team and was a physiotherapist in a clinic, implying the men's team was better taken care of with respect to athletic therapy. In addition, another female hockey player stated the men's team had their skates sharpened by their trainer, while the women's team had "to designate one person to take the big stick of heavy skates to [a sporting goods store] once a week. ... [the store] hates us because we bring in 40 hockey skates that have to be sharpened in a day" (H3). The difference in experience of trainers could be that since the men engaged in more aggressive and physical play than the women, they were more susceptible to serious injuries, which required the attention of more qualified support staff.

Theberge's (2000b) analysis of power and gender in women's ice hockey provided an alternative understanding of the issue of training staff and women's ice hockey. With the women's ice hockey team she followed, the trainer decided not to come back for the following season. Many of the players accepted this situation as 'just the way things were' because of the relative newness of their sport, and thus they did not expect to have the same privileges as the men, including regular access to qualified athletic trainers. Instead, they worked with what they had, a sentiment that was evident with many members of the women's team in this study as well.

#### *Facilities.*

Both ice hockey teams practiced and competed in an indoor facility on campus that was opened in 1963 (Athletic Department, 1992-1993). The facility housed four ice surfaces: the main rink which sat approximately 1300 people; two additional regulation-sized ice surfaces; and a fourth smaller hockey rink that was converted from a curling rink (Athletic Department, 1992-1993). The two teams used the main rink for their competitions. Unlike the men's team who regularly practiced on the main rink, none of the practices for the women's team were held there. One member of the women's team described the current situation of facility use in the following quotation:

The men's hockey team gets to practice on [the] main rink. We never get to touch the main rink except for games. We have two practices on one of the other rinks. And we have a practice on Thursday, which is right before our games on Friday [and] Saturday, on the little rink that used to be a curling

rink. ... Simply because our budget doesn't have the space for us to rent main rink. (female athlete H1)

Since the ice facility operated as a separate entity from the department, the teams paid to use the various ice surfaces, with the main rink being the most expensive space. The different level of access to this space was explained as a budgetary issue, in that the women's team did not have enough money in their operating budget to cover the additional costs to rent it, which was a further indication of the status and power exercised by men's ice hockey in Canadian society (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Theberge, 2000b). It was unlikely the men's team would practice on less than ideal conditions, while the women's team was content to have a chance to be a varsity team, even if they had to contend with fewer privileges and resources. In addition, it was the administrators who provided the funding to cover the rentals for both teams. If they were committed to ensuring equal access to the same space, they could have allocated more money to the women's team for ice rentals.

The teams also differed in their access to quality locker rooms. One male hockey player (H4) described their locker room as a "fairly nice locker room. It's got, you know, everyone has their own stall. Like gear hung up. And it's carpeted. And it's fairly, so it's nice yah." In comparison, one of the female hockey players depicted their locker room situation as less than ideal:

We don't have our own locker room. We have to put like our equipment in two change rooms. One for the defense and the coaches and the goalies and one for the forwards. And we just throw our bags there. We have like a couple of hangers, but our equipment always stays wet. Okay that's how bad it is. We have no stalls. ... we don't have a big room like the guys do with showers where they have their own stalls. (female athlete H2)

When the facility was first built, the possibility of separate locker room facilities for women was not considered because traditionally women were not playing hockey then and these sports facilities were constructed primarily for the use of men (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Steinbach, 1997). Administrators argued that costs were too high to consider remodeling facilities to accommodate women's teams (Steinbach, 1997). A female hockey player (H2) pointed out the men's team could share their change facilities with the women's team, since the two teams did not travel on the road together and the women could use the men's change room when the men were gone. That option did not appear to have been considered.

### *Schedules.*

Ice hockey season started in September with tryouts and ran until late February with the national championships for the women or mid-March with the national championships for the men. Unlike the basketball teams, the two ice hockey teams did not share the same facility (rink) for their practices, nor did they switch practice times during the week. The men's team practiced on the main rink four times a week, 90 minutes per session, three days starting at 5:00 pm and one day starting at 1:00 pm. They also had two off-ice workout sessions during the week. In comparison, a female hockey player indicated they had three on-ice practices, no organized off-ice training sessions, and attendance at practices was not strictly enforced. At one time the women's team practiced on the main rink, but that situation was inconvenient because "we had to practice like 9:15 [on] Wednesday nights. And I didn't get home until 11:30. And that was because the men practiced before us basically" (female athlete H1). When they shared the main rink, the women's team was given less desirable ice times. Although the women's team no longer practiced following the men's practices, they were still disadvantaged in that they practiced on less than ideal ice conditions. This situation demonstrated that women continued to be denied equal access to facilities (Theberge, 2000b).

The men's schedule consisted of a 28-game regular season against CIAU opponents. The women's team did not play as many games against CIAU opponents as the men's team; however, they competed in a local women's hockey league to extend their schedule. The women played at home when the men were on the road. Unlike the men's games where the start time was consistent at 7:30 pm, the women's games started at various times including 3:00 pm, 7:00 pm, and 7:15 pm (Athletic Department, 2000-2001).

### *Resource support.*

An analysis of budget statements from 1998-1999 to 2000-2001 showed the men's team and women's team were allocated significantly different operating budgets, even when coaching salaries and benefits were excluded. Over the three seasons, the women's operating budget steadily increased by approximately \$10,000 a year from around \$31,075 for the 1998-1999 season to \$51,335 in 2000-2001 (see table 8 for a breakdown of operating expenses for the men's and women's ice hockey teams). However, their budget was approximately \$100,000 less than the men's budget, which ranged from \$129,886 in 1998-1999 to \$149,881 for the 2000-2001 season (see table 8). Details of the operating budgets for

the 2000-2001 season revealed that the men's team were allocated \$61,000 more for travel costs, \$21,000 more for sports operations and supplies (including equipment), \$12,000 more for facility rentals, and \$2,000 more for long-distance and fax charges (see table 8).<sup>xi</sup> One explanation for the greater allocation of funds for the men's team was that they had a longer competitive schedule and traveled more often resulting in higher expenses. Additionally, costs for hiring on-ice officials was more expensive for men's hockey because universities were required to pay \$100 per referee and \$50 per linesman for a men's game, while referees received \$75 and linesmen \$35 for officiating a women's game (CIAU, 1998). Although these officials do similar tasks and work, the CIAU institutionalized a gender differential in that officiating a men's game was worth more than officiating a women's game. Another interpretation of the budget discrepancies was that the men's team had come to expect the department would consistently support their travel costs, equipment purchases, and facility rentals, even with the addition of a women's team, who might be competing for the same resources.

Table 8.

*Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons*

Season	Team	Operating expenses							
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	Rental	OE	Tel
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	men	n/a	129,886	n/a	91,422	n/a	24,639	11,270	2,555
	women	n/a	31,075	n/a	15,000	n/a	9,000	6,600	475
1999-2000	men	217,920	144,600	73,320	88,944	18,200	24,171	10,820	2,555
	women	51,335	41,085	10,250	22,480	2,200	13,000	2,890	515
2000-2001	men	220,111	149,881	70,230	93,100	23,600	25,200	5,400	2,581
	women	60,319	51,319	9,000	32,000	2,400	13,500	2,740	529

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget; SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

Players on both teams commented on the quality of their equipment and uniforms. Most of the female hockey players talked about the inferior quality of their equipment and the mismatched uniforms, as illustrated in the following quotation from one player:

Our goalie's wearing these pants that are from like 1970. ... they're expensive. And so the goalie's got these [old ones], they're just like no padding anywhere. It's so horrible. And my helmet that the team gave me is just like this biggest piece of crap. Hockey helmets are supposed to be replaced every two years. And I'm sure mine was bought second hand probably three or four years ago. Like it's crap. And that's like a safety issue. ... I guess the university got a good deal on hockey socks. ... the guys have the same colours as us, but they're a little bit different shade. ... And so we got these socks to match the guys' uniform. And they got a good deal on them so they bought like a whole bunch. And they bought enough for us, which is really great. They bought us socks. But they don't match. ... So we look kind of dorky in our socks. (female athlete H3)

I noticed "players didn't have the same equipment. Some players had black helmets, others had blue helmets. Most had black CCM pants, some blue pants. Not all [players have] the same [brand of] gloves" (observational notes, October 2000). One member of the men's team said that the uncoordinated look of the women's uniforms contributed to an unprofessional image:

As far as I'm concerned ... our appearance on the ice looks great. I saw one of the women's games a while ago and it almost looked like a 'bad news bears' kind of situation. It's different colours here and there. Somebody's wearing a red helmet. That's not the university's colours. So it didn't look like a professionally run program. I think people that were coming to watch that maybe like I could see somebody walking through the rink that has never seen hockey before. And sees a team like the men's ice hockey team. And going ... like "wow, these guys look sharp. They look professional. Their jerseys are shining white. Fabulous." But you walk into the girls' [game], it kind of looks like a game of pick-up hockey. (male athlete H5)

This quotation suggested that while uniforms and equipment have a functional role, they also symbolically served to identify players as a cohesive, efficient, and elite team and as representatives of the university.

The inconsistency in the quality of equipment can also be attributed to the fact that men's ice hockey was marketed to fans as a physical game where force, domination, aggression, and speed were emphasized, while women's ice hockey was marketed as a tactical game dominated by strategy (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Theberge, 2000b). In an earlier meeting with the athletic director, he mentioned that the men's team received more money for equipment because men were more physical in their play and broke more hockey

sticks more often. As a result, they were allocated \$3000 to buy sticks each year (approximately 10 sticks per player) as compared to \$300 for sticks for the women's team (approximately 2 sticks per player) (observational notes, March 2000). Not only did the athletic director underestimate the physical abilities of women, but he also considered aggression and physicality through the breaking of sticks as a natural part of the hockey experience in the men's game. It was acceptable for men to break or wear out their equipment, at an added cost for the department, because that was 'part of the game.' In comparison, the female hockey players were not rewarded for taking care of their equipment as some did because they could not afford to buy extra sticks, new helmets, or other equipment on a yearly basis.

As indicated earlier, every male ice hockey player was outfitted in the same, coordinated uniform and used the same brand of equipment (observational notes, January 2001). According to one male hockey player, his team was supplied with sticks every year and new uniforms, including jerseys, pants, and gloves, every three years. In addition, they usually received free skates; however, due to recent budget cutbacks, players now had to pay for a portion of the cost. Another male hockey player noted that receiving new equipment was a common practice in his sport:

...you get those things paid for. But that's almost once you get a certain level. Growing up in minor hockey ... once I was 16 years old you get all those perks anyways. ... Like I haven't paid for a piece of equipment since I was about 16 years old. (male athlete H5)

Some members of the women's team expressed their frustration about the privileges that the men's team enjoyed with their equipment and about the lack of consideration of their needs. The following quotation from one female ice hockey player reflected this sentiment:

They get outfitted head to toe every year in equipment. The goalies get brand new equipment every year. ... I'm going into debt for the next year to buy my ... equipment and they get it handed to them. And then they get to keep it. And sell it afterwards. ... With the helmets and pants and gloves, they throw it into a bin at the beginning of the year when all the new stuff comes in. "Does anybody have any friends that needs this?" as opposed to going "Hey the women's hockey team didn't have enough helmets and pants last year for their players. Maybe we should give it to them." (female athlete H2)

Recently, some members of the women's team organized a hockey pool to raise funds to buy additional equipment. Their reluctance to accept the current allocation of monies for

equipment and their willingness to remedy the situation could be seen as an example of women challenging the status quo in sport (Shaw, 2001).

Substantial discrepancies in resource support were also apparent when the teams hosted games. At the men's ice hockey game, game-day staff sold and took tickets, handed out programs, gave away merchandise to fans, and organized events at the intermissions (observational notes, January 2001). At the women's game, I did not pay for admission, the programs were left on a stool for spectators to pick up on the way into the arena, there were no give-aways to fans in attendance, and the overhead heaters for the comfort of spectators were not turned on (observational notes, October 2000). One member of the women's ice hockey team acknowledged they did not receive the same level of game-day support as the men's team, but was content with the current situation. She said, "we still get the music which is nice. You know we get the goal judges and stuff like that still. But we don't get the ticket people stamping the hands and stuff" (female athlete H2).

Obviously, the level of resource support was considerably different between these two teams. The discrepancies in resource support signified that the department valued the male hockey players more than the female hockey players.

#### *Visibility.*

Information regarding the men's ice hockey team, including upcoming games, results, statistics, previews, and announcements of recruits, was regularly mentioned in the news releases, whereas stories on the women's ice hockey team were infrequent. There were 47 stories on men's ice hockey in 1998-1999, 56 for the 1999-2000 season and 44 stories during 2000-2001. In comparison, the department provided half as many stories on the women's ice hockey team in those years with 29 stories in 1998-1999, 18 stories in 1999-2000, and 24 in 2000-2001 (see appendix H for further details). One explanation for this difference was that the men's team was categorized as a major sport; therefore upcoming games for their team were regularly promoted around the campus assuming that this investment in promotions would be recovered in ticket sales.<sup>xiii</sup> When the women's ice hockey was reintroduced in the late 1990s, the department devoted some resources to promoting them. However, they no longer actively promoted the women's team because of low attendance figures (female administrator A3) and were only promoted if no other teams were hosting home games (female athlete H3).



According to the communications coordinator they recently stopped producing elaborate programs for the teams:

We don't print game programs anymore. The only thing we do is the schedule and we do a game hot shot, which has, it's equal ... Yah it's four sided. It's a 11x17 [piece of paper] and it's equal billing. Women's and men's write ups. Women's and men's rosters. Women's and men's stats on the back. So they're totally equal. (female administrator A3)

With the exception of the athletic department logo that was printed in colour, the program that I received at the men's ice hockey game was printed in black and white on 11 x 17-sized paper. It contained a general overview of the weekend's games, rosters for the two teams, and regional conference statistics (observational notes, January 2001). In spite of the communications coordinator's claim that programs for men's and women's teams were equal, the program for the women's game was less professional looking and included less information. It was printed entirely in black and white on an 8 ½ x 11 blue piece of paper, half the size of the men's program. The only information included in it was the rosters for the two teams and a short paragraph previewing the weekend's games (observational notes, October 2000). There were no statistics or extensive write-ups. It appeared that less time and effort went into the production of it, which reaffirmed the notion that promoting the men's ice hockey program was a higher priority.

#### *Fan support.*

Fan support favoured the men's team over the women's team. I estimated approximately 100 people in attendance at the women's game and between 300 to 400 fans at the men's game (observational notes, October 2000, January 2001). Members of the women's team did not deny they had fewer spectators, but instead focused on the increased numbers of fans from the previous season. According to one female player:

I wasn't there last year so I don't know, but people say there's been a lot more support this year for our team. ... even just people who've been at the rink and we've been playing. And they've stopped and stayed for a few minutes or whatever. Like friends coming out and family coming out. It's been a lot bigger this year. (H3)

Ice hockey was characterized as one of the few sports in North American society where masculinity in the form of physical play, violent actions, and aggressiveness was prominently displayed, valued, and celebrated (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993, Theberge, 2000b). Because of debates about the appropriateness of women displaying similar masculine behaviours, body checking, a major component to the men's game, was not

allowed in the women's game (Theberge, 2000b). As a result, some viewed women's ice hockey as a different game where different aspects were valued. In the women's game speed and strategy were highlighted, as compared to power and force (Theberge, 2000b). The coach of the women's team (B6) described the women's game as a "...finesse game where success is not dictated by size and strength. This does not mean that the games are not physical and intense, it is still in your face hockey, but passing and team speed are keys to winning" (Author N, 1999, p. 15). Underpinning these ideas was the notion that power and force were more exciting to watch than finesse and strategic play. A comment from one male hockey player summed up the common sentiment that women's ice hockey offered something to fans, yet men's hockey was more desirable to most fans as it reflected the 'true' game. He stated, "Yah I enjoy watching women's hockey and it's great. But I want to see the guy taking a 100 mile-per-hour slap shot. ... Or I like to see the bone-crunching body checking. Right, where the women's game just doesn't provide that for me" (H5).

*Athletic council.*

One of the female hockey players I interviewed was the current president of the athletic council. She was involved with it not only to meet other athletes, but also to advocate for more support for the women's ice hockey team. In her words:

...obviously if I'm president ... and I'm an ice hockey player, ... the more our team's going to get [from] the administration, [and] the more our team's going to get known. And they're going to know we're participating and putting back our effort to the funding they're giving us. (female athlete H1)

Neither of the male hockey players involved in my study sat on the council, but they were aware that two of their teammates were.

*Summary of the ice hockey program.*

The structure and institutional conditions of the men's and women's ice hockey teams were the most divergent of the four selected sport programs. The men's team had a more extensive competitive schedule, greater access to quality coaching, support staff, facilities, and schedules, better quality equipment and uniforms, and their sport was promoted more extensively. The women's team struggled for legitimacy as a varsity sport with fewer resources and less desirable competitive and practice conditions. The differences, as I explain in subsequent chapters, were usually attributed to the long history of the men's team and the influence of their alumni, which compensated for the fact that the men's team had not had a successful season in many years.

## *Rugby Program*

### *History and accomplishments.*

Men's rugby was the oldest university sport on campus, with athletes playing it in 1906 (Author D, n.d.). Over the years, 75 players from the men's rugby program have been selected to the senior Canadian men's national team and 15 have won the university's male athlete of the year award, which was named after a male rugby player (Author D, n.d.). Despite their long history, the CIAU did not support a national championship for men's rugby and thus it was not recognized as a CIAU-sanctioned sport. The dominance of men's football, another field-orientated sport, and the variance in regional interest in men's rugby has contributed to keeping it at a club level in Canadian universities (Author O, 1999).

The history of women's rugby at LCU was relatively short as it started out as a club team in 1991 (Author P, 1998). By the 1998 season, the department had granted the team CIAU varsity status. An increase in grassroots development of women's rugby was one reason given by the male athletic director to account for their elevated status. This explanation was interesting given the misogynistic nature of rugby where derogatory comments about women and femininity are common and masculinity was epitomized and revered (Mean, 2001; Schacht, 1996). Another explanation was that since the CIAU was committed to achieving gender equity with their programming opportunities they added three national championships for women including one for women's rugby in 1998, with ice hockey and wrestling being the other two additions (Author O, 1999). In their first season as a CIAU team, the women's team won the regional championship and came in third at the national championships (CIS, 2001b). Four members of the women's rugby team have been honoured as All-Canadians and one was the CIAU player of the year (CIS, 2001b).

### *Roster sizes.*

The men's rugby program typically fielded four teams: a first division or university team, a second division, a fourth division, and an under-19 team that acted as a developmental system for the university team (Athletic Department, 1997; Author O & Author Q, 1997). For the 2000-2001 season the men's university team consisted of 32 players (Athletic Department, 2000-2001).

The women's program fielded two teams: a university team and a developmental or club team (Author M, 1999b). There were 35 to 50 members involved in the women's program, with around 17 players on the university team (Author M, 1999b; Author P, 1998).

According to CIAU regulations, a maximum of 22 players can be listed on the game-day roster for national championships (CIAU, 1998). The coach for the women's rugby team argued that having two teams allowed for women with varying skill levels to participate with the rugby program. In contrast, one female rugby player contended their program should not support two teams given the limited availability of resources:

They shouldn't have this junior varsity team. They're not organized enough to have it. They don't have enough money. They don't have enough coaches. They don't have enough anything to have two teams. It just makes things so disorganized. ... When things have been established, then bring in the junior varsity team. ... You can have people practicing but at the moment it's just not working. (R2)

*Staff.*

The coaching staff of the men's rugby program consisted of a male part-time head coach, three male assistant coaches, and one female athletic trainer for a total of five members (Athletic Department, 2000-2001). The department budgeted approximately \$41,000 for coaching salaries and benefits for the men's program (see table 9). The part-time head coach of the men's team had access to two offices on campus - one in the main gymnasium and one in the rugby clubhouse, while the part-time head coach of the women's team had access to office space, albeit small, at the clubhouse (Author M, 1999b).

At the start of the data collection period, the coaching and support staff for the women's program consisted of a female head coach, which was designated as a "part-time honorarium position" (Athletic Department, 2001b), a male assistant coach, and a female athletic trainer, for a total of three staff members. Part way through the 2000-2001 season the female head coach resigned. For the duration of the season, a man acted as the interim head coach. To ensure their coaches had time to concentrate on coaching, the female rugby players formed an executive committee responsible for administrative concerns, such as booking transportation, scheduling games, fundraising, and so forth. It was also possible they took on this added responsibility to demonstrate their commitment and dedication to the sport and thus legitimizing their status as a varsity sport.

Budget figures for salaries for the women's program were approximately 10% of that for the men's program, even though the women had CIAU status and the men did not. For the 1999-2000 season \$4,600 was budgeted for salaries, with \$4,000 allocated for the

following season (see table 9). These salaries were in line with national figures as the majority (9) of women's rugby head coaches were paid less than \$5,000 per year (CIAU, 1999).

Trainers were assigned to both rugby programs; however, one female rugby player (R1) noted their former trainer 'moved up' to the men's program. Rugby is a physical and masculine sport where injuries are common and seen as a badge of honour (Schacht, 1996). Since displays of masculinity were expected with the men's team, there was an assumption that there were more chances for injuries on their team and more experienced trainers were required to ensure players were properly assessed and treated. Training for the women's team was viewed as a 'stepping stone' to training for the more prestigious men's team, where they were more likely to get better experience dealing with injuries (female athlete R1).

#### *Facilities.*

Both rugby programs had access to four, full-size fields (pitches) and a rugby clubhouse, located on campus, for their practices and games. One pitch was fenced in and lighted with bleachers on one side of the field to accommodate 500 fans (Athletic Department, 1992-1993). The clubhouse included three change rooms, a storage area, office space, and a lounge. In describing the lounge portion of the clubhouse, one female rugby player alluded to artifacts associated with the men's program:

... we have like this little lounge. And there's like all the old jerseys and awards from when the guys' team has gone places. ... There's things like trophies and stuff and they're all really old. The place is really gross and kind of crappy, but it does the job. (R2)

Another member of the women's rugby program (R1) suggested there was a hierarchy of access to the change rooms and fields. When the men's and women's teams played at the same time or on the same day, the men's teams (home and visiting teams) had access to separate change rooms, while the two women's teams shared the third change room. As for the field access, the men's university team was at the top of the hierarchy, followed by the women's university team, then the men's second division team. In terms of access to facilities, the needs of the new women's rugby program were accommodated, but the men's program retained preferential access to fields and locker rooms.

#### *Schedules.*

The rugby season ran from September to March for the women's program and from September to May for the men's program (Athletic Department, 2000-2001; 2001-2002). From September until the end of the October, the women's university team competed in the

regional and national championships and from September to April in a local rugby league (Athletic Department, 2001-2002). Practices for the women's rugby teams were held two to three times a week (Athletic Department, 2001-2002).

The men's season consisted of an exhibition schedule against other university teams from Canada and the United States. Like the women's program, they extended their schedule by competing in a local rugby league. The exhibition schedule for their team used to be more extensive, but with recent financial cutbacks, especially to the travel budget, the schedule was reduced with less travel to other Canadian universities.

*Resource support.*

Some members of the women's rugby program believed that having CIAU status and a successful program garnered greater recognition and legitimacy on campus, as well as increased resource support from the department (Author P, 1998). However, their operating budget was lower than the men's with major differences in salaries and benefits and travel (see table 9 for a breakdown of operating expenses for the rugby programs). Although the men's travel budget was reduced from \$26,680 for the 1998-99 season to \$15,565 for the 2000-2001 season, their total travel budget was significantly more than that for the women's program, which was almost cut in half from \$4,000 in 1999-2000 to \$2,500 in 2000-2001 (see table 9). A few people I interviewed assumed the women's team had a larger travel budget because they traveled to national championships, but the athletic director clarified this misconception. In his words, "it cost us \$20,000 to send the women's team to nationals. But we fund [travel to] championships from a separate varsity budget" (A5). The department had a separate budget account for travel to CIAU-sponsored national championships that was accessed by any team with CIAU-status.

Members of both rugby programs discussed efforts to address shortcomings with their operating budgets. For example, female players fundraised in order to supplement their meager budget and cover basic operating costs, like field maintenance and travel. A male rugby player indicated:

I don't know how many other teams sell chocolates throughout the year to try and raise funds so they can just break even. ... they have to pretty close pay out of their own pocket to travel. ... And just transportation even just in around the city. So that's a big hassle so. But it's sort of like the minnow looking up at the mammoth, rather than anything else. (R3)

Even though the men's operating budget was greater than the one for the women's program, they experienced gradual cutbacks in recent years:

When I first came in like '95, we got scholarships and what have you. And we always have this continual exchange with [two American schools] and so forth. And traveling down there was like that was all paid for. We stayed in hotels and so forth. Compared to when I finished with the team, there were no scholarships and we were billeted. (male athlete R3)

While the men's program counted on their alumni to offset financial cutbacks, the female rugby players took action to supplement the limited resource support from the department.

Table 9.

*Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Rugby Programs over Three Seasons*

Season	Team	Operating expenses						
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	OE	Tel
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	men	n/a	27,495	n/a	26,660	n/a	300	535
	women	n/a	5,500	n/a	3,500	n/a	2,000	0
1999-2000	men	63,705	23,115	40,590	19,660	2,600	200	655
	women	12,100	7,500	4,600	4,000	3,500	0	0
2000-2001	men	64,014	23,141	40,873	15,565	2,800	4,095	681
	women	11,500	7,500	4,000	2,000	5,200	0	0

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget; SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

The men's program had corporate support, in addition to alumni support, something the women's team did not. According to a female rugby player:

Our men's team is sponsored by adidas this year. We never even heard a thing about it. ... all of a sudden they had all these adidas track suits and where did that come from? ... We're never been sponsored by anybody before. (R1)

My observations substantiated her claims as I noticed many members of the men's rugby team wearing varsity jackets with the adidas logo on it (observational notes, 2000, 2001).

One difference in support from the department that favoured the women's program was with uniforms. One female rugby player (R1) indicated that their program had "four sets of jerseys. There's a jv [junior varsity] home and away. And there was a varsity home and away." At the women's rugby match I attended the women wore rugby shirts emblazoned with the athletic department logo and some players sported LCU toques (observational notes, January 2001). In comparison, I did not notice their logo on any part of the men's uniforms. As well, their numbers were pinned on to the rugby shirts, as opposed to permanently sewn on. Overall, the uniforms for the men's rugby program looked "dingy and old" (observational notes, March 2001). It was possible that the women's team was outfitted with better looking and newer uniforms so as not to look inferior to their CIAU competitors.

Overall, the men's rugby program had greater resource support from the department, alumni and sponsors. This discrepancy was particularly poignant considering that CIAU status and success at the regional and national level had not translated into significant commitment from the department for the women's program.

#### *Visibility.*

A few of the athletes I interviewed commented that the department did not regularly or substantially promote either of the rugby programs. A female basketball player (B3) remarked, "I don't even know if they are CIAU or anything because I never hear anything about them." This sentiment was supported by my analysis of the news releases. There were five short stories on women's rugby in each of the three seasons I analyzed and there were five stories on men's rugby in 1998-1999, two stories in 1999-2000, and no stories during the 2000-2001 season (see appendix H). The low numbers of stories can be attributed to the short CIAU season for the women's team, the extensiveness of the exhibition schedules for both programs, which were not regularly promoted or reported on, and the status of the men's team as a club sport. Nevertheless, I expected that the success of the women's team at the regional and national levels would have been highlighted more, especially given the importance that the department placed on success and winning championships. Given the low numbers of fans attending the rugby matches, it was not surprising that they did not print programs for the rugby matches, nor charged for attendance (observational notes, January, 2001, March 2001). In spite of the lack of promotion and coverage, the women's team had taken the initiative to produce and distribute posters to promote upcoming games.



*Fan support.*

Historically, men's rugby attracted many fans to their games (Author D, n.d.), but currently neither the men's nor the women's rugby teams played in front of a large number of spectators. Players on both teams indicated that usually only a handful of people came out to their games, which was supported by my observations. There were about 20 people sitting in the bleachers at the women's match and approximately 30 people standing on the sidelines at the men's game (observational notes, January 2001, March 2001). The low attendance figures for both teams contrasted considerably with the regular fan support for the basketball teams and the men's hockey team. According to the athletic director, sports with low attendance, like rugby, were not promoted. However, one could argue that if they promoted those teams more often and more extensively, attendance and interest might increase.

*Athletic council.*

According to the president of the council, the women's rugby team sent representatives to the council, but the men's team had never done so. Two rugby players I interviewed did not comment at all on it, while one female rugby player, who was not an athlete representative, indicated it was important to have the council as a place to voice their opinions. As a formally recognized and structured entity with athlete representation, the council could pressure administrators and coaches to be held accountable for gender equity. However, comments from many other athletes implied that there was a general lack of awareness of it and its role in the department. Additionally, I suspect that the overall indifference towards the athletic council could be attributed to a lack of time and interest in volunteer work.

*Summary of the rugby program.*

I expected the structure and institutional conditions of the women's and men's rugby programs to be more comparable in that the women's program would have privileges based on their CIAU status that would balance the preferential treatment the men's team received because of their traditional status on campus. Instead the tradition and longevity of the men's program contributed to privileges such as a larger operating budget and greater access to facilities and practice space. In contrast, the department displayed minimal commitment to the women's program despite their status as a CIAU team and their recent successes.

Considering all four sport programs, the entire rugby program received little support from the department, especially with regards to promotion and full-time coaches.

### *Swim Program*

Unlike the other three sport programs in this study, the swim program operated in an integrated manner as a combined sport. Practices for male and female swimmers were held in the same pool, at the same time, under the direction of the same coaching staff. The swim program was only distinguished as separate men's and women's swim teams for meets and championships titles and even then, competitions were run in an integrated manner.

#### *History and accomplishments.*

When LCU officially opened in 1915, students could belong to a men's or women's swim club. Both programs were elevated to varsity status in the late 1950s. In the 1990s, the university swim program amalgamated with a community swim club to create a developmental system for competitive swimmers in the region (Author R, n.d.). As a result of this partnership, coaching salaries were usually not included in the university's financial statements (see table 10). Instead, monies were allocated to the swim program from the department for professional fees.

Prior to the recent successes of the men's and women's swim teams during the data collection period (both teams won 4 consecutive national championships), the men's team had won 4 regional championships and 2 national championship and the women's team had won 12 regional championships and 6 national championships (Athletic Department, 2000-2001; CIS, 2001b). The swim program had been honoured with the CIAU men's coach of the year four times, the CIAU women's coach of the year eight times, the CIAU male swimmer of the year five times, and the CIAU female swimmer of the year three times (CIS, 2001b). In swimming, CIAU All-Canadians were awarded to the top two finishers in every individual and relay event at the national championships. To date, there have been 83 male All-Canadians and 95 female All-Canadians from this swim program (CIS, 2001b).

#### *Roster sizes.*

Each university was permitted to enter a maximum of 18 male swimmers and 18 female swimmers for national championships (CIAU, 1998). At LCU, the roster sizes for the men's and women's teams were determined on an annual basis by performance standards. According to the male coach I interviewed, "the training groups ... were all done by standards [that] are strictly performance [based]. And the numbers are related to people

making the standards" (S5). In recent years, more men than women met their gendered performance standards (there was a men's standard and a women's standard) and as a result, the men's team consisted of 14 or 15 athletes, while the women's team ranged between 7 to 9 athletes. Another explanation was that female swimmers' performance peaked in their late teens, while male swimmers excelled later in their 20s. One female swimmer (S1) recounted that she had "never known a girl to graduate [from LCU] and still be swimming," and male swimmers "do their five years of varsity and are still going to school and still training after that for a few more years ... swimming into their mid to late 20s." At this university, performance standards and physiological peaking dictated the number of playing opportunities for male and female swimmers.

*Staff.*

The same all-male coaching staff (two male full-time head coaches and one male assistant coach) worked with both male and female swimmers. One head coach worked with the elite university swimmers, who qualified for the national team and competed at the international level, and another head coach was in charge of swimmers who competed for the university but were not national team members.

According to the 1999-2000 budget, \$20,800 was allocated to the swim program for salaries and benefits, with another \$35,000 directed towards professional fees. For the 2000-2001 season they were budgeted \$55,000 for professional fees (see table 10). It was difficult to determine if these salaries were in line with national data because these figures only accounted for a portion of their entire salaries, which were subsidized by fees from the community swim program.

Three swimmers (two women, one man) discussed the lack of female swim coaches in their program and in the sport of swimming generally. Two swimmers (S1 & S3) noted that there were occasional communication breakdowns between the "male dominated staff" and some of the female swimmers, but there was a concerted effort on behalf of the coaches to better understand them. It was presumed the male coaches 'naturally' identified with their male athletes. Female head coaches in swimming, particularly at the elite levels, were uncommon. For the 1998-1999 season, there was only one female swim coach in the CIAU (CIAU, 1999). One female swimmer (S2) recognized the general lack of female coaches, but added she was not concerned about it because she wanted to be coached by the most-qualified person regardless of gender. Even though the swimmers mentioned the dominance

of men at the coaching ranks, none of them seemed concerned with the situation. Rather, the lack of female coaches was 'just the way things are' in this sport. While gender equity in coaching was not the focus of my study, it was obvious that systemic inequities continued to exist in the coaching ranks (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Inglis et al., 1996, 2000). The perpetuation of men in coaching roles, not just in swimming, sent the message to female athletes that coaching was not a viable career option for them.

#### *Facilities.*

Swim practices were normally held in an on-campus, indoor aquatic facility that was built in 1978 (LCU, n.d.). The facility accommodated lanes of 25, 50, and 80 metres in length, a meeting room, an equipment room, and the coaches' office located near the pool deck (LCU, n.d.; observational notes, January 2001). Banners celebrating regional and national championships, along with meet championships, were displayed from the rafters and on the walls in the aquatic facility. This facility also included an upper balcony with bleachers (observational notes, January 2001). The swim program also made use of an outdoor pool with 55-yard lanes that was completed in 1954 and was located adjacent to the indoor facility (LCU, n.d.).

#### *Schedules.*

Unlike most other sports, male and female swimmers trained together in the same facility, with the same coaches, at the same times (observational notes, February, 2001, June 2001). They practiced 9 to 10 times a week, up to five hours a day. In the words of one male swimmer:

We're here from 5:30 to 7:30 in the morning. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday. And then Saturday we have another two-hour workout later like at 8 to 10. And then every [weekday] we're here from 1:45 to 4:30. Forty-five minutes before 2:30 [we]'re doing dry land, like running, [or] weights, medicine balls. ... that's pretty much the template. So it's about 24 hours a week of training. (S3)

Most swimmers I spoke with also competed on national-level teams, which meant their training extended to 11 months of the year.

The university swim season started in September, included 6 to 10 meets during the season and ended in late February or early March with the national championships (Athletic Department, 2000-2001). Regional and national championships for both swim teams were held on the same weekend in the same facility. For many other CIAU sports, the women's national championship was held a week or two prior to the men's championship. At regional

championships points were awarded to the men's and women's teams separately, with the men's and women's races scheduled in an alternating format, which suggested that the accomplishments of men and women were equally valued (observational notes, January 2001). One female swimmer reflected on the integrated structure of their swim meets: "it is kind of neat how we alternate in a swim meet. It alternates a men's event and women's event. ...So you're behind the blocks and you've got a teammate, male, in the water" (S3). Unlike many other university competitions I have witnessed, male and female teammates stood together on the pool deck and cheered each other on (observational notes, January 2001). It appeared they identified themselves with the entire swim program instead of with a separate men's team or women's team.

*Resource support.*

Unlike the other sports, there was one budget for the entire swim program. A large portion of it was directed towards the rental of the pool (see table 10 for a breakdown of operating expenses for the swim program). Like the ice arena, the aquatic facility functioned as a separate entity from university athletics and therefore, the swim teams paid to use it.

According to one of the head coaches (S5), swimmers who trained during the off-season, which was the non-university season, were required to pay monthly fees of approximately \$200 to the swim club "for coaching and pool time." During the university season, the athletic department covered these fees for the athletes, and provided all the swimmers with swim caps, a state-of-the-art swimsuit, tracksuits, and pool-deck jackets.

Table 10.

*Operating Expenses for the Swim Program over Three Seasons*

Season	Operating expenses								
	TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	Rental	OE	Tel	Fees
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	n/a	81,800	n/a	49,920	n/a	30,000	(50)	2,010	n/a
1999-2000	140,580	119,780	20,800	49,920	2,500	30,000	350	2,010	35,000
2000-2001	n/a	145,432	0	46,500	6,120	35,000	150	2,662	55,000

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget; SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel = telecommunications; fees = professional fees

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

Since the teams were not allocated separate budgets, I could not compare the financial support given to male and female swimmers. In general though, it appeared that they were supported at comparable levels by the department.

*Visibility.*

Most university teams were mentioned in news releases specifically by their gender. For example, stories on the men's and women's basketball teams were referred to as 'men's basketball' or 'women's basketball' instead of under a common title of 'basketball program.' This was not the situation with the two swim teams who were treated as one entity. Probably because of their success at the regional and national level, the swim program was mentioned regularly; yet, the total number of stories was smaller when compared to less successful teams like men's ice hockey, or sports with shorter seasons like men's football (see appendix H). For example, in the 1999-2000 season there were 18 stories on the swim program compared with 56 for men's ice hockey and 20 for men's football. Likewise in 2000-2001, swimming was mentioned 14 times, men's football 23 times, and men's ice hockey 44 times (see appendix H). Nevertheless, the stories on swimming were the longest of any of the four selected sport programs. For the 1999-2000 season, the average length of a story on swimming was 14.6 lines and for the 2000-2001 season it was 20 lines. The next highest average was for women's rugby at 11 lines and men's ice hockey at 10.8 lines (see appendix H). However, the stories on swimming included both the men's and women's teams, while all other stories were on single-gender teams.

The department did not charge admission, nor print a program for the regional swim championship I attended (observational notes, January 2001). According to the athletic director, "There's no point in promoting swimming and other sports where ... you might play one home event a year" (A5). Despite the irregularity of their meets, I was surprised they did not provide a program or promote the meet because the swim teams were two of the most successful university teams in recent years and I assumed they would want to emphasize and showcase their successes to the general public.

*Fan support.*

In spite of the recent successes of both the swim teams, few people attended their meets. According to one male swimmer "we're lucky if we get 10 people to cheer us on." A female swimmer added that despite the popularity of swimming as a participation sport in Canada the swim program struggled to get fans out to their meets. Their impressions of low

attendance were supported by my observation as I counted about 50 people at the regional championship (observational notes, January 2001). The low figures could be attributed to the belief that swimming was not considered a spectator sport, and the department had chosen to not promote it.

*Athletic council.*

Two members of the swim program (a man and a woman) that I interviewed sat on the council to develop “a sense of community among the athletes” (S3). The female representative explained:

I've only actually been doing that the last year and a half or two years. ... just finally got to know a lot of other teams, because the swim team's a bit secluded. I don't know why, we just kind of [are]. I don't know if it's just because we're in our own venue and we just kind of do our own thing. And yah the other teams seem to have a lot more time ... their schedules kind of mesh so that they're all doing the same thing at the same time. We always seem to be a bit off. (S3)

Sitting on the council was a way for swimmers to increase their visibility and connection with other athletes.

*Body image.*

Of all the athletes I interviewed, swimmers were the only ones who commented on body image and the pressures to lose weight. Male and female swimmers indicated they personally knew female swimmers with eating disorders and while not directly attributing it to the prevalence of male coaches, they suspected that having male coaches complicated the situation. According to one female swimmer:

... swimming's a bit messed up too just because, I don't know, it's something to do with being in bathing suits all the time and they see you. They're not afraid to say you need to lose weight ... [or] you're not looking as fit. (S3)

A male swimmer felt it was easier for women to approach a female coach about concerns over weight control. While not a primary focus of my study, it seemed gender played a role in swimmers' competitive experiences, with female swimmers having added pressures to control their body weight.

*Summary of the swim program.*

The situation with the swim program was very different from the other three sport programs. In general, male and female swimmers competed in the same institutional conditions, whereas in the other programs, male and female athletes often faced very

different structures and conditions. This difference can be largely attributed to the fact that the swim program was run in an integrated manner and as a result male and female swimmers had similar access to facilities, qualified coaches, and operating monies. The recent success of both swim teams also contributed to the similar conditions for them. If one team had been less successful than the other, I suspect I may have found greater discrepancies in the institutional conditions of the two teams.

*Summary of the Institutional Conditions of the Four Sport Programs*

Of the selected sport programs, the two basketball teams, men's ice hockey, and men's rugby had the longest history on campus. Women's rugby and the recent reincarnation of women's ice hockey were the newest teams to be included in this study. Although men's teams with longer traditions on campus tended to have more established alumni groups, women's teams, including those with historical ties to LCU did not. The men's and women's swim teams were the most successful teams as evidenced by their recent string of national championships.

Roster sizes between the men's and women's basketball teams were similar in number. However, there were fewer women than men on the hockey, rugby, and swim teams. The lower numbers were attributed to a lack of qualified female participants.

For the most part, men's teams had greater access to resources such as operating budgets, equipment, staffing, and facilities. Men's teams were allocated more money for coaching salaries than the women's teams, a trend that was consistent across Canadian universities (CIAU, 1999). The ice hockey and rugby programs had the greatest discrepancies in budgets between the men's and women's teams. With respect to facility access, male and female swimmers and basketball players had similar access to their training facility. In rugby and ice hockey, accommodations were made for the newer women's programs, but the men's programs still retained preferential access to locker rooms and training facilities (Steinbach, 2000; Vertinsky, 1992).

The two basketball teams and the men's ice hockey team had the highest number of spectators. Major sports, like basketball and men's ice hockey, were deemed to be of interest to the general public and the media and thus were promoted on a regular basis. While few fans attended swim meets, the swim teams were regularly mentioned as a result of their continued successes at regional and national championships.



In comparing the four sport programs, the structure and institutional conditions surrounding the swim program were the most equitable, albeit not completely. Male and female swimmers were coached by the same staff members, practiced in the same facility, and had similar successes. In stark contrast, the conditions surrounding the men's and women's ice hockey programs were very different to each other. There were significant variations in staffing, facility access, promotion, and operating budgets. Even though the men's and women's rugby programs were not a high priority for the athletic department, the men's program enjoyed more privileges, including greater facility access, more qualified staff, and substantially more funding. On the surface the conditions of the men's and women's basketball teams were comparable, yet there were differences between the two that favoured male basketball players, including preferential facility access and sponsorship. In this chapter I illustrated that not only did the structures and conditions differ between sport programs, they also differed within the programs.

In the following chapters I discussed and analyzed themes that cut across the four sport programs, which are referred to as a cross-case analysis (Creswell, 1998): the meanings and practices related to gender equity, and the justifications used to explain the gaps between meanings and practices. Here, it was important to describe and analyze the institutional conditions of the case study sport programs so as to ground the findings and to understand their impact on those meanings and practices.

---

<sup>i</sup> This figure included part-time and full-time undergraduate and graduate students.

<sup>ii</sup> To maintain the confidentiality of the university, I assigned pseudonyms to authors of documents and reports generated from university departments and of articles from campus newspapers and publications.

<sup>iii</sup> Athletes were listed on rosters as a red-shirt, meaning they practiced with the team, but were not registered with the CIAU and were not eligible to compete in sanctioned events. Coaches often kept players on in this capacity to provide them with experience without losing a year of CIAU eligibility.

<sup>iv</sup> These figures were indicative of the last season of the data collection (2000-2001). When I started collecting data in 1999, there were 21 head coaches in the athletic department and 5 of whom were women. Of those five women head coaches, only two were associated with the four case study sport programs.

<sup>v</sup> The Regional Conference operations manuals consisted of two components: i) the constitution, and ii) the bylaws.

<sup>vi</sup> More detailed and in-depth analyses of the operating budgets are included in appendix G and chapter 6.

<sup>vii</sup> During my observations I gleaned information from championships banners, such as the year teams won championships and the level of championship (i.e., national or regional).

---

<sup>viii</sup> Each year, the CIAU recognized athletes' outstanding athletic accomplishments in each sport with All-Canadian awards. They also recognized outstanding academic accomplishments with Academic All-Canadian awards. These awards were handed out on a yearly basis to athletes who earned a grade point average of 80% or higher for the year in which they competed in a CIAU sport.

<sup>ix</sup> Following the 1999-2000 season, the male head coach of the men's basketball team, who had been with the team for 14 seasons, resigned. A former player with the men's basketball team, who had prior experience as a coach, was hired for the next season.

<sup>x</sup> Interestingly, at the same university, the men's and women's volleyball teams switched game times during a weekend. On Friday night, the women played the early game and on Saturday night the men played first. Greater interest in women's volleyball and a mutual agreement between the two head coaches of the volleyball teams were given as reasons why the game times were switched in this sport.

<sup>xi</sup> Universities pay the CIAU a fee to participate in different sports and these differed from sport to sport. The highest fees for the 1998-1999 season were for women's ice hockey and women's rugby, both at \$450 per university team. In comparison, participation fees for men's and women's basketball and men's ice hockey were \$200 each. Fees for men's and women's swimming were \$100 per team (CIAU, 1998).

<sup>xii</sup> I requested information on the revenue generated from the varsity sports, but my requests were not fulfilled.

## 5

### Meanings of Gender Equity<sup>1</sup>

Conceptually, gender equity often goes unquestioned and unpacked as individuals often do not reflect on what it means, nor do they check if their understandings are shared with others (Bryson & de Castell, 1993). Therefore, part of the study was devoted to identifying the meanings that selected administrators, coaches, and athletes associated with gender equity. These verbalized meanings are reflective of discourses that produce versions of the truth about gender equity (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Scott, 1990; Weedon, 1997). The findings indicated that there were three dominant meanings of this organizational value: i) equality, ii) conditional equality, and iii) it is a women's only issue, and each of these had a number of different dimensions associated with them (see appendix N for percentages of the respondents' meanings based on gender, stakeholder group, and sport affiliation). Similar meanings have been identified in previous research on gender equity in organizations more generally (cf. Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Liff & Cameron, 1997) and in sport and recreation more specifically (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Kay, 1996; McKay, 1994; Shaw, 2001; Yule, 1997). However, this study suggested that one's understanding of gender equity was partially influenced by a combination of their stakeholder group, gender, and sport affiliation, implying that there are problems with relying only on the views of upper administrators as previous research has done. In this chapter, I described and discussed the three meanings.

### Equality

The dominant force in gender equity reform in sport has been the emphasis on equality that is underpinned by liberal feminism (Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Hall, 1996; Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Hargreaves, 1990; McKay, 1994; Nilges, 1998; Vertinsky, 1992). Gender equity as equality has come to be understood as providing men and women with the same opportunities and treating them in the same fashion (cf. Hall, 1996; McKay, 1994; Kent & Robertson, 1993; Shaw, 2001). For example, in his study on gender equity policies in the Australian sport system, McKay (1994) identified a dominant liberal feminist discourse that he labeled the "change the rules" discourse. This discourse centred on the idea that

---

<sup>1</sup> A version of this chapter has been published. Hoeber, L., & Frisby, W. (2001). Gender equity for athletes: Rewriting the narrative for this organizational value. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1, 179-209.

equality is achieved once structural barriers within the existing system, such as limited access to programming opportunities, are removed and opportunities are created, an idea that was echoed by the participants in this study. Versions of the equality discourse have also been found in other sectors as well (cf. Bailyn, 2003 - academia; Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998 - banking; Benschop et al., 2001 - banking and law enforcement; Bryson & de Castell, 1993 - and Kenway et al., 1994, 1998 - education).

The predominance of the equality discourse in the sport literature suggests that the terms equity and equality are used interchangeably, yet some organizations have suggested that they do not mean the same thing. This problem has been noted in previous research on gender equity and contributed to confusion and ambiguity about how the organization and its members understood it (cf. Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1995). For example, the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport and Physical Activity (CAAWS), an advocacy group, established separate definitions for gender equity, equality, and equity. They defined gender equity as “the principle and practice of fair allocation of resources, programs and decision-making to both women and men, and includes the redressing of identified imbalances in the benefits available” (Kent & Robertson, 1993, p. 43). Key components of their definition were an emphasis on fairness, the multiple-dimensionality of gender equity, and the necessity of political action to address inequities. They defined equality as:

...treatment that is equal or the same for any two or more groups of people. Within the context of the Canadian sport system, equality refers to girls and women at all levels of the system having the same opportunity as boys and men to participate in the system. (Kent & Robertson, 1993, p. 42)

The equality definition assumes that girls and women are essentially the same as men and boys, and thus should be provided with the same opportunities and treated in the same way (Hall, 1996). CAAWS's definition of equity was as follows:

...equity is the belief and practice of fair and just treatment for individuals and organizations. To be equitable means to be fair, and to appear to be fair. ... Equity does not necessarily mean that all persons must be treated exactly the same. Where discrimination exists, people may need to be treated **differently** in order to be treated **fairly**. In other words, because girls and women live their lives in different conditions from those of males, the creation of equal access may require different treatment. (Kent & Robertson, 1993, p. 4)

For them, equity was equated with fairness and required steps be taken to atone for prior injustices. Fairness recognizes that “equal opportunity, even if it exists, is not equitable if

constraints are very unequal” (Bailyn, 2003, p. 139). It is difficult to achieve equity if one group faces systemic discrimination and are unable to meet the standards that privilege another group. Therefore, gender equity exists when there are “equal opportunities *and* equal constraints” (Bailyn, 2003, p. 140).

In this study, the predominant meaning of gender equity was to position it as ensuring equality between male and female athletes reflecting a liberal feminist understanding. Administrators, coaches, and athletes brought up the idea that women should be equal to men, but they differed in their understandings of how this should be accomplished. They referred to three variations of equality: i) equal opportunities for male and female athletes (79% of respondents); ii) equal allocation of resources (75% of respondents); and iii) equal treatment (32% of respondents). I separated the three variations into distinct sections even though there were inherent connections between them as over half of the respondents (19 in total: 11 women, 8 men) referred to more than one of them. *Equal Opportunities: “Gender equity is equal opportunities for men and women.”*

Twenty-two out of 28 respondents (79%; 13 men, 9 women) defined gender equity as ensuring “equal opportunity for athletes and their teams” (male athlete H4) or that “regardless of your gender, you should be provided with equal opportunities” (female athlete R1). The following quotation was illustrative of this variation:

Equity is having the same opportunities or the chance to the same thing.  
And so I think gender equity ... is the women having the same opportunity as men to do things. So you know having the same opportunities as far as teams ... if there's a sport that they want to play. Or the same vice versa. ... So both genders having the same opportunity if there's a desire there. (male athlete B4)

From a liberal feminist perspective, if the barriers that create a “sloped playing field” and privilege men (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000) are removed within the existing system, it is thought that gender equity can be achieved (Acker, 1987; Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Hall, 1997; Hargreaves, 1990). In sport, those barriers have typically been identified as the lack of programming opportunities afforded to women. As a result, equal opportunities in sport emerged as an organizational strategy implemented in the late 1960s and early 1970s to address inadequacies in the quantity, quality, and diversity of programs available to women (Vertinsky, 1992). The fact that this strategy has become taken for granted may explain why this variation of equality was referred to by a majority of athletes and coaches in each of the selected sport programs (basketball - 57%, ice hockey - 71%, rugby 100%, swimming -

100%). Interestingly though, more men (93%) than women (64%) referred to equal opportunities, suggesting that more men than women assume that gender equity will be accomplished simply by offering an equal number of programming and playing opportunities (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1997, 1999.) Additionally, their belief in equal opportunity served to reinforce an idea that all participants have an equal chance, which in turn implied that men did not receive special treatment (McKay, 1999). Opportunities could refer to many other areas such as equal access to scholarships, athletic therapy, quality coaching, travel, equipment, and so on. Because of the potential for multiple understandings, I asked respondents to elaborate on what equal opportunities meant to them. They described it in terms of programming, scheduling, and access to facilities and resources to name a few areas.

Eleven respondents (39%; 6 women, 5 men) described it as having equal numbers of teams for women and men or the "same amount of opening[s] per team" (female athlete S2), thus ensuring "an equal number of men and women athletes" (male athlete S4). This understanding is in line with the sport literature that advocates for equality in programming (cf. Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Hargreaves, 1990; Kent & Robertson, 1995).

These quotations confirmed my initial assumption that respondents conceptualized equity as equal opportunity with respect to the numbers of programs for athletes (analytical notes, 2000); however, other understandings were also mentioned that I had not initially considered. For example, a male hockey player (H4) suggested that all athletes should have an equal opportunity to access scholarships and to obtain an education, while a male rugby player (R3) and two male coaches (B7 & H6) spoke in terms of all athletes having the chance to improve athletic skills. Two women (a coach and a swimmer) discussed "access to [the] same quality of coaching" (B6) and the "same amount of coaching attention" (S2). The following quotation from the female development officer illustrated that some individuals understood equal opportunities in a comprehensive manner that touched on many aspects of being a university athlete:

I think it is equal access to sport, to playing sport, to be encouraged in sport. And that means everything from participation to scholarships and awards, funding, coaching quality, and then staff for those women's sports. So it affects everything from the coaches all the way down through to the athletes ... in training opportunities and access to professional athletes and their mentoring. It's all of those things. (A2)

For this respondent, gender equity involved having the opportunity to participate in athletics and to access funding, staffing, training, and mentoring. These meanings suggested a broader notion that went beyond simply 'opening the doors' to athletes to participate in the same numbers of sports (Hall, 1996; Shaw, 2001). It was apparent that by listening to more voices, alternative meanings of gender equity were being uncovered (Fletcher, 1999).

*Equal Resources: "Equal funding for male and female teams."*

Twenty-one respondents (75%; 13 women, 8 men) mentioned another variation of equality: equal distribution of, and access to, resources, including financial and human resources. For example, a female basketball player (B2) discussed "equal funding for male and female teams," while a male swimmer (S4) argued that it was about providing an "equal allocation of resources." Based on these points of view, gender equity meant that men's and women's teams should receive the same operating budgets, quality of coaching staff, as well as other resources, such as game day staff, facilities, equipment, and uniforms. This variation of equality implied that while opportunities for men and women to compete can be similar, resources were not always allocated equally.

More women (93%) than men (57%) referred to this variation of equality. One explanation for this difference was that women traditionally have had less access to resources and as a result they were more aware of the need for their equitable distribution. This variation was also used more often by athletes (82%) and administrators (100%) than by coaches (33%). It is possible that since coaches had little control over the distribution of resources, they were less concerned about it compared to the athletes who benefited from them and the administrators who distributed them. A majority of the members of all four sport programs (basketball - 71%, ice hockey - 57%, rugby - 75%, swimming - 100%) spoke about the equitable distribution of resources, which indicated that this was important to most athletes, regardless of their gender or their sport affiliation.

*Equal Treatment: "Teams are treated equally regardless of gender."*

A third variation of equality was the emphasis placed on equal treatment of male and female athletes. Nine respondents (32%; 7 women, 2 men) discussed "mak[ing] sure that the teams are treated equally regardless of gender" (female athlete B1). Approximately 75% of the respondents from the women's basketball team and 67% of the respondents from the women's rugby team referred to this variation of equality. In comparison, no respondents from any of the men's teams mentioned it, suggesting that the respondents from those two

women's teams were more concerned about "how fairly both are treated" (female athlete B2). Historically when making decisions, athletic department administrators have favoured the interests of male athletes, and some female athletes still believed they were treated unfairly. A quotation from a female basketball player provided an example of a historical privilege in facility access provided to the men's basketball team:

There's one great [practice] spot on Thursday early afternoons that everybody wants. And we've never gotten it. It used to be men's basketball forever and ever and ever. I think they probably still have it. It's just been theirs. I think we tried to share it with them and they wouldn't give it up. They've got that spot and they're not letting go. (B1)

The male event management and promotions officer was one of the few men and few administrators to position gender equity as ensuring all athletes were treated in an equitable manner when making decisions. He explained that it:

...is not necessarily if there were the same numbers of men's and women's teams or athletes. It's being treated with the same ... sense of priority from the department when we're thinking about attracting sponsors, or advertising or marketing or hiring coaches or winning on the field or on the court. (A5)

Traditionally, men's sports have been more valued on campuses because they were popular and brought in more revenue. In turn, they were provided with more privileges in areas such as scheduling, marketing and promotions (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). Some respondents suggested that women's teams should be marketed in a similar manner to men's teams, which would illustrate equal importance and value. Compared to the meanings of equal opportunities and equal resources, equal treatment was concerned with putting the organizational value of gender equity into practice in a more sincere and comprehensive way.

#### *Multi-dimensional Meanings of Equality*

Some respondents referred to more than one variation of equality when asked to define this organizational value. For one female coach, gender equity meant equality in the opportunities to participate, in the allocation of resources, and in the treatment of athletes. She explained that gender equity:

... would be ... equal access to participation in sports. Equal treatment as far as scheduling, budget, new equipment. ...equal promotion as far as what's valued on campus for spectators. [The] same amount of funds that go into promotion and marketing. ... access to the same quality of coaching. (B6)



Similarly, a female basketball player indicated that gender equity was about “equal funding for male and female teams, equal publicity, [and] equal exposure” (B1). These comments suggested that gender equity was multi-faceted, requiring attention in several areas including programming opportunities, resources, and treatment, which was reflective of CAAWS’s definition of it (see page 131), except that decision making was not mentioned by the respondents. This finding is also in line with what Shaw (2001) recommended from her work on gender relations in sport organizations. Adding more teams or more spots on teams was not sufficient (Hall, 1996).

The multiple meanings of equality could have stemmed from the fact that the department’s mission statement did not clearly identify or define their organizational values (see appendix D). As a result, while most respondents identified gender equity as an organizational value, the understanding of it was left open to individual interpretation. Based on the post-structuralist feminist understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge (cf. Calás & Smircich, 1996; Kenway et al., 1994; Weedon, 1997), it is reasonable to assume that certain meanings carried more weight than others in part because of who espoused them.

More men (93%) than women (64%) referred to equal opportunities, whereas more women (93%) than men (57%) interpreted gender equity as having equal resources. Male coaches (100%) and male athletes (100%) relied on equal opportunities more than the other meanings, which suggested that it was the easiest way for them to define gender equity because the numbers of teams were already similar. While 50% of female athletes espoused equal treatment, only 20% of administrators and no male athletes did. As shown by McKay (1997, 1999), men in management positions believed their sport organizations followed a principle of equal opportunity. Since it is usually male sport administrators who are identified as key informants in research, their meanings are heard more often and are perpetuated as the truth (cf. Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1997, 1999; Shaw, 2001). This is problematic because there is little consultation with organizational members with lower status and power, such as women or athletes, who may have other understandings of organizational values that could be accommodated (Martin, 1992, 2001; Salzer-Morling, 1998). As well, male sport administrators exercise power through engaging in dialogues and establishing agendas to construct and reinforce dominant discourses that are restrictive and confining, while at the same time overlooking and silencing alternative meanings. Thus, what

is understood as the truth is not open to discussion and challenges to it are easily dismissed (Fletcher, 1999).

Another possible explanation for the different meanings was that it would be simpler and more convenient for some stakeholder groups, especially administrators, to demonstrate equal numbers of programming opportunities for male and female athletes than it would be to ensure equal treatment and access to resources. By emphasizing the mainstream idea of equal opportunity, they were able to direct attention away from alternative understandings that required greater changes and which might have threatened the normalcy of the status quo.

#### *Commentary on Equality*

Prior research on gender equity in sport organizations (cf. Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1994, 1997, 1999) has suggested that equality was often understood as uni-dimensional, with a focus on programming opportunities. This study implied it was multi-dimensional, including the allocation of resources and the treatment of athletes. As a result, administrators, who tended to espouse equal opportunities, needed to recognize that athletes and coaches were also concerned about equality in these other areas. While researchers have used the ideas of equal opportunities, resources, and treatment interchangeably (cf. Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998), I argue that these are different variations of the liberal feminist view of gender equity as not all three naturally existed at the same time. To illustrate, an athletic department can provide equal programming opportunities to male and female athletes, but there are no guarantees that they also provide equal resources to them or treat them equally. Furthermore, if the institutional conditions are unequal in the first place, the treatment and experiences of athletes will not be the same.

Equality in terms of increased numbers of women participating in sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2000; Theberge, 2000) does not adequately challenge the inherent masculine-dominant system of sport (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990). The goal of equality is for women to have the same opportunities as men to participate, but that premise is based on them participating within a traditionally male-dominated system and being equally successful as men (Bailyn, 2003; Hovden, 2000; Larkin & Staton, 1998; Martin, 1994). The underlying assumption is that women are expected to consent to assimilate to the masculine norms that dominate sport (Fraser, 1997; Hall, 1996). Hovden (2000) studied the criteria used to select leaders of Norwegian sport organizations, such as flexibility with time, connections with the

business community, determination, goal-orientation, and loyalty. Despite claims that women had an equal chance to apply for those positions, they were usually deemed less qualified with respect to the subjective criteria that favoured men. Many maintain that this 'add women and stir' approach, where women are mixed in to the existing system, is ineffectual when the existing gendered culture is not confronted (Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Gherardi, 1994; Martin, 2000; McKay, 1994). Meanings of gender equity based on liberal feminism "are not sufficient to disrupt the pervasive and deeply entrenched imbalance of power" (Ely & Meyerson, 2000, p. 589), so it has not led to substantial changes to the existing male dominated structures, practices, conditions and power relations that sustain gender inequities in organizations (Acker, 2000; Benschop et al., 2001; Ely & Meyerson, 2000). Specifically, gender equity initiatives based on liberal feminist notions do not address historical and systemic inequities embedded in the masculine culture of sport organizations, such as the devaluing of female athletes and women's sports, which made it difficult for men and women to be equal in the first place (Bell-Altenstad & Vail, 1995; Greendorfer, 1998; Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Lenskyj, 1994; McKay, 1999; Nilges, 1998; Staurowsky, 1995).

Other researchers have found that organizational members assumed they all clearly understood what gender equity meant and shared the same meanings (Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Garnsey & Rees, 1996). The multiple meanings of gender equity (i.e., equality as equal opportunities, equal resources, or equal treatment) implied that understandings of this organizational value were not completely shared. Two other meanings were also evident and I labeled them: i) conditional equality and ii) it is a women's only issue.

### ***Conditional Equality***

Conditional equality was another prominent meaning, whereby individuals appeared to support gender equity, but resisted changes in the status quo unless they were beneficial to the dominant group. McKay (1999) noted that male managers expressed support for gender equity initiatives in Canadian national sport organizations as long as women were not provided with special considerations because of their gender. In her study of responses to gender equity policies in a university setting, Bagilhole (2002) found some men were cautious and conservative in their understandings of how it could be implemented into organizational practices.

In this study, some respondents (36%; 4 women, 6 men) understood gender equity as an organizational value that was achievable only under certain conditions or scenarios. Respondents who spoke about conditional equality took various factors into consideration that restricted possibilities for implementation, due to the desire to maintain the status quo. They believed that men's teams should continue to be treated more favourably because they earned their privileged status as a result of their tradition, history, and status with the department.<sup>i</sup> Whereas the equality meaning reiterated a view of men and women as the same and thus should be treated the same, this understanding of gender equity reflected the view that women should be treated differently because they are distinct from men (Fraser, 1997; Hall, 1996). Fraser (1997) argued that this meaning was problematic because it was essentialist and reinforced gendered stereotypes.

*Considering Institutional Conditions: "It doesn't necessarily have to be dollar for dollar."*

Some respondents added a caveat by saying that it was not possible, or even desirable, for the department to achieve gender equity for every competitive university team, considering the financial ramifications, the popularity of men's sports, the success of teams, or the histories of the teams on campus.

Of the four sport programs, conditional equality was most prevalent with members of the two hockey teams (100% of ice hockey). One female hockey player defended the provision of different levels of funding to men's and women's teams when she defined gender equity as:

...providing what's needed according to what's needed almost. It's not straight out okay they get you know \$250,000, we get \$250,000. Because we don't need that. ... So it's just a matter of treating each team according to what you know they need to be able to function. (H2)

Since the women's ice hockey team was a newer team on campus with fewer conference games and players than the men's hockey team, she felt it was unnecessary for her team to receive the same level of funding. Another female ice hockey player (H1) stated, "when I define equity I take into factor other things as far as how long the sport's been around," while a third female hockey player (H3) believed that if a sport was not as popular, it should get less money. They believed it was appropriate to provide more resources and programming opportunities to men's teams that had a longer history or were more popular. The coach of the women's ice hockey team (H6) saw gender equity as "an equality of opportunity situation. So [it] doesn't necessarily have to be dollar for dollar, player for player

type of thing.” For him, as long as programming opportunities were equal, other components of the university athlete experience did not have to be the same for male and female athletes. Their meanings of gender equity considered the historical and social contexts of ice hockey that were characterized by entrenched gender relations (Theberge, 2000). Martin and Meyerson (1998) found that some upper management women excused the practice of men hiring other men, which contributed gender discrimination in the selection process. Similarly, findings from this study illustrated that some female athletes defended the athletic department’s position of providing more resources to men’s teams even though their own teams were disadvantaged.

In another example, part of the intercollegiate coordinator’s interpretation of gender equity centred on the idea of providing “equal fundings for those opportunities at the level of which they’re warranted” (female administrator A1). While it was reasonable to consider what was gender equitable on a sport-by-sport basis and to recognize the unique needs of each team, these needs were defined by the administrators rather than by the athletes. The female ice hockey players acknowledged that their basic needs, such as ice time and essential equipment, were addressed. However, they would have preferred to practice on an appropriate ice surface with matching equipment and a full time coach, but these needs were not seen as essential by athletic administrators.

*Not Taking Away From Others: “Not at the expense of the men’s teams.”*

Respondents discussed not adversely affecting the traditional structure of sport that favoured men’s teams. Most of the male coaches (80%) claimed they supported gender equity in the sense of providing programming opportunities and resource support, but only as long as the existing practices for men’s teams were maintained. One male coach’s (S5) understanding was that, “everybody should be allowed to pursue athletics at the highest level, but if it’s at the expense of somebody else who’s at a higher level, then I don’t necessarily agree [with that].” His comments implied that there was a gender order in university sports, with male athletes playing at a higher level than female athletes, and as such they deserved more support and promotion. This male coach further explained that:

They [the administrators] need to be able to assess the level of the team and the entry point. And what it takes to be forward and what’s competitive. ... And women might not be as good as top twelve in men. And that’s the reality right now. Maybe in fifteen years it’s equal. ... [In] some of these sports that we’re adding to for gender equity, wonderful ideas. But the reality

is they're not as good as the men's sports. Sorry. Build the program. Right [but] not at the expense of the men's program. (S5)

He, like other coaches of men's teams, supported gender equity, but did not want to see resources being diverted away from existing men's programs to support newly established women's teams. They saw the participation of women as a threat to the established gender order where sport was a male domain and women were invaders in their space (Theberge, 2000; Vertinsky, 2000).

Despite their concerns that resources were being diverted to support new women's teams, over three seasons the men's university teams collectively received between 35 – 37% of the athletic department's total budget, while women's teams received only 16 – 19%, demonstrating that even with the addition of two new teams for women the men received twice as much of the financial resources (see table 5 in chapter 4 and appendix G).

#### *Commentary on Conditional Equality*

I was not surprised that some men (43%) expressed the conditional equality discourse, as research has consistently shown that they are privileged within the existing sport system and would not likely endorse changes that could significantly threaten those privileges (Greendorfer, 1998; Kay, 1996; Kidd, 1995; Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). Staurowsky (1998) suggested that their reliance on it may be explained by the fact that they do not recognize the prevalence of systemic barriers facing women. Messner (1988) found that many men approved of women competing in sport, but maintained a belief that “inequality is part of the natural order” (p. 207). Therefore, it was unrealistic to expect that male and female athletes would have the same access to resources or programming opportunities, because male athletes are ‘naturally’ more talented and their athletic performances are more highly valued. Greendorfer (1998) found that some male coaches and administrators in American universities felt that the privileges provided to men's teams must be protected against what they saw as the threat of preferential treatment of women's teams. Their protection of the status quo reinforced the underlying belief in the superiority of men's interests and that “reverse discrimination is far worse than systemic discrimination and ignores decades of unequal access discrimination against women” (Greendorfer, 1998, p. 87). This meaning is indicative of hegemonic power in that inequities based on gender were taken for granted as natural or normal (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Kearins, 1996).

I did not expect some women (29%) to also rely on this meaning of gender equity. One female rugby player (R2) explained she did not support the idea of equal programming opportunities across all sports, because "If you're stopping people from playing their sport because there's not another girls' team ... I think it's stupid." A similar comment was made by one female administrator (A2) who asked, "Do you eliminate football because it skews the gender equity issues? I mean ... that's eliminating an opportunity to play a sport for men just to accommodate women's inability to play football." In the current social environment, if athletic departments wanted to add a new team for men, it was generally expected that a team for women would be added, thus ensuring equal opportunities to participate. Nevertheless, this department recently added a men's baseball team without adding a female counterpart in the same or another sport, and football continued to exist as a male-only sport at this university.<sup>ii</sup> Given the patriarchal nature of sport, it might be safer for women to accept the status quo than to advocate for greater changes and risk having their opportunities and resources reduced or taken away by the men who control university sport (Blinde et al., 1993, 1994; McClung & Blinde, 2002; Staurowsky, 1998). Benschop and Doorewaard's (1998) also found that some women resisted equal opportunities policies believing that being the recipients of special treatment because of their gender would undermine their achievements. In my study, some women may have interpreted gender equity under conditional terms because of the risks associated with taking a stronger stance, such as being labeled a troublemaker and jeopardizing their career (Ashford, 1998; Ashford et al., 1998; Martin & Meyerson, 1998).

### ***It is a Women's Only Issue***

It is well-documented that women have had fewer opportunities to participate as athletes in sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2000; Hoffman, 1995; Hall, 1996; Inglis, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990) and that less attention has been paid to them by the media, fans, administrators, and sponsors (Kane, 1996; Shaw & Amis, 2001; Staurowsky, 1995). Gender equity initiatives and policies have traditionally targeted women to level the playing field (cf. Doherty & Varpalotai, 2000; Hall, 1996; Hoffman, 1995; Kay, 1996; Kidd, 1995; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1997; Theberge, 2000). While there have been improvements in regards to women's involvement in sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2000; Inglis et al., 1996, 2000), the fact that gender equity was espoused as a women's only issue by

many of the respondents suggested they believed that all women were underprivileged and undervalued. I identified three different variations of this meaning in the data: i) women were undervalued as athletes (32% of respondents; 8 women, 1 man); ii) something should be done for women, but not for men (71%; 9 women, 11 men); and iii) gender equity was the women's responsibility (68%; 10 women, 9 men).

*Women were Undervalued: "Women are the curtain raisers."*

Some respondents (32%; 8 women, 1 man) positioned gender equity as a women's only issue because women's teams and female athletes were characterized as the "curtain raisers" for men's sports (R1), the "underdogs" (B1), "second-class" athletes (H1) or "not the top bill" (B6). One female athlete (R1) stated that in many sports the tradition of scheduling women's competitions first implied they were not the primary focus or the main event, but instead they were the opening act or the 'curtain raisers' for the men's teams. Men's teams and male athletes were regarded as having superior and desirable skills and talents and thus were more highly valued (Eitzen, 2003, Gruneau & Whitson, 1993). In comparison, women's teams and female athletes were viewed as inferior and less valued, and thus not worthy of being showcased in prime time (Kane, 1996; McClung & Blinde, 2002; Nilges, 1998).

The idea that male athletes were more skilled and thus more important indicated a gender order, which in turn meant that men had more power and privilege than women athletes (Connell, 1987; Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; McKay, 1994, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1995). In a hypothetical example, one female coach acknowledged this division when she stated:

If you take one of the best men's basketball players and throw him in a gym with the best women, there's always going to be that separation, which is always the "I'm better than you, so I'm valued more than you." (B6)

Overall, members of the sport programs did not frequently refer to the women's only issue discourse (basketball – 28%, ice hockey – 14%, rugby – 50%, swimming – 40%). None of the men associated with the sport programs discussed the undervaluing of female athletes and women's teams, while some members of women's teams recognized and even reinforced their secondary status. For example, one female hockey player (H1) believed that "the men ... they're athletes. And we're just trying to be athletes." The formal separation of male and female athletes on gender-segregated university teams should minimize comparisons made between them; yet, because of the prevailing and deeply held view that



men were the real athletes, this discourse supported a naturalized distinction between them (Connell, 1987; Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Nilges, 1998). Consequently, some female athletes felt that their accomplishments did not measure up to those of male athletes. Hall (1996) critiqued the prevailing practice of setting men up as the norm in sport against which women are compared. She suggested that this devalued the accomplishments of women because the norms privileged masculine skills and attributes, such as competitiveness, physicality, and aggressiveness.

*Something Should be Done for Women: "Helping women's programs stay even with men's programs"*

Over 70% of the respondents (11 men, 9 women) understood gender equity as an organizational value that specifically benefited women, not men, in the department. This meaning was referred to by a majority of all three stakeholder groups (athletes – 59%, coaches – 83%, administrators – 100%) and in all four sport programs (basketball – 71%, ice hockey – 57%, rugby – 75%, swimming – 60%), which suggested that it was systemic and inscribed in the organizational culture. One male administrator (A4) noted that gender equity was understood, particularly by other administrators, as “an issue of helping women's programs stay even with men's programs.” A male coach of a women's team (R4) indicated, “Equity is saying ‘well let's try to change this for women so they can do it better.’” The objective was for women to be “on par with the men” (female coach B6). In other research, this meaning has been labeled as doing something for women (Liff & Cameron, 1997) or a woman-centred ideology (Yule, 1997), where the understanding is that equity initiatives help women only (Ely & Meyerson, 2000).

For two male coaches, their support of this discourse stemmed from their concerns about limitations with their daughters' future opportunities in sport. One full-time coach stated:

... a lot of men ... had daughters, [and] they wanted the opportunity to have scholarships for their daughters. I myself have one daughter, a four-year-old daughter, and I'm looking for opportunities for her. And it certainly shed light and opened up my thoughts and beliefs in it as well by having a daughter. (male coach B7)

For them and a majority of the male athletes (71%) gender equity “isn't a huge issue with me” (male coach H7) because they “haven't really had any problems” (male athlete B5). Many male athletes have not been faced with a limited competitive schedule, having to buy their own equipment, or making due with less than adequate training facilities. Few coaches

of the selected men's teams were paid an honorarium instead of a salary or worked in a small office (see chapter 4). Since gender equity was not something that directly affected the coaches of men's teams or male athletes, they did not associate gender equity with 'helping out the men' for the most part. In general, men had little experience with oppression and consequently gender equity did not often enter their consciousness (Bagilhole, 2002; Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1997, 1999). Instead, they indirectly understood it because of their relationships with their daughters, wives, mothers, or sisters and were supportive if it would benefit women they knew (McKay, 1997, 1999). It is interesting that none of the coaches or administrators who had families mentioned concerns about the opportunities for their sons to be involved in sport. This illustrated an underlying assumption that few men were disadvantaged in the existing system and substantiated the historical privileges that men have had in sport.

*It was the Women's Responsibility: "She was one of the few who really made gender equity a priority."*

Based on the assumptions that women had the most vested interests in elevating their status in organizations and that they benefited most from gender equity practices and policies (Ashford, 1998; Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Inglis et al., 2000; McKay, 1997, 1999), it was not surprising that 19 respondents (68%; 10 women, 9 men) implied gender equity was the responsibility of women. All the coaches (100%) and most of the administrators (80%) referred to this idea. Although only 53% of the athletes referred to it, 70% of female athletes felt that gender equity was their responsibility.

Over half of the members of the four sport programs (basketball – 57%, ice hockey – 86%, rugby – 50%, swimming – 60%) indicated that if their sport was to be gender equitable, women had to take on the responsibility of being actively involved in narrowing the gap and letting people know if "they're being treated properly" (male coach S5). This feeling was most prominent in ice hockey where 86% of participants shared this understanding. Some members of the women's ice hockey team were involved in gender equity efforts as a means of demonstrating their legitimacy to the department. One was the president of the athletic council and another organized a hockey pool "... to prove to them that we can come up with some money" on their own (H2). According to these two female athletes, they took on the responsibility to "make it a little harder for them to cut us so quickly" (H2) and to make it "harder for them to be sexist because I'm standing right there" (H1).

Some of the other ways in which women were actively involved consisted of being aware of gender equity issues, questioning the status quo at athlete council meetings, and advocating for changes to programming opportunities and resource allocations. A male coach of a women's team stated it was important to have women in leadership positions, such as one of his players who was the president of the athletic council, to make sure "things [did not] get out of whack on the equity thing" (male coach H6). The female intercollegiate coordinator was identified by a male administrator (A4) as the primary person in the athletic department who "really made gender equity a priority," in part because she was in charge of university athletics, but also because "she was the highest-ranked woman in the program." It was assumed that men in similar positions (e.g., president of the athletic council or intercollegiate coordinator) "would let it slide" (female coach B6). Other women who were actively involved in gender equity included a coach (B6) who made sure game day programs and half-time promotions were equal between the men's and women's teams and the development officer (A2) who encouraged alumni to donate to women's teams as well as to men's teams. These examples illustrated that some women have internalized this meaning and taken on the responsibility for gender equity for athletes, because if they did not do it there would be no pressure to change. This assumption was also formally included in the department's written gender equity policy, where the onus was put on individuals associated with women's teams (i.e., coaches and athletes) to be "active in their community outreach and alumni development" for fundraising and scholarship development (see appendix A). There was no mention of the responsibility of other coaches, athletes, or administrators associated with men's teams in regards to gender equity. By institutionalizing women's responsibility for gender equity in a policy and by remaining silent on men's responsibility for it, athletic administrators' construction of knowledge contributed to placing responsibility for gender equity improvement on women.

Most of the women I interviewed felt some level of responsibility for gender equity for athletes. In stark contrast, seven male respondents, including some coaches of men's teams and some male athletes, admitted that they had no part in it. This sentiment was exemplified by one male basketball player (B5) who in responding to my interview questions explained that he was trying to "equate it basically to the women's point of view with it," because he did not "perceive it to be a major problem." While he might have been trying to be empathetic, his comments further highlighted male privilege in sport (Hall, 1996).

Some of the male coaches of men's teams indicated they only thought about gender equity if there was a possibility that their teams would be negatively affected by new initiatives, such as through financial cutbacks to their operating budget to accommodate women's programs. Some men believed that it was women's, not men's, responsibility to rectify gender inequities. A male coach indicated that the budgets for the men's teams were typically larger in part because they have had more time to establish and develop them. To address this issue, he recommended that "the responsibility goes to the women's program [to] develop your budget to this level" (S5). There was no consideration on his part that the budgets for men's teams were excessive and should be reviewed. There was no questioning of the current levels of funding to the men's teams, as it was assumed that the current privileges that men's teams and male athletes received were appropriate and justified and that women's teams needed to work harder to close the gap.

Other researchers have also found that men tend to reject responsibility for gender equity because they had not experienced any problems (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Liff & Cameron, 1997; McKay, 1997). Post-structuralist feminists argued that it was a male privilege to reject responsibility. They maintained that some organizational members abdicated responsibility for gender equity because it was a distraction from their 'real work' (Fletcher, 1999a; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999), which implied that it was women's work.

This lack of responsibility for gender equity by some men was significant in that they had greater access to forums in which power was exercised to establish "a system of shared meaning that reinforce[d] mainstream ideas and silence[d] alternatives" (Fletcher, 1999a, p. 17). In the department studied, a man held the top management position of athletic director. From his place in the department, he exercised power through engaging in dialogues and setting agendas, and thus was intimately involved in knowledge making (Rao et al., 1999). In addition, the total number of male coaches (16) significantly outnumbered the number of female coaches (5) at the time of data collection, which meant that men's voices were more prevalent in discussions and meetings (Rao et al., 1999). If these men did not see gender equity as an important value, a point that was made by one male athlete (S3) who stated that gender equity was "not that important to enough people," it is unlikely that this value would be reflected in organizational practices. Power can be used to bring attention to gender equity or to advocate for changes through what Rao et al. (1999) termed the power of conflict. In this study though, it did not appear that many male administrators and coaches

exercised power for that purpose. A few of the women including the female intercollegiate coordinator and the one female coach did recognize that if they did not advocate for gender equity, little attention would be paid to it. Even more significant was the finding that the onus was on female athletes who have little positional power to police the actions of others, including those in positions of authority (Acker, 2000; Kenway et al., 1998). Since the men indicated they had no or little responsibility for gender equity, one can anticipate that changes will be slow or non-existent. There was little recognition of shared responsibility for gender equity (Inglis et al., 2000) or that it was important to both women and men (Alvesson & Billing, 1997).

*Commentary on It is a Women's Only Issue*

Even though this meaning appeared to atone for historical and structural inequities by recognizing that women have traditionally been disadvantaged, there were three concerns with it. First, positioning gender equity as a women's only issue sent the message that women required special treatment to compensate for their 'deficiencies' (Liff & Cameron, 1997). Second, it was based on the assumption that all women were disadvantaged within the existing system (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Nilges, 2000) and did not recognize the possibility that gender equity could be relevant for all male athletes in the department. Third, and most importantly, the prevailing discourse allowed men to abdicate responsibility for it.<sup>iii</sup>

This meaning implied that women required and received special treatment based on their gender, which contributed to resentment from some men as it conflicted with the underlying assumption that individuals succeeded based on their own merit (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998; Shaw, 2001; Shaw & Slack, 2002). It naturally placed the responsibility for rectifying these inequities on all women, but did not recognize that men's involvement in sport could also be modified (McKay, 1997). Additionally, it did not consider that alternative discourses were needed to support change (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Liff & Cameron, 1997).

This meaning did not acknowledge that some men were or could be disadvantaged by the hegemonic masculine ideology (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Nilges, 2000). Previous research has also shown that not all women felt disadvantaged in the existing sport system or considered themselves as second-class athletes (Blinde et al., 1994; Riemer & Chelladurai, 2001; Staurowsky, 1998). One example with the rugby teams illustrated that female athletes had more privileges than male athletes. The women's rugby program was a CIAU sport; a

status that afforded them access to travel funds for CIAU-sanctioned national championships. In contrast, the men's rugby program had club status, which meant they did not have access to national championship funding.

It was also problematic to assume that women were a homogeneous group who all equally benefited from gender equity (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990). Women competed in a variety of sports with different structures and institutional conditions, which impacted their access to programming opportunities, resources, and treatment. As discussed in chapter 6, women who competed in major sports (e.g., basketball) tended to be better off than women who competed in minor sports (e.g., rugby). A similar argument can be made for male athletes in the basketball and rugby programs. While many men were privileged in the existing system, those who competed in minor sports (e.g., swimming and rugby) generally received less promotion and resources than men who competed in major sports (e.g., basketball and ice hockey). I agree that the alternative understandings of gender equity that challenge and critique the existing masculine structure of sport or that do not reinforce a natural gender order with women as the disadvantaged gender should be established (Hargreaves, 1990). However, the findings from this study suggested that there was still a need to direct attention to women, as the traditional gender ideology continues to exist in sport and there have not been enough significant changes to suggest that women are on an 'equal footing' with men.

### ***Concluding Comments on Meanings of Gender Equity***

This chapter consisted of a discussion of three meanings of gender equity for athletes: equality, conditional equality, and it is a women's only issue. Respondents' notions of equality frequently reflected a liberal feminist ideology where the focus was on ensuring that male and female athletes were provided with equal access to opportunities, resources, and treatment. I uncovered two other dominant meanings: conditional equality, which was about supporting equal opportunities, resources, and treatment to male and female athletes as long as existing privileges were not threatened, and gender equity is a women's only issue, which abdicated men from their responsibility for ensuring gender equity.

The findings in this chapter clearly illustrated that the meanings of gender equity for athletes were multiple and sometimes contradictory, which disputed the assumption of shared and unitary meanings in much of the organizational values' literature (cf. Buenger et

al., 1996; Cable & Judge, 1996, 1997; Dobni et al., 2000; Pant & Lachman, 1998; Voss et al., 2000). Although previous literature in sport has shown multiple understandings of gender equity (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997, Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Sanger & Mathes, 1997), the differences in understandings were generally defined by one's stakeholder group, gender, or sport affiliation. My findings suggested that meanings of gender equity were not clearly defined by these factors. For example, while some female athletes and administrators agreed that gender equity was a women's responsibility, not all of them shared this view. Similarly, the conditional equality meaning was used by some male coaches and athletes, presumably to protect their existing privileges, but it was also identified by all the female hockey players, who were at a distinct disadvantage compared to their male counterparts. Using a post-structuralist feminist perspective heightened my awareness of these differences in meanings of gender equity, by recognizing that groupings such as gender, sport affiliation, and stakeholder position were arbitrary and did not accurately reflect the diversity of individuals. Meanings were not fixed in a particular setting (Alvesson & Billing, 1997; Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Fraser & Nicholson, 1990; Kenway et al., 1994, 1998; Weedon, 1997). Instead, they changed depending on which organizational practice or teams the respondents discussed.

One aim of post-structuralist feminism is to reveal alternative and hidden meanings. Equality is mentioned frequently in the gender equity in sport literature and was the most dominant one used by respondents. By listening to a variety of voices (Ferguson, 1994), alternative meanings, that is conditional equality and gender equity is a women's only issue, became apparent. Nevertheless, these meanings, while somewhat different from each other, all reinforced the existing gender asymmetry (Gherardi, 1994) and reflected a liberal feminist perspective, in which the belief is that men and women should be recognized and treated as equals in our society (Calás & Smircich, 1996; Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Theberge, 2000a; Vertinsky, 1992). The equality meaning ignored the hegemonic masculinity ideology embedded in sport that served to privilege men over women. The conditional equality meaning supported maintaining the status quo so as not to pose a threat to existing advantages experienced by some men's teams and male athletes. Even though the women's only issue meaning recognized the barriers that many women faced, it reinforced the essentialist notions that all women were disadvantaged and that they were solely responsible for their lack of success in the male world of sport. Overall, the emphasis of each of the three dominant meanings was on upholding traditional patriarchal values and practices,

while changing structural aspects of the system to help women, rather than challenging the fundamental values that underpin sport or acknowledging the role of other axes of diversity.

None of the meanings served to disrupt the traditional and taken for granted assumptions underpinning the knowledge truths associated with university athletics. There was little mention of meanings that questioned male privilege within the existing system and that focused on “transforming competitive practices, hierarchal structures, and men’s values” (McKay, 1994, p. 81). There was little consideration of understandings that incorporated the concepts of fairness and justice (Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Hall, 1996) or that recognized the need to have “unequal treatment in unequal situations” (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998, p. 799). There was little discussion of meanings that acknowledged multiple and constantly shifting understandings of this value, similar to Meyerson and Kolb’s (2000) post-equity or Bryson and de Castell’s (1993) post-structuralist discourses. Meyerson and Kolb’s (2000, p. 563) post-equity discourse assumed that “sex differences are socially constructed and that they take on particular forms depending on race, class, and other aspects of identity.” In a similar vein, Bryson and de Castell (1993, p. 352) conceptualized gender equity as a “more generalized policy of equity with respect to a vast range of kinds of difference,” recognizing that gender is “no more a privileged site of difference than race, class, or any of a host of other possible differences.” While there was some recognition of differences that extended beyond gender, such as the institutional conditions of teams, no one discussed the impact of gender in relation to other aspects of identity such as race, ability, social class, or sexuality. The absence of these understandings may be attributed to the fact that since meanings in sport are created, controlled, and reinforced in many situations by white men with similar backgrounds (Bell-Altenstad & Vail, 1995), alternative meanings that challenge the masculine culture have not been considered (McKay, 1994). It might also be that respondents did not have access to alternative understandings, and thus were unable to conceive of it in ways that challenged the taken for granted liberal feminist ideology. As a result, dominant meanings of gender equity have become so ingrained and accepted that it was seen as a “straightforward technical problem, rather than a question that has scarcely begun to be formulated, whose meaning has yet to be grasped” (Bryson & de Castell, 1993, p. 345).

From a post-structuralist feminist perspective, these meanings illustrated the complexities and struggles involved in understanding gender equity (Oswick et al., 1997).



They also represented “the gender we think” (Gherardi, 1994, p. 591) that is, how respondents understood gender equity. In the next chapter, I turn my attention to “the gender we do” (Gherardi, 1994, p. 591) that is how gender equity was enacted. Given the complexity associated with this organizational value, variations and inconsistencies with respect to how this value was enacted are expected (Bagilhole, 2002; Bryson & de Castell, 1993).

---

<sup>i</sup> This meaning was reminiscent of the CAAWS’s definition of equity that emphasized fairness and implied an allowance for differences depending on circumstances. However, the meanings provided by the respondents stressed the goal of ensuring that men and women had equal opportunities, resources, or treatment. Fairness and justice did not enter into their understandings. Instead, they were advocating for the maintenance of historical differential treatment, instead of championing for different treatment to atone for historical inequities. Hence, I labeled this meaning ‘conditional equality’ rather than ‘conditional equity.’

<sup>ii</sup> Women’s football was not a CIAU sport and I was unaware of any university women’s football teams in Canada. If they did exist, it was most likely at the club level.

<sup>iii</sup> I discuss how men abdicated responsibility for gender equity in chapter 7.

## 6

### Gender Equity and Organizational Practices

Underlying the idea that organizational values establish and underpin the vision of how organizations should operate (Collins & Porras, 1996; Pant & Lachman, 1998) is the assumption that if values are espoused, they should be implemented (cf. Stackman et al., 2000). Recent studies have demonstrated that the value of gender equity is not always enacted and researchers have recommended that organizational practices be examined to expose this problem (Bagilhole, 2002; Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Gherardi, 1994; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). This is important because espoused values will have little impact if they are only used to create a favourable public impression (Garnsey & Rees, 1996; Martin, 2000). Since discourses are manifest in organizational practices as well as in language, it was important to understand this aspect of the production and maintenance of asymmetrical power relations (Fletcher, 1999; Phillips & Hardy, 2002).

Although there is some literature that addresses gender equity practices, particularly around the issue of compliance with Title IX legislation in the United States (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998; Sanger & Mathes, 1997; see chapter 2), much of it has overlooked the relationship between meanings and practices. While these studies provided evidence of the embedded nature of gender inequities in sport organizations, they did not examine whether multiple meanings are actually put into practice. In order to change these practices, it is imperative that the dominant meanings which drive these practices be identified, while uncovering the meanings that have been suppressed (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). This provides insight into the connection between discourse construction and power relations. As Weedon (1997, p. 108) stated, "it is only by looking at a discourse in operation ... that it is possible to see whose interests it serves at a particular moment."

In this chapter, I identified, discussed, and analyzed the manner in which gender equity was enacted for the sport programs studied and how those practices related to the previously identified meanings. Acker (1990) identified five gendered practices in organizations: i) establishing formal divisions of labour, space, and power; ii) implementing formal work practices such as job selection and resource allocation; iii) executing informal work practices such as social interactions between men and women; iv) establishing symbols

and images; and v) constructing gender identities. In this study, formal practices were the focus of attention.

The three organizational practices that were most often discussed by respondents as contributing to gender equity and inequity were programming, resource allocation, and promotions (see appendix O for a detailed overview of responses based on gender, stakeholder group, and sport affiliation). As a result, I highlighted these three practices, although I realize that there are many others that could contribute to gender equity (e.g., decision making, fundraising, and policy development). Programming referred to the department's establishment of teams and their practice and competitive schedules. Resource allocation considered the distribution of financial, human, and material resources, as well as the provision of access to facilities and fields. Promotion referred to the department's marketing, communications, and recognition of athletes. Unlike previous work on gender equity in sport that have primarily relied on interview and/or survey data (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; McKay, 1997, 1999; Sanger & Mathes, 1997), I collected and analyzed data from additional sources including observations, news releases, and operating budgets to interpret, challenge, and make sense of the respondents' understandings of how gender equity was implemented. This was important because some informants could have indicated that gender equity was an organizational value that was fully implemented when that was not actually the case.

### ***Gender Equity and Programming***

To uncover respondents' understandings of organizational practices, I asked them to consider if the department and their team was gender equitable and to provide evidence to support their claim. They identified a number of practices both at the departmental and team levels. The most commonly mentioned organizational practice was programming or the department's establishment of teams, which referred to either the number of teams for men and women or the number of spots on teams for male and female athletes. This conception of gender equity related to the equal opportunities meaning of gender equity that was discussed in chapter 5.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents (64%; 9 women, 9 men) felt the department provided equal programming opportunities in terms of the numbers of teams for male and female athletes and the numbers of female and male athletes. In comparison, 36% of the

respondents (7 women, 3 men) believed that this varied across the department. Most of the discussions for this practice considered programming at the departmental level rather than at the sport level, because it was assumed that since both men and women competed in the four sports I selected, they were already equitable.

*Equality in Programming: "If there's a men's sport, there's a women's sport."*

A majority of athletes (65%), coaches (67%), and administrators (60%) believed that there were "equal [numbers] of men and women's teams" in the department (male coach S5). This understanding was shared among most respondents based on their sport affiliation (ice hockey - 71%, rugby - 75%, swimming - 100%). The one exception was with basketball where only the female coach and two male players shared this belief. The interview questions were open-ended and as a result I did not expect or require all respondents to speak to the same practices, which might explain why only a few of them commented on programming.

The idea that "if there's a men's program, there's a women's program out there" (female athlete H2) was attributed to the department's philosophy of broad-based programming and to their obligation to conference policies. According to a female coach (B6), they "offered a lot of sports and they try to balance if there's a men's sport, there's a women's sport. And so a claim to fame is the broad based access to a number of different sports." Others suggested that they were obligated to guarantee equal numbers of teams for men and women. According to one female athlete (R2), "your university has to have the same amount of girls' teams as it does boys' teams. Like that's a rule. And I think at LCU that we do have the same." CIAU regulations stipulated that member universities must support a minimum of one sport for men and one for women, while the regional conference mandated a minimum of two sports for men, two for women (CIAU, 1998; Regional Conference, 1999).

The department, however, was not formally mandated to ensure equal numbers of teams across all sports. At the time of the data collection, there were 16 university teams for men and 14 for women (see table 6 in chapter 4). Historically women had fewer opportunities to participate in Canadian university sports (Matthews, 1974). The current situation suggested that there is a commitment to gender equity as evidenced by the increased number of teams available to women (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Inglis, 1988; Pomfret, 1986). The recent addition of ice hockey and rugby teams for women at the CIAU

and departmental levels was often cited as examples of gender equity in programming, because these two sports had traditionally been the domain of men, but were now open to both men and women (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Mean, 2001; Schacht, 1996; Theberge, 2000). This showed that the CIAU and the department were responding to calls for new ways to get women involved in university athletics.<sup>i</sup> Nevertheless, there were two sports (football and baseball) in which there was not a dedicated team for women.<sup>ii</sup> The recent addition of two new teams for women along with the existence of two men's only teams could explain why more male athletes (86%) than female athletes (50%) assumed there were equal numbers of teams. Male athletes were aware that the numbers of teams for women had increased, but female athletes recognized that they could not participate in all sports.

While all respondents implied that the number of teams were the same, they overlooked other aspects of programming. For example, while the men's and women's basketball teams competed in the same gymnasium on the same evenings, the women's game was always scheduled before the men's game (see chapter 4), with the understanding that more spectators came to watch the men.<sup>iii</sup> One of the few examples where a men's team was disadvantaged in its programming was with the men's rugby team because it did not compete for a CIAU championship. The women's ice hockey team played 12 regular season games in comparison to 28 games for the men's team (see appendix H). In addition, the women's hockey team traveled less often and competed against a fewer number of teams in their league. These oversights were significant because, as identified in the previous chapter, respondents' understanding of programming opportunities extended beyond just the opportunity to compete. It also referred to the possibility of playing during a favourable time slot, traveling, or vying for a national championship.

Hall (1997) stated that many equity strategies are underpinned by liberal feminist agendas where the aim is to increase women's participation rates and interest in sport by adding more programs or teams. One male coach suggested that ensuring equal numbers of teams or athletes was a relatively simplistic way for athletic departments to demonstrate their commitment to gender equity, but he questioned whether it was the most appropriate way:

... the easiest but maybe not the most effective way to do it is like if we have 200 women, we should have 200 men. And I don't know if that's the necessary right way to do it. But it is the easiest way. (S5)

Pointing to recent changes in programming that established a gender balance in these four sports represented a simplistic solution to a complex problem as it failed to address other

aspects of their experiences (Garnsey & Rees, 1996; Hall, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Vertinsky, 1992).

*Conditional Equality in Programming: It depends on "what model you use."*

More women (50%) than men (21%) indicated that equity in programming depended on "what model you will use when you're looking at [it] in the overall department of athletics" (female administrator A2). About 40% of athletes and 60% of administrators agreed that there was conditional gender equity in programming, while none of the coaches commented on it. Approximately a third of the respondents of the basketball and ice hockey teams indicated that programming was equitable "to some extent" (male athlete B4). However, no members of the rugby and swim teams mentioned it. This difference could be attributed to the reality that some athletes were aware of the availability of programs within the department, while others were only aware of the situation within their particular sport.

The ambiguity surrounding gender equity in programming stemmed from the diversity of ways that it could be interpreted (Rao et al., 1999). Although most respondents commented on it with respect to the number of teams for men and women, there were other ways of implementing it. For example, Inglis (1988) examined the number of national championships, teams, and athletes in her study of the opportunities for men and women in the CIAU. Among the selected sports in this study, all teams except for men's rugby competed for a national CIAU championship. In all four sports the roster sizes were larger for the men's teams (see chapter 4). At the departmental level, there were more spots available for men considering that men's football and men's baseball had relatively large rosters.<sup>iv</sup> These findings underscored the fact that simply focusing on the number of teams overlooked many other aspects of programming (Kenway et al., 1998).

Even though there were more teams for men and there were more male athletes in the department, the male athletic director repeatedly stated that programming was equitable on a "sport by sport basis":

Some sports have developed and others are just growing. In sports where there is some tradition at LCU, so basketball, volleyball, swimming, track and field, cross country, golf. If you take a look at say 80 percent of our programs, they're gender balanced in terms of opportunities, travel, league, coaching, etcetera. But ... there are some that are difficult because in the case of the men's sports. Well let's look at rugby and ice hockey, which have been traditionally played for a number of years by men and only recently by women. ... They're started now. They've been added and they're building up. I mean there's no [regional conference] hockey league for women that

compares with men. There's no rugby league at all. The men just play an exhibition schedule. But the women now have a national championship. But there isn't any formalized league. So that's a sport that's just been started. ... So right now there's still an imbalance. But you know. I don't think it's fair to compare the men's football, the men's rugby with women's rugby, men's hockey [with] women's [ice hockey] at this stage, because it was a lot easier to explain it when we didn't have women's hockey. (A5)

His last point illustrates there has been a change in the gender logic about the appropriateness of certain sports for men and women (Connell, 1985). Traditionally sports like ice hockey and rugby were viewed as men's sports and were too rough, aggressive, and physical for women, which negated any discussion about women participating in them (Mean, 2001; Schacht, 1996; Theberge, 2000). A few respondents (female athlete H3 & male athlete B3) pointed out that there was no women's football team at LCU, which suggested that questions were raised about other new possibilities for women and implied that there was still room for alternative ways of thinking about how women can participate in university athletics.

The athletic director's rationalization of the inequities in programming reflected conditional equality, which was significant because as the top decision maker in the department, he was "the primary architect of the attitudes evidenced in all sectors of the sports program" (Pomfret, 1986, p. 86) and was involved in the production of knowledge about this organizational value. But rather than addressing the inequities in schedules and access to national championships, he saw them as normal and acceptable, which, in turn perpetuated the gender logic in programming.

Although there were equal numbers of teams for men and women in the four sport programs, which demonstrated a partial commitment to equity, Inglis (1988) argued that we must examine other practices to reveal a more comprehensive picture of the department's commitment. This point is particularly relevant when placed in the perspective that "the addition of women's sports had little to do with an appreciation for women's sports" (Fink & Pastore, 1999, p. 323). Opening the door to women does not automatically challenge the prevalence of the hegemonic masculinity ideology in sport as women were expected to conform to traditional masculine values such as competition, strength, dominance, stoicism, and commitment.

### **Gender Equity and Resource Allocations**

Some respondents spoke about gender equity in relation to the allocation of resources, including financial, material, and human resources, and the access to facilities for male and female athletes. Some (39%; 6 women, 5 men) felt that resources were equally distributed to male and female athletes, while others (32%; 6 women, 3 men) suggested they were distributed in an inequitable manner. Still others (32%; 5 women, 4 men) indicated that resource allocation was contingent on factors other than gender, such as the history or success of the team. The analysis of observational data and budget statements showed that resources were distributed in an equitable manner for the swim teams, but were inequitable for the three other sport programs.

*Equal Distribution of Resources: "The teams have equal amounts of money."*

Approximately half of the athletes (47%) and coaches (50%) believed that the men's and women's teams were allocated similar levels of resources from the department and were provided with equal access to facilities. The following quotation from one male athlete (B5) reflected this belief: "The teams have equal amounts of money available. ... I think they're pretty good about spreading it around." Notably, none of the five administrators, some of whom were directly responsible for distributing resources, agreed with this perception.

A majority of the respondents associated with the swim (80%) or basketball (71%) teams also shared this belief. For example, the female basketball coach (B6) noted, "just seeing what they have on their budget, I would think that we probably have a similar budget," while a member of the men's swim team (S4) explained, "in terms of funding, it's equal. We go on the same trips, go on the same training camps." In terms of access to facilities, one female basketball player stated:

We get the same gym times. Like it's not like they get the good gym every day of the week. And we're like at [the other gym] or something. It's not like that. It's pretty good from what I know. (B3)

This is a change from the time when most women's teams "faired badly in relation to the allotment of [sporting] spaces" (Vertinsky, 2000, p. 14).

Data from observations and operating budgets partially supported the claims that the basketball and swim teams had similar access to resources and facilities.<sup>v</sup> The two swim teams practiced at the same times in the same facility with men and women sometimes swimming in the same lanes (observational notes, January 2001, June 2001). From my experiences in university athletics, this practice of men and women sharing the facility at the



same time was uncommon and was rarely mentioned as an option. The men's and women's basketball teams received nearly equal operating budgets (see table 11), had the support of full-time coaches, assistant coaches, athletic trainers, and managers, shared access to the same practice and competition facility, and switched practice times (observational notes, February 2000; see chapter 4). However, there was evidence of some discrepancies in the allocation of resources to the two basketball teams. Two female basketball players (B2 & B3) noted that their team locker room was smaller in size. In addition, the men's team received approximately \$14,000 more for coaching salaries over two seasons. While these discrepancies were notable, they were more pronounced for the men's and women's ice hockey and rugby teams.

Table 11.

*Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams*

Season	Team	Operating expenses						
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	OE	Tel.
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	m	n/a	51,575	n/a	45,520	n/a	4,700	1,355
	w	n/a	47,677	n/a	44,185	n/a	2,037	1,455
Comparison		n/a	3,898 (m)	n/a	1,335 (m)	n/a	2,663 (m)	100 (w)
1999-2000	m	139,361	56,600	82,761	46,145	4,500	4,500	1,455
	w	121,327	53,077	68,250	46,547	4,500	575	1,455
Comparison		18,034 (m)	3,523 (m)	14,511 (m)	402 (w)	0	3,925 (m)	0
2000-2001	m	133,430	51,269	82,161	41,638	3,900	4,150	1,581
	w	117,244	49,594	67,650	41,638	3,950	2,525	1,481
Comparison		16,186 (m)	1,675 (m)	14,511 (m)	0	50 (w)	1,625 (m)	100 (m)

Note: All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget, SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel. = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

*Inequitable Distribution of Resources: "They don't have their own dressing room."*

In general, fewer stakeholders thought resources were distributed in an inequitable manner, as only 29% of athletes and 17% of coaches expressed this belief. One exception

was that 60% of administrators, who were directly responsible for the distribution of resources, suggested that the allocation favoured men's teams. In regards to the entire athletic department, the female intercollegiate coordinator who determined the budget noted, "We have less money for the women's teams for the coaching staff. And ... our budgets are lower for the women's teams" (A2). In comparison to the members of the basketball and swim programs who generally agreed that resources were distributed equitably, respondents from the women's ice hockey team (75%) and the rugby program (50%) discussed differences in staffing, inadequate equipment and locker rooms, and smaller budgets for women's teams. The analysis of observations and operating budgets supported their views.

The availability of staff support was different for the men's and women's ice hockey and rugby teams. The men's ice hockey team had a full-time coach, while the women's team had only a part-time coach. The men's rugby program had a part-time coach, while the women's team had a volunteer coach who was paid an honorarium. As a result of the differences in salaries, it was reasonable to expect that the coaches for the men's teams could devote more time and energy to the development and training of their athletes. As mentioned in chapter 4, there were differences in access to athletic trainers between the men's and women's ice hockey and rugby teams. In ice hockey, the women's team asked one of their assistant coaches to volunteer for the role, while one of the trainers for the men's team had experience with a professional hockey team and as a physiotherapist. This difference suggests that the men's team was better serviced with respect to athletic therapy. According to one female rugby player (R1), their trainer "moved up to being the guys' trainer this year." It was likely that she perceived this as a more prestigious assignment and learning opportunity given the increased frequency and severity of injuries that are common in men's rugby (Schacht, 1996). The level of game-day staff was inconsistent between the two ice hockey teams as well, with the women's team receiving minimal support in the form of goal judges, while at the men's game, paid staff undertook a variety of jobs including promotions, ticket taking, and communications (observational notes, October 2000, January 2001). A possible explanation for this situation was that more spectators were expected to attend the men's game and thus the event required more organization and support.

From my observations, it was obvious that the two hockey teams differed in the quality and quantity of their equipment. The men's team had a sufficient supply of hockey

sticks so that even if each player broke two sticks in a game, there were more available. Additionally, the men's team was outfitted in coordinating uniforms and equipment, while the women's team wore mismatched equipment and older-looking uniforms (observational notes, October 2000, January 2001). The team that Theberge (2000b) investigated in her case study of women's hockey had coordinated uniforms, which presented a professional image, but that was uncommon in comparison to other teams. In the following quotation, one female hockey player explained the department's provision of equipment to the two teams:

We have to pay for our sticks. We have to pay for our tape. We have to pay for sharpening. It's not that much but still we have to pay. We have to get our own towels. Like we don't have our own towels. We have to do our own laundry. We have to clean our own jerseys. For that matter, right now we don't have enough jerseys for everybody. ... Yah we do have some but [they're] really old. And [we're] supposed to get new ones but they're not here yet. Like they're not doing much about it. And even the sticks. I mean they supply two sticks a year for women. And it's not enough. We can break a stick so easily you know. And so we end up paying for that in the end. The guys get sticks all year long, how many sticks they want. (H3)

Athletic administrators were aware of the high costs of outfitting players, yet it was understood that women made due with older and potentially less safe equipment and the men expected to be provided with new equipment on a regular basis. Even though they were engaging in similar types and levels of activity, the protection of male players seemed of greater importance, which was ironic given that historically women were discouraged from playing hockey because of the physical nature of the sport and concerns about injury (Sabo, 1988; Theberge, 2000a, 2000b).

Some hockey players discussed the inadequacy of locker room facilities for the women's team, and I noticed this when I attended their game. Before the start of the women's hockey game, the players carried their bags and other belongings from a public locker room to another room that was closer to the ice surface. In contrast, the men's ice hockey team kept their belonging in a secure, private locker room that was located adjacent to the rink (observational notes, October 2000, January 2001). A male hockey player (H4) noted that the women's team did not "have their own dressing room... it's like a storage room from what I've heard. It's not like a nice room sort of thing." Since many facilities, including the ice arena, were constructed at a time when women's involvement in sport was limited, there was little consideration for the provision of adequate space for them in those

facilities (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Steinbach, 2000). With the expanded involvement of women in sport, access to facilities has become a contested terrain and the inadequacies in access to space are being identified (Steinbach, 2000; Vertinsky, 1992). However, many administrators still consider the refurbishment of facilities to accommodate female athletes a cost-prohibitive initiative (Steinbach, 2000).

Differences in access to practice fields and competitive spaces were noted with the rugby and hockey teams. The male rugby player initially indicated that there were no disputes over field access between the men's and women's programs, but later acknowledged that the men's team felt they had priority over the women's team. His comments were supported by one female rugby player (R1) who noted there was a hierarchy of access to fields, with the men's university team having the top priority. This was surprising given that the women's team was a CIAU sport, which should have provided them with priority access to the fields. This practice "reinforce[d] hierarchical boundaries between who ... count[ed] as an athlete and who [did] not" (Vertinsky, 2000, p. 7) and sent the message that the men's university team had a more legitimate right to the space because of their gender. Theberge (2000b) argued that the "most critical resource in hockey is ice time" (p. 8). Yet, in this study, the men's team practiced on their home ice and the women's team practiced on other ice surfaces, including one that was undersized. In rugby and hockey, men's teams maintained their preferential access to facilities and space, thus reaffirming the notion that sporting spaces are the domain of men (Vertinsky, 1992).

An analysis of the operating budgets for the ice hockey and rugby teams confirmed respondents' claims of inequities in financial support. For the 2000-2001 season, the operating budget for the men's ice hockey program, including coaches' salaries, was approximately \$160,000 more than the women's budget (see table 12). Money is a source of power (Hardy & Clegg, 1996) and as such the men's team had the potential to accomplish more. The men's team received more money for salaries to hire a full-time coach, for travel to compete against the seven other teams in their league, for supplies, for better equipment and uniforms, and for the rental of the ice surface so they could practice on their home ice. Some could argue that the operating budget for the women's team increased over three seasons, demonstrating a commitment to gender equity. However, the budget for the men's team also increased over the same time period, implying that inequities in budget allocations were perpetuated over time.

Table 12.

*Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams*

Season	Team	Operating expenses							
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	Rental	OE	Tel.
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	m	n/a	129,886	n/a	91,422	n/a	24,639	11,270	2,555
	w	n/a	31,075	n/a	15,000	n/a	9,000	6,600	475
Comparison		n/a	98,881 (m)	n/a	76,422 (m)	n/a	15,639 (m)	4,670 (m)	2,080 (m)
1999-2000	m	217,920	144,600	73,320	88,944	18,200	24,171	10,820	2,555
	w	51,335	41,085	10,250	22,480	2,200	13,000	2,890	515
Comparison		166,585 (m)	103,515 (m)	63,070 (m)	66,464 (m)	16,000 (m)	11,171 (m)	7,930 (m)	2,040 (m)
2000-2001	m	220,111	149,881	70,230	93,100	23,600	25,200	5,400	2,581
	w	60,319	51,319	9,000	32,000	2,400	13,500	2,740	529
Comparison		159,792 (m)	98,562 (m)	61,230 (m)	61,100 (m)	21,200 (m)	11,700 (m)	2,660 (m)	2,052 (m)

Note: All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget, SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel. = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

With the rugby programs, the entire operating budget for the women's team was just over \$11,000 for the 2000-2001 season, while the men's team had an additional \$50,000 to work with (see table 13). The men's rugby program was allocated approximately \$40,000 for salaries, while the women's team was only allocated \$4,000 making it difficult for them to hire even a part-time coach. Even though the men's team was designated as a club sport, they were allocated significantly more money to cover travel costs, implying that the history of their program outweighed the women's legitimate status in terms of garnering resource support (see table 13). In the United States, some members of men's teams, such as men's football and wrestling, have claimed that the introduction of teams for women would result in a redistribution of funds (Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). The findings from this study revealed that the male privilege in the allocation of financial resources was protected and preserved in ice hockey and rugby where new teams for women had recently been added.

Table 13.

*Analysis of Operating Expenses for Men's and Women's Rugby Programs*

Season	Team	Operating expenses						
		TOB	TOB less salaries	Salaries	Travel	SOS	OE	Tel.
1998-1999 <sup>a</sup>	m	n/a	27,495	n/a	26,660	n/a	300	535
	w	n/a	5,500	n/a	3,500	n/a	2,000	0
Comparison		n/a	21,995 (m)	n/a	23,110 (m)	n/a	1,700 (w)	535 (m)
1999-2000	m	63,705	23,115	40,590	19,660	2,600	200	655
	w	12,100	7,500	4,600	4,000	3,500	0	0
Comparison		51,605 (m)	15,615 (m)	35,990 (m)	15,660 (m)	900 (w)	200 (m)	655 (m)
2000-2001	m	64,014	23,141	40,873	15,565	2,800	4,095	681
	w	11,500	7,500	4,000	2,000	5,200	0	0
Comparison		52,514 (m)	15,641 (m)	36,873 (m)	13,565 (m)	2,400 (w)	4,095 (m)	681 (m)

Note. All figures are in Canadian dollars.

TOB = total operating budget, SOS = sports operations and supplies; OE = operating expenses; Tel. = telecommunications

<sup>a</sup> Budget figures were not as detailed for the 1998-1999 season, thus accounting for the absence of some information.

*Conditional Equality in Resource Allocations: "The sports that are more popular tend to get more money."*

Finally, some respondents (24% of athletes, 33% of coaches, 60% of administrators) felt that there were some inequities in resource allocations, but justified them on the basis of the structure and institutional conditions of the sport, such as the number of years in existence on campus. This idea was espoused by some members in the two sports with the greatest disparities in resource allocations – ice hockey (43%) and rugby (25%), but was rarely mentioned by members of the two sports with more equitable distribution of resources - basketball (14%) and swimming (0%).

Two male coaches, speaking about the men's and women's ice hockey teams, articulated a common theme that disparities in resource allocations were justifiable based on the historical and economic conditions of the teams:

Do they have completely equal facilities, schedules, resources? No. Are the two programs at the same stage of development? No. Therefore, does that mean that you're allowed to justify the imbalance? No. One sport is really at the developmental stage and one has been around for fifty, sixty years. (H7)

Do I think that there's more money on the men's side of the program? Probably. But is that a function of being gender equitable or is that a function of the cost of doing business? And I think it's probably more the cost of doing business on the men's side. (S5)

From these quotations, one was led to believe that it was reasonable to expect greater resource support for the men's teams because they had been around longer, had worked longer to achieve their current level of support, and it was more expensive to operate them. These two male coaches did not question why it was more expensive to operate men's teams, or how these teams have had many years to develop their current level of resource and promotional support. One female athlete suggested that the sports with the most fan interest, usually men's teams, should receive the largest budgets. In her words:

I don't know if this has anything to do with gender, but the sports that are more popular tend to get more money. And I think that kind of gets mixed up with gender. And then football and hockey are more just male sports. So they get a large portion of the budget. But there's no sort of female equivalent to take the budget. (B1)

The major-minor sport distinction explained the allocation of budgets for basketball and ice hockey. Both basketball teams and the men's ice hockey team were considered major sports thus accounting for their larger budgets. However, this distinction did not explain the discrepancies between the two rugby teams. Both teams were deemed minor sports, yet the men's team received substantially more funding. It should also be pointed out that revenues, particularly gate receipts, generated from university athletics are much less in Canadian universities compared to American universities, because of significantly fewer fans and media attention (Dryden, 1997). Thus, arguments supporting inequitable resource distribution based on revenue generating potential are weakened because major sports generally do not produce substantial revenue in Canadian universities.

Comments from the female intercollegiate coordinator and the male athletic director, who allocated resources, reaffirmed the idea that it was unrealistic for new women's teams to presume the same level of resources as more established men's teams. In the following quotations, two upper administrators recognized discrepancies in the operating budgets in ice hockey and rugby, but argued that the department had provided adequate resources to both women's teams according to their level of play:

It may not be equal but it's equitable. ... So men's hockey will receive say \$200,000. Women's hockey we've worked up from \$8000 to \$20,000 to \$35,000 because that's all they've needed at the [time]. But we've provided

what they've needed at the time. So we're treating them equitably but it's not equal. So their [women's hockey] budgets have been increased slowly. Right now they're not equitable in terms of the dollars given to them yet. But every year we bring them up. (female administrator A1)

It's [women's rugby team] getting the resources it needs to be competitive where those competitive opportunities lie. (male administrator A5)

The underlying assumption here was that the budgets for the men's teams were acceptable and were the standards that women's teams should strive to obtain. The administrators unquestioningly accepted the men's expectation to maintain current levels of financial support, even though the economic situation of the department had changed with the introduction of new teams and increased operating costs. It appeared that they did not consider new alternatives like asking if men's teams could operate with budgets comparable to the women's teams.

### ***Gender Equity and Promotions***

As an organizational practice, I defined promotions as any internally generated communications that provided information on, or publicized, athletes and teams to external media, the general public, and students. Promotional material and activities included on-campus signage, news releases, game-day programs, and year-end celebrations. As with the two other organizational practices, there were multiple understandings regarding the promotion of men's and women's university teams. Some respondents (36%; 6 women, 4 men) felt that men and women were promoted equally. A smaller group of respondents (21%; 3 women, 3 men) suggested that female athletes and women's teams were not promoted as extensively. Other respondents (25%; 3 women, 4 men) noted that the department's promotion of male and female athletes depended on factors other than the gender of the team. An analysis of news releases and observations suggested that promotions were inequitable in basketball, ice hockey, and rugby, but were equitable for swimming.

*Equal Promotions: "We promote both the same."*

About half of the athletes (47%) and the administrators (40%) thought "the athletic department ... promoted women's and men's sports the same" (male athlete B4). This idea was not shared among the coaches (0%), but this difference can partially be attributed to the fact that only one male coach commented on this organizational practice.



Athletes from basketball (57%) and swimming (60%) felt that male and female athletes were promoted in an equitable manner, but few members of the ice hockey and rugby teams (14% and 0% respectively) shared this sentiment. According to one female basketball player (B1), the department encouraged “equal numbers of members from the men's and women's teams to go together” to promote upcoming games. From my observations, the department advertised upcoming games for the men's and women's basketball teams on a regular basis and produced a game-day program that highlighted both teams equally (see chapter 4). Additionally, the number of stories and lead stories in news releases were comparable between the two basketball teams over three seasons (see table 14). This was not surprising because as major sports, they were ensured regular promotion.

Yet, a closer analysis of the content of the news releases revealed that the total number of lines and average number of lines per story favoured the men's basketball team (see table 14). For example, for the 1998-1999 and the 2000-2001 seasons, there were over 70 more lines devoted to men's basketball compared to women's basketball (1998-1999 season: 414.5 vs. 340; 2000-2001 season: 368.5 vs. 291.5). Over three seasons, stories on the men's team averaged 9.2, 8.6, and 8.2 lines compared to 7.4, 8.2, and 6.2 lines for stories on the women's team. One could assume that more successful teams warranted more in-depth coverage, yet during those three seasons the men's and women's basketball teams had similar records (see appendix H). Although the number of stories was comparable between them, the men's team received more detailed description in the news releases. According to one male basketball player (B5), the department “...may place a little higher emphasis on the men's athletics.”

With respect to the swim program, one female swimmer (S1) commented on the equal recognition and celebration of the two swim teams at the year-end awards banquet, while another female swimmer (S2) indicated she received the “same amount of attention [as] the guys.” The comparable level of promotions for the men's and women's swim teams can be attributed to the fact that both teams were equally successful and both were considered minor sports (see appendix H). This explanation stands in contrast to the situation with the basketball program where despite having comparable records and equal status, the men's team was promoted more often and more prominently than the women's team. This incongruence potentially suggests that drawing attention to status and performance maintained a belief in the ideology of gender neutrality and diverted attention

away from asymmetrical power relations in that men's team were considered more valuable and 'inherently' more interesting (McKay, 1997).

Table 14.

*News Releases for Men's & Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons*

Season	# stories	# lead stories <sup>a</sup>	Shortest story <sup>b</sup>	Longest story <sup>c</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines
1998-1999 men	45	18 (9)	1.5	53	414.5	9.2
1998-1999 women	46	12 (9)	1	54	340	7.4
1999-2000 men	52	15 (6)	2	47	446	8.6
1999-2000 women	50	17 (6)	1.5	44	410	8.2
2000-2001 men	45	11 (6)	3	38	368.5	8.2
2000-2001 women	47	14 (6)	1	26	291.5	6.2

<sup>a</sup> The number in parentheses indicates the number of shared lead stories.

<sup>b</sup> & <sup>c</sup> Figures in these columns represent the number of lines for a story.

*Inequitable Promotions: "If there's nothing else going on, then the girls' hockey team gets promoted."*

According to five athletes (29%; 3 women, 2 men) and one male coach (17% of all coaches), the department promoted, publicized, and celebrated men's teams more than women's teams. The perception of inequitable promotion was most pronounced with members of the rugby team (75%), although a few respondents from ice hockey (29%) and swimming (20%) also shared their view. Members of the men's and women's rugby programs most likely held this view because, in comparison to other teams, their games were rarely promoted and their accomplishments were rarely mentioned in news releases (observational notes, 2000, 2001). Echoing comments from other athletes, one female hockey player (H3) stated that the women's hockey team was rarely promoted: "You know it's really like if there's nothing else going on then the girls' hockey team gets [promoted]," which implied that their team was not a priority. In comparison, the men's ice hockey team was promoted on a regular basis. The CIAU recognized that women's sport were under-promoted and adopted a policy to ensure that both genders were represented in publications and communications and that publications were "free of sexism, and portray[ed] both

genders in a positive manner” (CIAU, 1998, p. OM 109). While their goal was to encourage an “equitable portrayal of both genders in promotional materials” (CIAU, 1998, p. OM 87-88), the policy was limited to the promotion of national championships and was not applicable to regular season games. This policy had limited impact particularly given that it did not address the promotion of male and female athletes at the local level.

While most of the respondents addressed inequitable promotions with respect to publicity and marketing, one male swimmer (S3) discussed gendered differences in the recognition of athletes’ accomplishments. He suggested that the criteria for the ‘athlete of the year’ awards were gendered. Only senior male athletes were eligible for the LCU male athlete of the year award, whereas all female athletes were considered for the LCU female athlete of the year award. He speculated that these criteria existed because historically the pool of graduating female athletes was small in number and therefore by opening it up to more women, the award was more prestigious. The fact that the criteria went unquestioned suggested that this gendered practice was taken for granted despite the increased number of high calibre senior female athletes at this university.

A content analysis of news releases revealed that the men’s hockey team was covered more often, extensively, and prominently than the women’s team (see table 15). For example, in the 1999-2000 season, there were 56 stories on the men’s ice hockey team compared to 18 on the women’s team. During that same season, there were 10 lead stories on the men, but only 1 for the women. For all three seasons, the total number of lines devoted to men’s ice hockey in the news releases was greater than the coverage that women’s ice hockey received (see table 15). Similarly, in 18 news releases, the stories on men’s ice hockey appeared before and separate from the stories on women’s ice hockey. With the other three sports, it was common practice for the story on the men’s team to follow the story on the women’s team or vice versa. Yet in ice hockey, there was an obvious disassociation of the stories on the two teams, possibly because the women’s team was not viewed as equally legitimate or at the same calibre as the men’s team.

Table 15.

*News Releases for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons*

Season	# stories	# lead stories <sup>a</sup>	Shortest story <sup>b</sup>	Longest story <sup>c</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines
1998-1999 men	47	6	2	31.5	331	7.0
1998-1999 women	29	3 (2)	1.5	17	158.5	5.5
1999-2000 men	56	10 (1)	1	123	606.5	10.8
1999-2000 women	18	1	3	27	107.5	5.9
2000-2001 men	44	2	3	60	365.5	8.3
2000-2001 women	24	0	2	17	117	4.9

<sup>a</sup> The number in parentheses indicates the number of shared lead stories.

<sup>b & c</sup> Figures in these columns represent the number of lines for a story.

By examining what was not covered or announced in the news releases (Martin, 1990), it was evident that the department prioritized and showcased some men's teams. For example, they typically announced the season's new recruits for men's football, men's ice hockey and men's basketball, but did not cover new recruits for women's teams (see appendix H). Three stories on men's basketball and 18 on men's ice hockey were titled in a non-gender specific manner (e.g., LCU basketball team defeated ...), whereas women's teams were never mentioned without identifying their gender (e.g., LCU women's basketball team defeated ...) (see appendix H). The practice of using asymmetrical gender marking (Kane, 1996) distinguished the women's teams from the more legitimate men's teams. Calás and Smircich (1992) maintained that the absence of gender labels for men signified that a natural gender association was assumed. To illustrate, in the news releases it was assumed that ice hockey referred to men's ice hockey because the sport was not naturally associated with women.

Based on her deconstruction of recent books on corporate governance and boardrooms, Bradshaw (1996) argued that the use of gendered terms like princes, as in the 'new princes of industry', and chairman privileged the masculine, devalued the feminine, and reinforced the message that "the boardroom is the male domain or kingdom" (p. 105). The findings in this study suggested that men's teams were identified as "authentic" and the

women's teams were seen as "imitations or after-thoughts," which served to trivialize and diminish them (Parks & Robertson, 2002, p. 191). Whether it was intentional or not, "the persistence of inequalities [was] encoded in [the] language" (Garnsey & Rees, 1996, p. 1062) of the news releases. If the athletic department and the communications personnel were committed to gender equity, one could argue that every team, including those like men's football that did not currently have a female counterpart, should be referred to with a gender label so as not to reinforce gendered ideologies about the participants of certain sports (Parks & Robertson, 2002).

*Conditional Equality in Promotions: "There's no point in promoting sports that play one home event a year."*

Many more administrators (80%) than athletes (18%) or coaches (0%) argued that some sports were promoted more than others because of their major designation. The feeling was that the department did not promote sports that only hosted "one home event a year" (male administrator A5) or had little revenue generating potential. The communications coordinator (A3) explained that "we tried to market women's ice hockey two years ago, [but] there was no interest." After one year, the department stopped charging admission and promoting the women's team because "it cost more to charge" (male administrator A5), suggesting that their efforts for cost-recovery were unsuccessful. It appeared that new women's teams faced greater pressures to be successful, to generate fan support, and to make money in a short period of time, even though men's teams have had years to do the same (Eitzen, 2003). If these were the deciding factors for promoting a team, the promotion of the men's hockey team should have decreased because of their poor win-loss record (see appendix H). Considering the long history of men's hockey at LCU and the embeddedness of men's ice hockey in Canadian culture (Gruneau & Whitson, 1993; Theberge, 2000), we could expect more than 300 to 400 spectators at the men's game.

This perception of conditional equality in promotions was not widely shared among any members of the four sport programs, although one female basketball player noted:

I guess it [level of promotion] depends for which sports. Like for basketball it is the same, because for all the promotions we do it with the guys' team. But for sports like hockey you don't really hear about the women's team. And rugby, same thing with rugby. I don't even know if they are CIAU or anything because I never hear anything about them. (B3)

It could be argued that athletic departments should promote all men's and women's sport programs equitably to reflect all athletes' commitment rather than the revenue generating potential of teams which is often unrealized (Dryden, 1997). Given the relatively low numbers of spectators at sport events in Canadian universities (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001), one could claim that athletic department's promotional efforts are wasted.

A content analysis of the news releases disputed the claim that minor sports were not promoted. To illustrate, during the 1998-1999 season, there were only 5 stories on women's rugby and 5 on men's rugby; however there were 25 stories on the swim program and 29 on women's ice hockey – two other minor sports (see table 16). After examining the news releases more closely, it was apparent that the swim program was featured more prominently and in more depth than women's ice hockey and men's and women's rugby programs. During the 2000-2001 season, there were nine lead stories on swimming, but none for women's ice hockey or the two rugby teams. In each of the three seasons, the total number of lines devoted to swimming was significantly greater than for the other three minor sports. These findings contradicted the athletic director's assertion that swimming was not promoted because there were so few swim meets hosted at LCU.<sup>vi</sup>

Table 16.

*News Releases for Swimming, Women's Ice Hockey, and Rugby over Three Seasons*

Season & sport	# stories	# lead stories <sup>a</sup>	Shortest story <sup>b</sup>	Longest story <sup>c</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines
1998-1999 swimming	25	6 (1)	1.5	29	207.5	8.3
1998-1999 women's ice hockey	29	3 (2)	1.5	17	158.5	5.5
1998-1999 rugby <sup>d</sup>	10	1	1.5	8	24	2.4
1999-2000 swimming	18	5 (1)	2	46	263	14.6
1999-2000 women's ice hockey	18	1	3	27	107.5	5.9
1999-2000 rugby	7	0	4	22	64	9.1
2000-2001 swimming	14	9 (1)	1	49	280	20
2000-2001 women's ice hockey	24	0	2	16	117	4.9
2000-2001 rugby	5	0	1	20	32	6.4

<sup>a</sup> The number in parentheses indicates the number of shared lead stories.

<sup>b</sup> & <sup>c</sup> Figures in these columns represent the number of lines for a story.

<sup>d</sup> Since both men's and women's rugby programs were considered minor sports, totals were combined.

The success of the men's and women's swim teams was likely a significant factor for their prominence in news releases. Yet Disch and Kane (1995) proposed another explanation for the disparity between the promotion of female athletes in swimming and basketball teams compared to female athletes in ice hockey and rugby. The authors discussed 'erasure' by the media that overlooked female athletes and teams that participated in traditionally masculine sports like ice hockey and rugby. This practice of erasing women reaffirmed the traditional gender logic that certain sports were acceptable for men and women to play, and the involvement of women in non-traditional sports like ice hockey and rugby challenged those taken for granted stereotypes (Kane, 1996; Theberge, 2000a, 2000b).

There was some resistance from women rugby players to the current level of promotion from the department. Some of them used their own money to create and distribute posters advertising upcoming matches. They also convinced reporters and photographers from campus newspapers to attend and cover their games. One male rugby player mentioned the proactive attitude of the women's team and the complacent attitude of the men's team with respect to gaining some media coverage. He stated:

... the women's team receives far more media attention simply because they do something actively about it themselves. Predominantly it's because ... one team actively goes out and does something about it. And the other one maybe sort of sits back and waits for something to happen. (male athlete R3)

This example illustrated that while the common practice was for the department to under-promote minor sports, not every team accepted the status quo.

In general, the department's promotion of the university sports reinforced the superiority of men's sports and male athletes and the marginalization of most women's sports and female athletes (Kane, 1996). While administrators did provide information to the media on both men's and women's teams, a close examination of the news releases revealed that men's teams in basketball and ice hockey were often positioned more prominently and with more description, which reinforced the idea that external stakeholders were inherently more interested in men's sports (Kane, 1996; McKay, 1997).

### ***Relationship Between Meanings and Practices***

One objective of this study was to determine which meanings of gender equity that were held by the organizational members had been put into practice. In the previous chapter, I identified three meanings of gender equity: equality, conditional equality, and it is a

women's only issue. By examining the connection between meanings and practices, it was apparent that some meanings had become embedded in organizational practices, but others were ignored or overlooked (Kenway et al., 1998).

#### *Organizational Practices and Equality*

Many respondents understood gender equity as providing men and women with equal programming, resources, and treatment. The numbers of teams for men and women were equal in the four sport programs. However, financial, human, and material resources were distributed equitably only to the men's and women's swim teams. Male and female swimmers had equal access to the pool and their accomplishments were noted in a comparable manner in news releases. Despite the dominant belief held by many respondents that "if [you] look at [it] sport by sport, we're very gender equitable" (female administrator A1), swimming was the only sport in this study in which programming, resources, and treatment were generally equitable.

#### *Organizational Practices and Conditional Equality*

The findings presented in this chapter indicated that gender equity was not fully enacted in the allocation of resources to, and the promotion of, the men's and women's basketball, ice hockey and rugby teams. Some respondents explained that although "the intent is to be gender equitable" (male coach S5), it was not possible for the department to do so for all teams. This discrepancy could also be interpreted as resistance to changing organizational practices in order to become more equitable, particularly in the traditionally masculine sports of ice hockey and rugby. These explanations support the conditional equality discourse as some respondents espoused gender equity as long as the status quo for men's teams was not significantly disrupted. The prominence of this meaning in practice was not surprising given that the recent addition of teams for women in ice hockey and rugby was seen as a threat to their existing privileges. Thus, using this meaning and arguing that the women's ice hockey and rugby teams did not require the same level of resources or promotion as their male counterparts may have been a way for athletic administrators to quell the fears of the men's teams who wanted to protect their existing privileges (Greendorfer, 1998; Stauirowsky, 1996).

#### *Organizational Practices and It is a Women's Only Issue*

The findings also illustrated that gender equity as a women's only issue was implemented in certain organizational practices. Respondents frequently mentioned the



addition of the women's ice hockey and women's rugby teams as indicative of gender equity initiatives favouring women. The introduction of the two sport teams reinforced this meaning in that respondents focused primarily on what the department did to support women, not on what they were also doing to support men. Additionally, they also drew attention to what had been done to improve gender equity, which diverted attention away from other practices that reinforced asymmetrical power relations. Similarly, Benschop and Doorewaard (1998) observed that a few women in upper management positions in Dutch banks were positioned as token examples or "show pieces ... as living proof of gender equality" (p. 793). These women served as irrefutable examples that there were equal opportunities for women to succeed in upper management positions, which diverted attention away from the gendered norms implicit in those positions.

Martin (1990, p. 339) indicated that "apparently well-intentioned organizational practices can reify, rather than alleviate, gender inequalities." All of the teams included in this study competed against other university teams, were provided with an operating budget and equipment, had access to coaching and facilities, and were promoted in the media. However, in basketball, ice hockey, and rugby, male athletes often had better competitive schedules, were provided with a larger operating budget and better equipment, had access to full-time coaches and more experienced trainers, were able to practice and compete under more ideal conditions, and were promoted more often and more prominently. In comparison, female ice hockey and rugby players fundraised or personally covered the costs of purchasing sport equipment, did not have permanent or secure locker room facilities assigned to them, and were provided access to part-time coaching staff, less experienced trainers, and inadequate training spaces. One could argue that some of these practices served as a 'glass elevator' for men, making it easier for them to concentrate on their roles as athletes in their university careers (Wilson, 2001). With the exception of swimming where male and female athletes appeared to have equitable experiences, these practices reinforced a gender order with men being more valued and perpetuated the notion that gender equity initiatives for women were required to elevate the status of female athletes in the department.

## ***Concluding Comments on Gender Equity and Organizational Practices***

There were three main contributions of the findings from this study. First, they provided some insights into the practices of enacting the organizational value of gender equity at a Canadian university athletic department. Second, the analysis of respondents' understandings and other sources of data revealed inconsistencies between meanings and organizational practices. Third, the findings revealed multiple understandings of how practices were enacted based on the gender and institutional conditions of the sport under examination.

### *Gender Equity in a Canadian Setting*

Although gender equity for athletes has been and continues to be a focus of study in the American setting (cf. Greendorfer, 1996; Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Kane, 1996; Sanger & Mathes, 1997; Staurowsky, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1998), there is little empirical study in the Canadian context. The state of Canadian university athletic departments, including the issue of gender equity, was examined in the 1960s and 1970s (Keyes, 1974; Matthews, 1974), the 1980s (Pomfret, 1986; Taylor, 1986), and in the new millennium (Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001). In the 1960s and 1970s, concerns centred on the limited number of teams available to women, the lower budgets for women's teams, and the governance of women's programs (i.e., segregated from men's programs or integrated) (Keyes, 1974; Matthews, 1974). In the 1980s, it was pointed out that while the scheduling of access to facilities, the number of teams, and the allocation of equipment had become more equivalent, male athletes still outnumbered female athletes by a ratio of 2.5 to 1 in the CIAU (Inglis, 1988; Pomfret, 1986). Recently, Danylchuk and MacLean (2001) discussed additional increases in the number of women's sports, but indicated that there were still more male athletes than female athletes and men's teams received more publicity and marketing. These studies provided descriptive information about the context of university athletics and the current state of gender equity, but they did not examine the underlying meanings or practices specifically.<sup>vii</sup> This study provided a more in-depth examination of the inconsistencies in organizational practices that will be helpful in recommending changes.

### *Inconsistencies between Meanings and Practices*

Gherardi (1994, p. 591) suggested that the connections between the 'gender we think' and the 'gender we do' must be examined to understand the culture of gender equity in organizations. Recent research on gender equity in sport has focused on stakeholders'

understandings of practices, but without considering the dominant meanings that drive them (cf. Fink & Pastore, 1997; Jacob & Mathes, 1996; Sanger & Mathes, 1997). Recognizing that gender inequities are maintained and reproduced through organizational practices and power relations, we can identify inconsistencies that can serve as indications for further change (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000).

Of the selected sports, swimming was the one program where gender equity was most apparent in programming, resource allocation, and promotions. The integrated model under which they operate, where facilities and resources are shared between the men's and women's teams, could serve as a model for other sports, but this would certainly challenge deeply entrenched positions.

In basketball, ice hockey, and rugby, some practices were seen as equitable while others reinforced inequities. For example, in basketball, there was still some room for improvement in terms of the budget for coaching, the amount of coverage in news releases, and the scheduling of game times. In ice hockey and rugby, it was understood that the inequities in resource allocation and promotion were natural and expected. These findings illustrate that equities and inequities can co-exist in an organization and can only be revealed by examining a variety of practices (Martin, 1992, 2002). Knowing this, gender equity must be addressed on an on-going and long-term basis and enacted in a more comprehensive manner than simply by providing equal programming (Hall, 1997; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999; Shaw, 2001).

Some respondents stated that they acted in a gender equitable manner, but as shown in this chapter their practices did not always reflect this commitment. A few of the respondents indicated that the department paid lip service to it, which supported Martin's (2002) arguments that espoused values are not always enacted in organizational practices and they play a political function to gain favour or good public relations for an organization. One male administrator and two coaches (one male, one female) pointed to the observed gap between the organizational value and practice, as revealed in the following quotations:

It's a value that they want people to believe not just because it's politically correct, because it's something that we value I think more in the world now and in sports in particular. But I don't think it's being done in practice. (male administrator A4)

If you sat someone down and you asked them what things they believed in, most of them would spout off that they believe in equity ... but it's a matter of do they have the integrity to do it when it comes down to making a hard

decision or something that might affect them. And then all of a sudden that's all out the window. (male coach H6)

... individually if you talk to certain people ... it's politically correct to say that you think that it [gender equity] should be an important issue for an organization. But I don't know whether if when you got down below the surface with certain individuals whether it would be or not. (female coach B6)

In the 1990s, there was a societal movement to change language to be more inclusive and to identify acceptable and unacceptable terms in particular with respect to gender (Mills, 2003). This was combined with calls for sport and recreation organizations to demonstrate a greater commitment to gender equity, diversity, and inclusivity (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink & Pastore, 1999; Fink et al., 2001; Taylor, 2001; Taylor & Toohey, 1999). While supporters of these measures argued that organizations have a moral obligation or social responsibility to attend to, and value, the changing demographics in organizations, others have seen them as a liability, but reluctantly espouse them in the name of political correctness (Doherty & Chelladurai, 1999; Fink et al., 2001). The above quotations reveal that 'political correctness' is used as a "backlash reaction" to express exasperation with the feminist campaigns to change language and be more inclusive, in so much as to be perceived as anti-sexist and socially responsible and thus be free of criticism (Mills, 2003, p. 90). It appeared that some organizational members espoused gender equity in order to avoid criticism, but were unlikely to be proactive and fully appreciative of the benefits of it (Fink & Pastore, 1999).

An obligation to espouse gender equity because of political correctness does not mean it will always be enacted in practice because of the desire to protect men's superiority and privileged status in sport (Hoffman, 1995; Shaw, 2001; Shaw & Slack, 2002) and the concerns over potential accusations of reverse discrimination by some men (Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). It may be that change only comes about by enforcing gender equity through legislation and political action (Kay, 1996). This sentiment was expressed by one female hockey player who felt that policies would force greater commitment from the department staff:

...it's human nature almost to do as little as you have to. [And] if the policy's not there then they can yank the plug on any program that they so wish. They can take money away. They can do whatever they want. Whereas if the policy's there, it's law, you have to do it. (H2)

One contribution of this study is the knowledge that studies of organizational values must examine how and to what extent espoused values are enacted in practice. Second, while it is valuable to ask respondents about their understanding and commitment to particular organizational values, it is also important to examine organizational practices concurrently, because practices do not always reflect stated intentions.

#### *Multiple Understandings of Gender Equity in Organizational Practices*

This study highlighted multiple understandings of gender equity relative to three organizational practices: programming, resource allocation, and promotions. Previous research has shown multiple understandings of practices among athletes from various sports (Fink & Pastore, 1997), among various stakeholders (Jacobs & Mathes, 1996; Sanger & Mathes, 1997), and between men and women (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1994, 1997). However, unlike those studies, this research illustrated that individual understandings of gender equity were contested and were not always shared. This finding supported the fragmentation perspective of organizational cultures (Martin, 1992, 2002; Meyerson & Martin, 1987) in that some respondents suggested the practices were equitable, some felt that practices were equitable for certain sports or in certain situations, others indicated that some practices were inequitable for some teams, and some acknowledged all three of these scenarios.

I began this research assuming that most women would identify and discuss examples of gender inequities and that most men would characterize the practices as gender equitable, but my assumptions were not supported by the findings. I found that men and women had various understandings of what this organizational value meant and how it was implemented. Some women acknowledged examples of gender inequities, while other women denied their existence. Some men assumed that programming, resource allocations, and promotions were implemented in an equitable manner, yet other men indicated that was not the situation. Based on these findings, it was problematic to assume that understandings of gender equity and practices were shared by all respondents regardless of their gender.

One's understanding of how gender equity was enacted was also partially influenced by one's sport affiliation and the institutional conditions underpinning the team as well as the organizational practice in question. Respondents who indicated that resource allocations were equitable were more likely associated with basketball and swimming, the two sports in which the institutional conditions were most comparable. If the respondents and I had

focused solely on gender equity with respect to programming, it would have appeared that the department was generally committed to it. But having considered gender equity in resource allocations and promotions, and having reflected on alternative understandings of programming, it was apparent that some practices contributed to the traditional gender logic where male athletes and men's teams were privileged over female athletes and women's teams (Kane, 1996; Theberge, 2000a, 2000b, Vertinsky, 1992, 2000).

Despite some respondents' awareness of gender inequities, they often accepted them as expected, natural, or normal. Alvesson and Deetz's (2000) and Fraser's (1997) discussion of Gramsci's theory of hegemony provides one means for understanding this situation. A hegemonic system, in which a particular arrangement of organizations favours dominant social groups on the basis of the subordinated groups' implied consent, is grounded in a belief of common sense and apparently natural order. Alvesson and Deetz (2000, p. 87) added that "Such a situation always makes possible a gap between that inscribed by the dominant order and that which a dominated group would have preferred." This research has shown that although female athletes would have preferred access to full-time coaches, fully furnished and secure team locker rooms, regular promotions, and so forth, they provide numerous explanations to justify the existing inequities, which in turn perpetuates the ideology of male supremacy in sport. In the next chapter, I examine the explanations that were given to justify the gaps between meanings and practices, providing further insight into the perpetuation of gender inequities.

---

<sup>i</sup> It could be argued that women's involvement in ice hockey was not new as there was a team during the early history of LCU and in the 1980s.

<sup>ii</sup> LCU was the only university in Canada to support a men's baseball team. While women do play baseball, the more traditional counterpart to baseball has been softball. In the NCAA, women's softball is offered as the counterpart to men's baseball, but that was not the case at LCU.

<sup>iii</sup> In recent years, some Canadian universities have begun to switch game times for men's and women's volleyball, with the women playing early on Friday night and the men early on Saturday night. Market interest in women's volleyball contributed to the change of this traditional practice. Despite interest in women's basketball, men's basketball was still viewed as more popular with the public. Consequently, there was a reluctance to change game times for the basketball teams.

<sup>iv</sup> There were approximately 60–80 spots for athletes on the men's football team and 35–40 spots on the men's baseball team.

<sup>v</sup> The athletic department provided one lump sum of funds to the entire swim program. I assumed that funds were distributed equitably to male and female swimmers, although this was not mentioned by any of the administrators, coaches, or athletes.

---

<sup>vi</sup> News releases were typically made available to the media on Wednesday or Thursday to promote upcoming home events and on Monday to announce the results from the previous weekend. Thus, those sports that had many home events (e.g., basketball with 10 home games during the regular season) had more prominence and coverage than sports with few home events (e.g., swimming with two or three swim meets during the regular season).

<sup>vii</sup> While there has been little research on gender equity for athletes in Canadian universities, there has been some work on gender equity in the coaching and administrative levels in athletic departments, which has shown that women are under-presented in these positions (cf. Inglis, 1988; Inglis et al., 1996, 2000).

## 7

### Explanations for Gaps Between Meanings and Practices

In this chapter, I examined and critiqued the respondents' explanations for the observed gaps between espoused and enacted values. The justifications that were revealed helped to partially explain the fragmented relationship between meanings and organizational practices. While it was apparent that gender equity was an espoused value that had multiple meanings, there was complacency and resistance to enacting it. The analysis revealed how the exercise of power produced knowledge that established dominant versions of the truth, which in turn maintained the status quo. The findings build on earlier work on gender equity in sport organizations (cf. Greendorfer, 1998; Hall et al., 1990; Kay, 1996; McKay, 1994, 1997; Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998) that has documented the arguments used by administrators and coaches, who are usually men, to resist the implementation of gender equity policies and initiatives, thereby protecting their existing privileges in the sport system. These arguments included denying gender discrimination exists, stating that discrepancies were a normal outcome of meritocracy, assuming that changes would evolve naturally rather than being imposed, or suggesting that gender equity resulted in reverse discrimination for men.

In their study of gender equity in the banking and law enforcement sectors, Benschop and Doorewaard (1998, p. 802) found that respondents justified inequities as a consequence of "history, individual excellence and coincidence" and not because of systemic gender discrimination. This study found evidence of mixed messages in that similar arguments were used to either deny or justify the gaps. I found that these arguments were presented by both men and women in the three stakeholder groups and across the four sport programs. Given the pervasiveness of the justifications there appeared to be little impetus for change, thus preserving the inequities that existed.

Respondents' explanations centered on two dominant, but contradictory, themes: i) a denial of gender inequities, and ii) a rationalization of gender inequities (see appendix P for an overview by stakeholder group and sport affiliation). Those respondents who denied there were no gender inequities and suggested there were no gaps between meanings and practices relied on two main arguments: i) there had been a gradual improvement, and ii)



gender inequity was not a problem. Each of these arguments implied that the sport programs were already gender equitable, thus there was no need for the athletic department to focus on further changes. Some respondents acknowledged that gender equity was an espoused, but not always enacted value; yet, they rationalized the gaps between meanings and practices on the basis of four related arguments: i) gender inequities were inconsequential; ii) other organizational values were more important; iii) gender equity was not their responsibility; and iv) inequities were accepted and normalized as just the way things were. In this section, I discuss these findings using a post-structuralist feminist lens to guide the analysis.

### ***Denying Gender Inequities***

In response to questions in the interviews regarding their awareness of gender equity issues in the department or with respect to their sport participation (see appendix C), many respondents stated that there were no gaps between the espoused value of gender equity and what was done in practice, which served to deny any claims of gender inequities. A majority of the respondents argued that since there had been gradual improvements for female athletes, gender inequities were not a major concern. Over one-third of them suggested that gender inequity was simply not a problem. By ignoring the possibility of gender inequities, these arguments served to maintain the status quo rather than searching for ways where further improvements could be made.

*Gradual Improvement: "It's better than it would have been years ago."*

Twenty-one respondents (75%; 11 women, 10 men) suggested that gender equity "has come a long way" (female athlete S2), but that these changes and improvements took time. Athletes (64%), coaches (100%), and administrators (80%) argued that there had been gradual improvements in the availability of opportunities, the allocation of resources, and the promotion of female athletes, which confirmed the department's intention and commitment to gender equity. This idea was also shared among the members from the four sports (basketball - 86%, ice hockey - 71%, rugby - 75%, swimming - 60%). Given the previous findings, this presented an overly optimistic view of the department's commitment to gender equity.

Some respondents concentrated on the "small little increases" (female athlete R1) and the idea that "it's better than it would have been years ago" (female administrator A2).

They accepted that gender equity was “just a long process” (female administrator A2) requiring an on-going, long-term commitment. The male athletic director (A5) indicated, “I think you have to have a goal of trying to make it equal and it's going to take time.” The female intercollegiate coordinator expressed her happiness that women’s hockey was now a university sport, but explained that it “takes a while to catch up” to a level similar to that of the men’s team. Similarly, a female ice hockey player reflected on the positive changes in resource allocation from the previous seasons:

...each year we have gotten more stuff. More ice time. Or like more money as far as we could buy ourselves gloves. So we've traveled a bit more each year. Maybe once more. Last year three times more. So I think they have been trying to advance. (H1)

The coach of the women’s hockey team added that he was “not too disappointed in what we've been getting,” in part because the athletic department had not cut back any of their opportunities or resources. A female rugby player (R1) noted that “you need to be patient and you can't expect all of a sudden I'm going to get the exact same thing as them” (female athlete R1). One of the underlying assumptions of this argument was that women’s teams had to exercise patience, yet men’s teams were not expected to lose ground. It was not surprising that some members of women’s teams focused on the small gains and ignored the large gaps that existed, because it might be too discouraging to think about the uphill battle yet to go.

However, one could argue that it will be difficult for women’s teams to close the gap, because many men’s teams have had a significant head start (Eitzen, 2003), and the emphasis continues to be on the men’s sports (Hall, 1996). As Pomfret (1986) pointed out: “The catch up game is always played uphill” (p. 83). This emphasis on the amount of time to change legitimated the apparently natural and “baby steps” pace (female athlete R1) the athletic department was taking with regards to gender equity. A natural evolution in response to changing societal attitudes was viewed as more acceptable than imposing structural changes (Hall et al., 1990; Hoffman, 1995). In the words of the female intercollegiate coordinator:

...the message that's out there in the world [is] that this is not right. I think people are becoming more comfortable with that. Because you hire younger coaches, they're just “that's just the way it is.” You wouldn't think of any other way. So yah I think it's been a slow process. (A1)

Seven out of 10 (70%) female athletes also downplayed examples of gender inequities and focused instead on incremental improvements to their competitive experiences. This supported findings from Riemer and Chelladurai (2001) who showed that in spite of evidence of gender inequities, Canadian female athletes were generally satisfied with their athletic experiences because they were better than they used to be. McClung and Blinde (2002) proposed that female athletes often refused to acknowledge disparities based on gender because it was safer for them to focus on the improvements rather than criticize those in power. The athletes' willingness to accept their current status and situation served to "nullify any existing inequalities" (McClung & Blinde, 2002, p. 122). In this situation, hidden power was exercised such that female athletes implicitly offered their consent to existing gender inequities that served to directly marginalize them (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Rao et al., 1999).

In comparison, fewer male athletes (57%; four in total) felt there had been gradual improvements with respect to gender equity. Based on previous research, it was likely that they viewed the addition of women's teams as possible threats to their existing status and privileges (Greendorfer, 1998; Riemer & Chelladurai, 2001; Staurowsky, 1996a, 1998). Bradshaw (1996) argued that implied threats signal that power is being exercised to preserve and maintain the status quo.

This emphasis on gradual improvements was reflective of the conditional equity meaning of gender equity discussed in chapter 5. The underlying rationale was that it was unrealistic, considering the historical context of the athletic department and the institutional conditions of the sports, to assume that female athletes would have the same opportunities, resources, and promotion as male athletes. As a result, some members of the athletic department believed that female athletes should be content with the current situation and not complain about inequities because they were inevitable or beyond the control of the department. It was also naïve to assume that all future athletes, coaches, and administrators would have better attitudes towards gender equity because that would mean they would be socialized into a dominant ideology that rejected traditional power relations that is so pervasive in sport (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

*Gender Equity Was Not a Problem: "It hasn't been a problem."*

Of the 28 respondents, 11 (39%; 3 women, 8 men) suggested that gender equity was not a problem in their sports. This belief was most prominent among athletes (47%),

particularly male athletes who indicated a lack of awareness of gender inequities (86%), but was much less widely shared by the female athletes (20%), administrators (20%), or coaches (17%). For example, when I asked one male rugby player if he was aware of gender inequities, he replied:

I haven't heard any whispers of anything different or I can't visually see that. Okay one team's got a paid coach. ... Like I'm just trying to think along the coaching lines, but I think that's pretty good as well. And even like the administrative side of it, it seems fairly good too. (R3)

It was not surprising for a male rugby player to deny that gender equity was a problem, because Martin (1996) argued that it is a masculine privilege to do so. It was troubling, however, that two administrators and a coach felt this way, as they are expected to act on behalf of athletes. If those with power did not consider gender equity a problem, it was unlikely that change would occur to achieve equity (Bagilhole, 2002; Liff & Cameron, 1997). Their reluctance to acknowledge gender inequities served to delegitimize it as a concern for others in the athletic department and to dismiss further change to organizational practices to address it (Halford & Leonard, 2001; Macintosh & Whitson, 1990; Rao et al., 1999).

More men (57%) than women (21%) concluded "if it's not negatively affecting you, then why would it be an issue" (male administrator A4). It has been shown that male administrators who have not personally experienced gender discrimination usually denied it existed and in doing so, defended against challenges to their existing privileges (Hall et al., 1989, 1990; Kay, 1996; McKay, 1997, 1999; Shaw, 2001). Most members of the swim teams (80%) believed that gender equity was not an issue in light of the opinion that "we've got a pretty good system and pretty good thing here" (male athlete S4). In contrast, fewer members of the basketball (43%), ice hockey (29%), and rugby programs (25%) shared this belief. Their different understandings likely stemmed from the institutional conditions of the sport programs as described earlier in chapter 4.

Some respondents argued that the lack of departmental gender equity policies was an indication that "... it hasn't been a problem" (female administrator A1) as the administrators were not required to enforce it. Even though one male athlete (R3) asked "why regulate something that people already do," it has already been shown that not everyone 'does' gender equity. In her study on the adoption of gender equity policies in sport organizations, Kay (1996) found that if organizational members were not mandated to act in a gender equitable manner, they would not do so voluntarily. In this athletic department, there were

no legal obligations or official mandates enforcing the implementation of gender equity (see appendices E & F). The policies that did exist were vague, not enforced, and did not guide practices in specific ways. Others who suggested that gender equity was not a problem pointed to the department's nearly equal provision of male and female teams to substantiate their argument. For example, the male athletic director (A5) stated "I don't really think it's ever been an issue that we've looked at in isolation. We've provided programming where there's been an interest." He implied that the department was responsive to the interests of all athletes, but the findings in chapter 6 suggest that female athletes' interests were not fully addressed.

Rao et al. (1999) argued that power could be exercised to create new meanings or protect old ones. In this study, several athletes, coaches, and administrators maintained there was a connection between espoused and enacted values, and this belief was held in spite of examples of observed gender inequities. By not naming gender equity as a problem a version of truth was constructed and protected that dismissed claims of gender inequities as a topic of discussion, thus negating the need to address it further (McDonald & Birrell, 1999; Rao et al., 1999). In doing so, their attention and energies could be directed toward the fulfillment of more highly desired organizational values, such as athletic performance excellence and revenue generation.

### ***Rationalizing Gender Inequities***

Some respondents, including some of the same ones who denied the existence of gender inequities, also acknowledged awareness of gaps between what people said and did. They defended and rationalized the inequities on the basis of four main arguments: i) the inequities were inconsequential (61% of total respondents; 12 women, 5 men); ii) other organizational values were more important than gender equity (46%; 7 women, 6 men); iii) gender equity was not their responsibility (39%; 3 women, 8 men); and iv) gender inequities were accepted and normalized (79%; 11 women, 11 men).

*Gender Inequities were Inconsequential: "It is nothing blatant."*

In contrast to the idea that women in sport were "sensitized to their disadvantaged position and thus ready to actively challenge such inequities" (Blinde et al., 1994, p. 52), 12 out of 14 female respondents (86%), including all the female athletes, suggested that they did not "feel strongly enough about it" (B3) to "start something [or] raise talk" (B2). They

identified examples where the espoused value did not match the enacted value, particularly in terms of resource allocations and promotions, but then stated, “we don't feel like we're in a horrible situation” (female athlete H1), implying that the gaps had been worse in the past and they had become complacent. In stark contrast, only 36% of male respondents shared this belief, probably because few of them recognized inequities. Hall et al. (1990) attributed this difference to the fact that men were less aware of inequities in the first place. This argument was more prominent among athletes (71%) than coaches (50%) or administrators (40%). Among the four sport programs, the idea that inequities were not blatant was shared among members of the basketball and ice hockey teams (86% and 71% respectively) and to a lesser extent among members of the rugby and swim teams (50% and 40% respectively). Given the findings presented in chapter 6, this suggests that athletes and coaches were either unaware of, or not willing to recognize, the systemic nature of the inequities that did exist.

Instead of female athletes being vocal about inequities, many of them expressed a lack of concern about them. A female hockey player (H1) recalled that when she started playing university ice hockey, she was very disappointed with the disparities between the two hockey teams. Now as the president of the athletic council, she has greater access to information and stated that she had to look beyond the two hockey teams to assess what the athletic department was doing as a whole:

If you asked me this two years ago I'd say like this sucks. We are totally unequal and the university does nothing. But I think people really need to be informed before they make an opinion like that. Look into exactly what the university is doing and then base your decision. You can't just look at what the men are getting and what you're getting. (female athlete H1)

One could have expected that with more information, she would have become even more frustrated because the department was inconsistent in their practices across all teams and she could have used this information to advocate for more changes. Instead, she used her knowledge of the larger picture facing the department as evidence to rationalize the existing situation, instead of challenging “inequitable relationships of power which involve gender” (Kenway et al., 1998, p. xviii). This example illustrates how hegemony works in that she was willing to privilege the knowledge that consents to inequities over the knowledge that challenges them (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

Some other female athletes in basketball, ice hockey and rugby appeared to accept their current situations because they realized the alternatives could be worse. They saw

themselves as more privileged relative to other athletes in minor or club sports or other students on campus who did not have the opportunities to compete in sport at a high level. Female basketball players indicated that they would rather have fans come later to their games, a practice which currently happened, rather than potentially having a mass exodus of fans, which they suspected would happen if the women's game was scheduled after the men's game. A few female hockey players complained about the inadequate level of resources, but added that they received more promotion and financial assistance than did male and female rugby players. Female rugby players appeared content with their small locker room, as they could easily have had no locker space. They may have been reluctant to criticize their situations, because they did not want to appear ungrateful and jeopardize losing the services they already received as athletes. In doing so though they condoned what was going on, which allowed the inequities to be perpetuated (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998).

Parks, Russell, Wood, Robertson, and Shewokis (1995, p. 73) referred to this contradiction as "the paradox of the contented ... woman." They indicated that despite the obvious disadvantages women have in sport organizations they are often as satisfied as men. They attributed this situation to women's lower salary expectations and their lack of knowledge about salary discrepancies. The findings of this study illustrated that some female athletes also exhibited this characteristic. At the playing level, the following quotation from a female hockey player nicely illustrated this paradox when she acknowledged inequities, but expressed contentment based on the institutional conditions of her team. She said:

When I first came into hockey, I was talking to some people ... I didn't even know the guys' team had like a big dressing room and all this stuff. And we just had [these] crappy little storage rooms. ... I thought the storage rooms were cool because I got to leave my gear at the rink. And that's good enough for me. But I started talking to these people and they started telling me about all like the benefits that the guys have. And I was like 'wait a second that's really, really not fair'. Like you know we're doing better than them. ... they suck and we're still getting shafted. But then I was like this team is only five years old. And you can't just expect [to] create a team and expect that all of a sudden you're going to be up there. And like it's not entirely someone else's responsibility. It's up to us too to establish our team and to play well. ... And I think that a lot of what happens in hockey is that the guys' team they've had a team for years and years. And they have all this alumni who can give them money. Whereas like the people on our team, some of them are still playing from the first year there was even a team. So it's not like we have this extra money coming in or whatever. It depends on how you look at it I think

is the thing. I'm sure that things aren't completely fair, like straight down the middle parallel. But for a team that is only five years old, or however seven years old, or however old ... considering we're flying everywhere and staying in nice places and getting ice time, and being able to host CIAU teams on Friday and Saturday night at the ice rink when you know other things can bring in more money for them. (female athlete H3)

These opportunities and resources were not readily available to women who wanted to play hockey 10 years ago (Theberge, 2000). In addition, their lack of knowledge of systemic inequities and belief in constant improvement and progress for their teams shaped their understandings in such a way that they rationalized inequities that directly affected them.

For a fifth-year female basketball player, who had been identified by two of her teammates as a vocal advocate and having strong opinions on gender equity, gender inequities existed but they were not systemic or overt (female athlete B1). In her words:

Specifically it is nothing blatant for sure. It's just sort of a feeling that you get when you sort of compare yourself and see the sponsorship and the clothes and the team room and the sport staff. And then you just get a feeling of wow they're just so much better taken care of than we are. But you can't sort of pinpoint how and where it all started. And so it's not really worth sort of pursuing because you can't sort of pinpoint and say "Well why did they have it? That's not fair." It all looks like it can be justified somehow. ...if you felt that you could have more power it would probably be a lot more alluring to become involved. Whereas right now it just feels like you have no control over the situation so what would be the point of sitting there. So why bother? (female athlete B1)

She argued that inequities were not blatant, yet she also identified inequities in sponsorships, facilities, and support staff. Similar to the female hockey player who was also the president of the athletic council, she would rather believe there was a reasonable explanation for the differential treatment, as opposed to blatant discrimination, in which case she may have felt obligated to expose it. Her position was echoed by a few other female athletes who explained they would advocate for changes, but they were not aware of the extent of the inequities. As another female athlete noted:

I don't know what goes on. If I knew then it would be a different story because then if I knew the men always got more money than the women then I'd be like "okay let's say something." But I don't really know. (B3)

These comments highlighted the power/knowledge connection because without knowledge the athletes had little power to advocate for change (Kenway, 1998). Although Rao et al. (1999, p. 6) stated that, "positional power resides in every position in an organization, not only at the top," the athletes lacked control over their own situations.



Since athletes are usually only enrolled in their academic programs for four to five years<sup>1</sup> and are often too busy with sport and school to notice or be concerned with what is going on elsewhere, their knowledge is limited and short term. Yet, the structure of the athletic department was such that long term and extensive knowledge was privileged. It was likely that administrators used that knowledge to their advantage to deny athletes access to the formal decision making process by arguing that the constant turnover of them would be disruptive to efficiency and effectiveness (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995a; Malloy & Taylor, 1999). Alvesson and Deetz (2000) referred to this as discursive closure where there is little recognition that the current decision making structure was problematic because the beneficiaries of the decisions were not involved in a meaningful way.

In addition, athletes from the university programs rarely met as a collective to discuss issues relevant to them. When representatives from the various teams did meet for the athletic council, much of the discussion centered on strategies to promote university athletics. As a result, athletes were often unaware of the situations experienced by those on other teams, which may have made it easier for them to accept examples of gender inequities as isolated incidents. The council could have been a forum where athletes could set their own agendas, engage in critical discussions, and advocate for change (Rao et al., 1999); however, there was no evidence of this.

Another explanation for some respondents' dismissal of inequities as 'not blatant' was that they might have been reluctant to broach the issue because of possible negative consequences, such as being labeled a troublemaker, whiner, feminist, or militant (Ashford, 1998; Ashford et al., 1998; Martin & Meyerson, 1998; McClung & Blinde, 2002; McKay, 1997). For many women and possibly some men, being a vocal advocate for change was associated with the risks of ridicule and backlash, because it was viewed as a threat to the established order of the department (McKay, 1997, 1999; Pomfret, 1986). For an athlete, speaking out could jeopardize his or her position on a sport team. One female administrator did not want to see gender equity become a women's crusade, as she was concerned about women being labeled as militant:

And the danger is that it looks like the women are being militant. It's better to have a mix of men and women who support gender equity. It's better to be like a combination. So that way there's more, and it's awful to say but there's more credibility. It should be a social issue. It shouldn't be a women's issue. (female administrator A2)

For her, the issue gained legitimacy if men bought into it as well, which reinforced the asymmetrical power relations in the department. In reflecting on the resistance to formal gender equity policies, one female coach said:

I don't think it would hurt having more in written form. ... The only caution is that I think people make a really big deal out of it [and] then sometimes it makes [an] issue when there isn't an issue. Or it pisses people off. ... Like the whole backlash about 'oh they're hiring that woman just because they have to hire a woman. She's not the best candidate for the job.' ... if there's too much 'in your face' then people get you know hyper-responsive almost. (B6)

Although it might be unrealistic to expect members of the athletic department to lobby for gender equity given the dominance of conservative attitudes and hegemonic masculinity in the sports world (Blinde et al., 1994; Hall, 1996; McClung & Blinde, 2002), Fletcher (1999) warned that if women accept their situations they "become unwitting agents of the larger processes that keep these conditions in place" (p. 2). In turn, by ignoring the systemic factors that contribute to gender inequities, they are unable to resist them or be involved in the production of alternatives.

*Other Organizational Values were More Important: "The men bring in more money than the women."*

A majority of administrators (80%), half of the coaches (50%), and close to a third of the athletes (29%) attributed the differences in resource allocation and promotion to factors other than gender, such as the performance of athletes, the major-minor sport status, and the popularity of teams. These factors pointed to the prioritization of other organizational values, in particular performance excellence and revenue generation. According to one male administrator (A4), "things like marketing and sponsorship and revenue are what drive decisions. It's not just about who gets to play." A majority of the respondents from the basketball teams (57%) and the swim teams (80%) spoke about the importance of other organizational values. In comparison, few respondents from the rugby teams (25%) and none of the athletes and coaches of the ice hockey teams did, probably because it was readily apparent that male hockey and rugby players had more privileges than their female counterparts.

Most members of the swim teams (80%) agreed that the lower number of female swimmers was an indication that fewer of them met the required performance standard to be on the team.<sup>ii</sup> As the male swim coach explained:

We figured out that in order to be a cohesive group that we want to be at the same standard. And there is not as many women swimming at a high

standard as there are men. And it's nothing to do with ... that we want to have less women. (S5)

There were different standards set for men and women, which promoted the idea they were rewarded fairly for meeting their gender-specific time. This echoes a commonly held belief in that organizational practices, such as promotions and hiring, are gender neutral as individuals are rewarded based on merit (cf. Acker, 2000; Hovden, 2000). However, one female swimmer (S1) noted that generally male swimmers' peak performances happened in their mid-20s, while many female swimmers peaked in their late teens or early 20s. For her, the physiological development of men and women provided a logical explanation for the difference in the number of male and female swimmers. If physiological development was a factor then university-aged female swimmers were at a disadvantage to meet the performance standard, while male university swimmers were not. This explanation suggests that the apparently gender neutral standard was based on criteria that benefited men and perpetuated gender inequities on the swim team.

Some female athletes believed that "with success comes the best coaching that can be available to them and the best training facilities" (female athlete R1). Members of the women's rugby team believed that their successes at regional and national competitions would be rewarded with an increased level of support from the athletic department. Their belief was based on the idea that if they worked as hard and were as successful as male athletes in the same sport, their successes would be equally valued and rewarded (Blinde et al., 1993, 1994; Lenskyj, 1994; McClung & Blinde, 2002; Pomfret, 1986). This appeared to be a reasonable expectation given the department's "dedication to excellence" as declared in its mission statement (see appendix E). Despite their successes, the operating budget for the women's team had not significantly increased over three seasons (see table 13 in chapter 6), they had not seen an improvement in their promotion from the athletic department (see table 16 in chapter 6), or in the hiring of a part-time coach for their team.<sup>iii</sup>

When women competed in traditionally male-dominated sports like rugby and ice hockey, the taken for granted assumption was that the game was played different, because women were not as strong or skilled as men (Theberge, 2000b). For example, a female basketball player suggested that "maybe people going to the games are more apt to go to a guy's game than a girl's game, just because ... they can dunk and they're really fast. It's totally a different game" (B3). Another female athlete stated (B1) "sports that are more

popular tend to get more money,” but denied a connection between popularity and the gender of the athletes. Although some respondents argued that women’s different style of play was appreciated and valued in its own right and was not compared to men’s style of play, it has been shown that their game was less valued and viewed as inferior. Men’s sports continue to be socially constructed as naturally and inherently more interesting and popular, because they emphasize and emulate valued masculine skills such as strength, jumping ability, aggression, and quickness (Doherty & Varpolatai, 2000; Hargreaves, 1990; McKay, 1997; Theberge, 2000b).

Some respondents suggested that discrepancies in practices were most pronounced between “gate sports and non-gate sports” (female administrator A3). In her discussion of budget allocations within the entire department, the intercollegiate coordinator (A1) acknowledged that men’s teams received more funding than women’s teams, but she defended the discrepancy by pointing out that football was a major men’s team, thus “it’s not even a gender equity thing. It’s just big sport versus the other sports.”<sup>iv</sup> As athletic departments place greater emphasis on new public management (Eitzen, 2003; Frisby et al., 2004), their focus and energies are directed towards revenue generation, cost recovery, marketing, accountability, and efficiency (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995b; Danylchuk & MacLean, 2001; Padilla & Baumer, 1994; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe et al., 2002). In turn, athletic departments are focused on generating gate receipts, fundraising, and establishing marketable teams. Wolfe et al. (2002) found that performance and revenue generation were deemed by many stakeholders to be of greater priority to athletic departments than social values such as education or gender equity. Revenue generation and performance are considered values that benefited management in that more successful teams, financially and on the playing field, contributed to more visibility and publicity for the department and more alumni support and sponsorship, which in turn helped with the financial bottom line. In comparison, while being important to athletes, a commitment to education and gender equity did not directly impact management’s concern with finances. As a result, this difference in prioritization of organizational values may be explained in that the payoffs associated with new public management outweighed the perceived benefits of inclusiveness in participation that would result from a greater commitment to social values, including gender equity and diversity (Eitzen, 2003; Frisby et al., 2004; Greendorfer, 1998; Staurowsky, 1998). This sentiment was expressed by one male coach (H6) who said, “The overriding

concern is [being] financially viable rather than gender equitable” and as a result, the “valuable sports are the revenue producing sports.”

Implicit with the value of revenue generation was the gendered assumption that “the bottom line is the money and unfortunately it's partly the public's perception that female sports aren't as valuable as male sports. So the men bring in more money than the women” (female athlete B1). In this athletic department it was presumed that some men's teams attracted media, spectators, and sponsors and generated revenue while most women's teams did not. Through their emphasis on the importance of revenue generation, the department's distinction of major and minor sports reinforced an established gender order with men's teams seen as the ‘breadwinners’ and women's teams were ‘passive consumers’ (Staurowsky, 1995). There was little discussion about the arbitrary nature of the major-minor distinction of teams, or more fundamentally about the practice of management generating revenues from the accomplishments of individuals whose primary reason for attending the university was to obtain an education. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) argued that the emphasis on management's interest in wealth creation has diverted attention away from employees' interest in social goals. Interestingly, although revenue generation was an important value for the department and it was understood that the performances of athletes was central to its mandate, athletes were never labeled as employees by coaches or administrators. The act of not labeling them as workers or employees diverted attention away from discussions of amateur athletes' entitlement to rewards for their work, such as a portion of the profits from their work or an increased involvement and investment in decisions affecting their workplace (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

Some athletes indicated that gender equity was not “one of the highest priorities at all. ... it's somewhere on the list but maybe it's one of the bottom ones” (female athlete, R1). Two male basketball players suggested that although it was an organizational value, “we don't hear about it as athletes” and surmised that it was “not one that they maybe overtly publicize” (B4) or that “it's kind of under the carpet. They don't make it known that it is one” (B5). One explanation for this is that they do not see gender equity as a core value as it interferes with their pursuit of other more salient values, such as performance excellence and revenue generation (Davies & Thomas, 2001; Fletcher, 1999a; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999; Pant & Lachman, 1999). Inequities were seen as an expected outcome of the department's emphasis on these other more important management-oriented values. This finding exposed

other discourses that shaped an understanding of the athletic department as operating in a gender neutral manner and did not discriminate on the basis of gender. To recognize gender as a contributing factor to the inequities would have compromised and threatened the ideals of meritocracy (Acker, 2000; McKay, 1994, 1997, 1999). By downplaying the influence of gender, the embeddedness of gender inequities in the culture of this organization was ignored.

*Gender Equity was not Their Responsibility: "I'm not going to step up because I don't really foresee a problem with it."*

Some respondents (39%; 8 men, 3 women) agreed that "there is a belief that we should aim for gender equity," but stated that they were not personally responsible for it. While this argument has been identified in other research on gender equity in organizations, particularly from the perceptions of male administrators (cf. Acker, 2000; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kenway et al., 1998), the findings from this study illustrated that it was held by more coaches (67%) than administrators (20%) or athletes (35%). A majority of coaches (67%; 1 woman, 3 men) and male athletes (57%) suggested that gender equity for athletes was irrelevant to them. One male athlete (B5) stated, "I don't think I'm going to step up because I don't really foresee a problem with it." They offered some support, probably because of a social expectation to do so, but indicated a lack of obligation to become actively involved because the issue did not personally affect them. Garnsey and Rees (1996), in their study of an English strategy to encourage more women to enter the workforce and take on management roles, argued that "indicating concern without assuming responsibility for the real complexities of the matter ... preempt[s] and divert[s] potential forces for change" (p. 1057). This argument reinforced a gender equity is a women's only issue discourse as there was little shared responsibility for ensuring that this organizational value was integrated into the culture of the department.

One female athlete (B1) indicated, "I certainly don't think there's anyone in athletics whose job it is to sort of make sure everything is equit[able]." As one male administrator (A4) noted, gender equity was not an issue "that the organization was expecting me to follow." Gender equity was not seen as an important value to everyone, rather it was adopted on an individual basis by those "people taking it on themselves to make this happen" (female coach B6). These statements contradicted the earlier comment that gender equity policies were not required because it was something that everyone already did, which

presumed that all organizational members took responsibility for it. This argument implied that those who were most personally affected by gender inequities should take responsibility for it. Yet some of those who were most affected by the inequities, such as female ice hockey players and female rugby players, did not consider them serious enough to take on themselves.

Although some coaches and administrators indicated they were not responsible, many of them referred to the female intercollegiate coordinator as “a champion of women’s sports” (female administrator A3) because she monitored all competitive university programs to make sure “other people are steered in the right direction” (female coach B6). It appeared that gender equity was off-loaded to the intercollegiate coordinator since she held one of the top positions in the athletic department and had the greatest potential to exercise power, such as agenda-setting or dialogue power in order to make a change (Rao et al., 1999). The intercollegiate coordinator resisted this informal role as the gender equity advocate. Instead, she indicated that she did not want to be labeled militant or a feminist and clarified that she saw herself as an advocate of all athletes. Her reluctance to be named a gender equity advocate may be indicative that those who support it may actually be jeopardizing their careers and reputations (Ashford et al., 1998). Alternatively, she may also have felt that everyone should take collective responsibility for this organizational value to make changes at the structural and cultural levels and not just assume that she would take care of it (Kenway et al., 1998; Martin & Meyerson, 1998).

In general, gender equity was not viewed as a fundamental component to their work as administrators, coaches, or athletes. In their study of the development of new public management in the public sector, Davies and Thomas (2001) found that an emphasis on gender equity conflicted with a traditional organizational agenda that focused on “competition and positive measures of performance” (p. 16). Similarly, Kolb and Meyerson (1999) found that some organizational members were hesitant to take on greater responsibility for gender equity because it was a distraction from their ‘real work’. A female administrator (A2) suggested that ideally, gender equity should be taken “out of the realm of it being a women’s problem and show it as a social problem.” For that to happen, gender equity must be an espoused and enacted organizational value and accepted as everyone’s responsibility (Inglis et al., 2000; Kenway et al., 1994, 1998). Additionally, Fletcher (1999b, p. 3) argued that since:

the responsibility for inequity lies not in self-interested individuals who are actively and intentionally oppressing another group, but in the systemic common, everyday assumptions that underlie organizational behaviour and the way members of an organization make sense of their world. Using this systemic approach also makes it clear that since people at all levels are active agents in the unobtrusive exercise of power, the responsibility for change cannot be taken up by just a few, but must be widely shared across all levels within the organization.

It could be argued that all key stakeholders had a professional responsibility for advocating for gender equity changes in the deep structure of organizations such that it was embedded in their daily practices. Kenway et al. (1998) outlined four types of responsibility that are necessary for successful change in this area: obligation, culpability, accountability, and collectively. Obligation suggests a sense of goodwill and sincere support of gender equity. This means that incidents of gender inequities are not ignored and that those who are not actively involved in promoting change support the actions of others who are. Culpability refers to a readiness to accept the demands and tasks necessary for change. In this study, culpability could include the willingness of administrators, coaches, and athletes to be knowledgeable about gendered power relations in sport. Accountability implies that organizational members are responsible for the consequences of their actions and inactions (Kenway et al., 1998, p. 197). Kenway et al. (1998) argued that gender equity is a fundamental component of every day work, and thus should not be dismissed as someone else's duty. Finally, they suggested that change will occur when everyone, in his or her own way, assumes some level of collective responsibility for it. This idea significantly disrupts the notion that gender equity is a women's only issue as it acknowledges the responsibility of men for it too. Shaw and Slack (2002) demonstrated that it is possible for gender equity to be embedded into practices as exemplified by one sport organization where the accomplishments and views of women and discussions of equity were regularly included in their magazine. While this practice may not be enough to ensure that gender equity becomes embedded in their organizational culture, it does show that alternative discourses can be identified and made more mainstream.

*Gender Inequities were Accepted and Normalized: "It's just the way things are."*

A majority of male and female respondents (79%; 11 women, 11 men) justified and tolerated examples of gender inequities as something to be expected. They were resigned to



the fact that gender inequities were “just the way things are” (female athlete R1). This echoed a similar finding from Martin and Meyerson (1998) who found that some women in management positions saw gender inequities as normal and unlikely to change. Respondents in this study argued that the gender inequities were a reflection of societal norms and were “not the university’s problem” (male athlete H5). For example, the athletic director (A5) noted, “You know crowds are lower for women’s sports and media attention is lower for women’s sports. And that’s just the way it is. ... That’s something that we don’t have any control over.” It can be speculated that men accepted gender inequities as natural and inevitable as a means of protecting the established order of sport and universities (Bagilhole, 2002; Hall et al., 1989; Messner, 1988). According to Alvesson and Deetz (2000, p. 19) it was insufficient to describe inequities as a natural occurrence because they are socially constructed to privilege certain groups. Recognizing that men have dominated decision making positions in sport organizations, through their decisions they have established a gendered order. They have decided which sports are funded, have access to facilities, are provided with top-quality equipment and a full-time coach, and are promoted on a regular basis. These are purposeful decisions and they have created the situation in which inequities exist.

In this study, this argument was shared among all stakeholder groups (athletes - 76%, coaches - 83%, administrators - 80%) and among the members of the basketball, rugby, and swim programs (100%, 75%, and 80% respectively). It was least evident among the members of the ice hockey program (57%).

The idea that gender inequities were to be expected revealed the taken for granted beliefs about the importance of men’s and women’s sports and the gendered roles of men and women. An upper year female rugby player was instrumental in lobbying the athletic department to grant the women’s rugby team CIAU status and had also taken on significant administrative duties for the team, which allowed their coach to focus on coaching. Even though she was committed to “prov[ing] that we’re a valid program... to the rest of the athletics” (R1), she has become complacent with the inequities over time and accepted the greater value that was placed on male athletes:

... it's like you get desensitized. And you just learn like that's just the way it is. ... It's just the way it is. And I'm just tired of fighting. ... And I think that affects almost every woman on our team. We fight and we fight, but at the same time we're like “Oh, the men are getting this. Oh look, the men are

getting that. We're not." And it's just kind of like it's just the way it is. ... everybody knows that subtly men are considered to be the better team. And even though it may not be a huge topic of conversation, it's like we know that. (female athlete R1)

Her comments alluded to the power of the "masculine ambience of sport" (McKay, 1999, p. 199) as a reason why inequities existed. Although her involvement in rugby challenged the taken for granted notion that it is a male preserve (Mean, 2001; Schacht, 1996), she has accepted the dominant idea of the superiority of men in sport as natural and thus not up for discussion and was unable to draw on alternative discourses that would disrupt it (Martin & Meyerson, 1998). While she has seen some improvements, she also experienced a glass wall (Wilson, 2001), in that she recognized that women's sport was under-appreciated and undervalued (McClung & Blinde, 2002), however, because of her limited power as an athlete, accepted their embedded nature.

Some comments that normalized gender inequities reflected gendered assumptions about expected roles of men and women and their earning power (Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1995, 1996b). The respondents indicated that inequities were likely because "Women don't have the history of giving back to athletics" (female administrator A2). A male basketball player defended the difference in alumni support for the two basketball teams as a reflection of "the way the world is working right now" (B4). On the one hand, it was believed that male alumni were "really established and well-connected. And can get on the phone and raise money for you" (male coach R4) because they have "been successful in business" (male administrator A5). On the other hand, female alumni "either went into teaching or worked for a few years and had a family and didn't go back into things" (male coach R4), and thus would only be able to donate back to her sport if she married a rich man, as one female athlete (H1) indicated. The female community development officer suggested that women were less likely to donate to the athletic department and to their team, even in those sports like women's basketball that had a long history on campus and should have a well-established alumni group when she said:

So you have the history of basketball and the men in basketball, and football and rugby. And those men are now 50, 60, 70 years old. They are well established. They have a lot of money. They want to give back. They have a passion. Women who were playing basketball, field hockey, soccer, rugby, some of them [the teams] are so new that they haven't established themselves. Women don't have the history of giving back to athletics. They're not as continually involved in their sports after they finish here as

men are. So they don't have the same continued loyalty as men do. They don't quite frankly just give in the same way that men do. A lot of the women who have come through the programs end up as teachers. They don't have the same capacity to give. So there's a lot of issues there. So that's the problem. (female administrator A2)

This quotation was representative of the taken for granted and gendered assumptions that all male alumni were successful in the private sector, were well connected to other influential men, and were loyal to the athletic department long after their university athletic careers were finished, while female alumni lacked this ability, which reaffirmed gendered ideas about public-private spheres (Rao et al., 1999; Shaw, 2001; Staurowsky, 1996b). In doing so, they overlooked that female students outnumber male students in universities and the diverse roles that women take on in society, and they failed to consider the possibility that women were less generous in donating to athletics because their experiences were less positive.

On a positive note, the athletic department recognized that because of a "... stronger tradition of men in sport and historically higher income for graduating men, designated funding [from alumni giving] is proportionately greater to men's teams" (Athletic Department, 1999, p. 1), and they developed a policy to encourage alumni groups and community supporters to donate funds to sports in general rather than to single-sex teams (see appendix A). In practice, they envisioned alumni donating to the rugby program or the swim program instead of specifically to the men's rugby team or the women's swim team. This was one of the few examples of challenging the taken for granted idea that inequities were normal and inevitable.

The explanation that inequities were expected because of entrenched societal attitudes shifted the blame and responsibility away from the athletic department by denying there was a significant organizational problem that required an organizational solution (Hall et al., 1990; Kenway et al., 1998; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990). Kenway et al. (1998) noted that teachers often asked students to change their actions to address gender discrimination, but were unlikely and unwilling to accept that their own actions and inactions also contributed to inequities in schools. In this study, most respondents placed the blame on larger societal attitudes and denied that their actions and meanings contributed to gender inequities because "acknowledging an obligation to change their practice seems tantamount to accepting blame for existing inequalities" (Kenway et al., 1998, p. 180).

### **Concluding Comments on Gaps Between Meanings and Practices**

I identified two main explanations that respondents used to excuse or defend the gaps between the 'gender we think' and the 'gender we do' (Gherardi, 1994). Depending on the team or organizational practice in question, some respondents denied that gender inequities were a problem, others rationalized the existence of gender inequities, and still others referred to both of these explanations. Previous sport research implied that stakeholders fell into one of two mutually exclusive camps, those who believed there were gender inequities or those who believed the organization was gender equitable (cf. Hall et al., 1989, 1990; McKay, 1994, 1997; Sanger & Mathes, 1997). This study extends that line of reasoning by recognizing that equities and inequities can co-exist at the same time in the same sports within an organization and that there are multiple interpretations and justifications for them. As well, these findings revealed an organizational logic that served as resistance to promoting gender equity more fully in order to protect the ideals of meritocracy and new public management.

#### *Organizational Logic and Resistance to Change*

The respondents' denial and acceptance of gender inequities were significant because of the connection between power, language, and knowledge (Calás & Smircich, 1996; Fletcher, 1999; Weedon, 1997). Certain knowledge espoused by dominant groups was privileged and came to be taken for granted through various mechanisms. For example, athletes were excluded from the formal decision making process. This sent the message that only the supposedly long-term and broad-based knowledge that coaches and administrators had, even though some of them had been at the university for less time than the upper-year athletes, was important and valued. As a result, not only was the knowledge of athletes not brought to the table, but they were denied access to knowledge about other sports that may have informed their understandings and decisions. Another mechanism in the production of knowledge was the constant reinforcement of the need to keep revenue generation and performance at the forefront. This worked to privilege management's interests over athletes' interests including gender equity. It was through mechanisms such as exclusion from the formal decision making process and the regular reinforcement of particular organizational values that gender equity became taken for granted as an unimportant organizational value.

Given the widespread use of the justifications discussed in this chapter, it appeared that they have become “common sense ... consensus and legitimizing rationalities” (Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998, p. 790) which were unquestioned and resistant to change, while ignoring other explanations. Paying attention to their explanations for the gaps between meanings and practices exposed the truth rules or organizational logic that shaped how gender equity was understood in this sport organization. As Fletcher (1999a) noted, the production of knowledge is powerful because what is constructed as the truth takes on the status of common sense and thus is not open to discussion.

The prevailing organizational logic in this athletic department was that gender equity was not a problem, because the inequities that did exist were accepted and normalized as a function of societal attitudes or an outcome of performance excellence and the emphasis on revenue generation. Inequities were written off as someone else’s responsibility or as isolated incidents. This was revealing because there was little impetus to change the culture of the athletic department as discussions and debates on gender equity were virtually non-existent. Thus, by rationalizing inequities or denying that they existed, these arguments acted to protect the status quo (Fletcher, 1999a). The justifications provided little space for a discussion about the serious nature of the inequities or the immediate need to address them. They did not present much of a challenge either to the prevailing values of performance excellence and revenue generation. There was no call for self-reflexivity (Rao et al., 1999) on the part of the athletic department to examine their role and responsibility in perpetuating inequities. No one pointed out the need to identify and address inequities that stemmed from other axes like social class, sexuality, or ethnicity. As Green et al. (2001, p. 203) indicated, “discrimination is so hard to challenge because it is rationalized and embedded within the organizational culture.”

One of the most significant outcomes of this organizational logic was complacency. I expected athletes to be more outspoken about inequities and more active in advocating for change. I expected coaches, athletes, and administrators to take a greater leadership role. Instead I found that organizational members were not interested in generating new meanings of gender equity and ensuring they were embedded in organizational practices. Male and female respondents who made use of arguments that denied gender inequities, claimed these inequities were expected because of societal attitudes or the natural outcomes of women being involved in male sports, accepted them but took no responsibility for

change. As argued in previous research on gender equity, respondents who provided justifications for the gaps between meanings and practices passively resisted further changes (Bagilhole, 2002; Kay, 1996; Martin & Meyerson, 1998).

The two explanations to resist gender equity that were discussed in this chapter were reminiscent of two other discourses identified in studies of the American university athletic system: Staurowsky's (1996a) male victim-female victimizer discourse and Greendorfer's (1998) backlash discourse. These were based on the ideas that women received special treatment as a direct result of Title IX legislation, and that men were the victims because some athletic departments have chosen to reduce funding or cut minor men's sports as a means of complying with Title IX requirements. Although Staurowsky (1996a) and Greendorfer (1998) indicated that it was usually men who employed these discourses because they believed that gender equity policies and initiatives were disruptive to the status quo, the findings from this study showed that some women were also resistant to change. It was possible that female athletes rationalized inequities because their understandings were shaped by their lack of knowledge of systemic inequities and a belief in gradual improvements. Coaches of women's teams and female administrators also recognized inequities, but their knowledge was shaped by the understanding that feminism and social action were not valued in this athletic department and that it was more important for teams to excel and generate revenue than it was to be gender equitable.

One benefit of using a post-structuralist feminist perspective is that it encourages listening to more voices to highlight new ways of thinking and reveals taken for granted assumptions (Fletcher, 1999). The findings did reveal embedded assumptions about the purposes of athletic department, the roles of men and women, and the importance of male and female athletes. However, the findings also suggested that women and men did not draw upon discourses to produce knowledge truths that challenged the status quo. Power was exercised in the production of knowledge primarily in an exclusionary manner to perpetuate gender inequities and to reinforce "existing arrangements of power between the sexes" (Benschop et al., 2001, p. 14). Respondents had a difficult time developing new ways of conceptualizing gender equity that did not conform to traditional notions about the importance of a new public management ideology, the 'breadwinner' role of men, the 'passive consumer' role of women, and the superiority and glorification of men's sports.

- 
- i While some athletes leave the department after four years when they have completed the requirements for their degree, CIAU regulations permit athletes five years of eligibility.
- ii The selection of swimmers to the university and national teams were based on their ability to swim particular lengths of the pool under a predetermined gender-relevant time.
- iii The coach of the women's rugby program was paid an honorarium, which was less than a part-time wage.
- iv Even by removing the budget for the men's football team from the total monies allotted to men's teams, the rest of the men's teams still received significantly more funding than all the women's teams combined, which suggests that men's teams were still favoured. For the 1999-2000 season men's teams received \$908,111 while women's teams received \$420,455. After subtracting the operating budget for the men's football team (\$296,209), men's teams still received close to \$200,000 more than the women's teams (\$611,902 for men's teams compared to \$420,455 for women's teams). See table 5 in chapter 4 for further details.

## 8

### Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the conclusions from the analysis of the findings and highlighted the contributions to the literature. Second, based on these conclusions, I presented recommendations for generating discussions to change the dominant discourses of gender equity for the athletic department. Third, as this study is only a starting point for understanding the gendering of formal and informal aspects of organizational cultures in sport organizations, I ended this chapter by offering suggestions for future research.

#### ***Meanings and Practices of Gender Equity: Conclusions and Contributions***

The aim of this study was to better understand the discourses associated with gender equity as an organizational value in a sport organization. To address this I focused on the meanings and practices of gender equity for athletes in four sport programs at one Canadian university athletic department to challenge the taken for granted notions that it was clearly understood and fully implemented in practice. I found that meanings were not shared, there were gaps between what was espoused and what was enacted, and power was exercised to maintain the status quo. I drew three main conclusions that are discussed in further detail below: i) initiating discussions are needed to challenge the knowledge of administrators; ii) the establishment of truth rules was a powerful way to maintain the status quo; and iii) there was a reluctance to entertain possibilities for change.

#### *Surfacing Multiple Meanings by Opening Up the Discussion to Marginalized Voices*

A valuable contribution of this study is that men and women from three key stakeholder groups and four sport affiliations were interviewed, observations of various practices in different sports were conducted, and documents that revealed other perspectives about practices were collected. From these different sources of data, multiple discourses were exposed. To some extent one's position in the hierarchy of the department, one's gender, and the institutional conditions did matter in which discourses individuals used. For example, more men (93%) than women (64%) discussed equal opportunities, whereas more women (93%) than men (57%) understood gender equity as having equal resources. More administrators (80%) and coaches (100%) than athletes (53%) conceptualized gender equity as a women's only issue. Overall, respondents from basketball (71%) and swimming (80%)



felt that resources were distributed equitably, while close to 60% of the respondents of the ice hockey teams felt it was inequitable. These were some of the notable differences between and amongst stakeholder groups, men and women, and across the sports.

The finding of multiple meanings disrupts the dominant belief in integrated cultures characterized by shared meanings, harmony, and consensus (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Korvajärvi, 2000; Martin, 1992, 2002) and the “picture of organizations as being ordered and static realities” (Salzer–Morling, 1998, p. 114). Instead, there were multiple meanings and inconsistencies between meanings and practices providing support for a fragmented culture, where ambiguities are seen as normal and expected rather than abnormal or problematic (Martin, 1992, 2002).

This finding also challenges the usefulness of studying only administrators’ views to elucidate organizational values (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). The examples of inequities in programming opportunities, resource allocation, and promotion provided evidence that espoused meanings, in particular equality, were not fully implemented into practice, thus challenging the assumptions that administrators’ meanings had already been enacted. Of the selected sports, swimming was the one program where gender equity was most apparent, although not completely, in the identified organizational practices. In basketball, there were some discernable differences between the men’s and women’s teams. The athletic department provided more information about the men’s team in news releases, scheduled their games during prime time, and invested more monies for staffing. With the ice hockey and rugby programs, there were significant differences between the men’s and women’s teams, which again favoured the men. The men’s teams had larger operating budgets and preferential access to facilities. Additionally, the men’s ice hockey team had a longer playing schedule, a full-time coach, and more coverage in news releases. It is important to point out that I studied programming, resource allocations, and promotions because respondents identified them in relation to the narrow meanings of gender equity they provided. If hidden meanings had been exposed, other organizational practices could have been studied.<sup>i</sup> This was a limitation of the study, but it did allow me to examine whether espoused meanings were fully enacted.

Interviewing other organizational members and gathering information from other sources helped to provide a broader, but sometimes messier, picture than the one espoused by administrators. While most administrators claimed that resources were distributed

equitably, the analysis of the budget statements showed that they were not. Some athletes and coaches alluded to inequities with respect to accessing facilities and support staff; the administrators rarely discussed this. This process helped to reveal hidden assumptions of the deep structure of the organization that reinforced the normal way of doing gender equity (Rao et al., 1999). These assumptions were also embedded in a larger governing structure where athletic performance excellence and revenue generation took precedence over gender equity (Frisby et al., 2004; Thibault et al., 2004; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990). Even though administrators' versions of the truth and the ideologies that drive the university and CIAU tended to dominate the production of knowledge, alternative understandings did exist. By not including other voices or sources of data, the knowledge produced by administrators was elevated to a status of objective truth and was seen as legitimate (Fletcher, 1999a; Scott, 1990).

Researchers operating from a post-structuralist feminist perspective seek out marginalized voices to disrupt the status quo and to surface alternative understandings (Fletcher, 1999b; Rao et al., 1999). While multiple discourses were identified in this study, they did not present much of a challenge to the status quo. In some instances, the meanings and practices were similar between and amongst the stakeholders, demonstrating that they were deeply entrenched. For example, athletes and coaches often confirmed what the administrators believed. Some male and female respondents from the three stakeholder groups understood gender equity as a women's only issue, or suggested that all athletes were promoted equally, or believed that gender equity was not a problem. These findings revealed the power of knowledge production and how certain meanings become taken for granted, even by those who are most disadvantaged by unbalanced power relations (Alvesson & Deetz, 2002; Fraser, 1997). Meanings of gender equity were narrow in that all three discourses, that is equality, conditional equality, and it is a women's only issue, reflected a liberal feminist perspective and there was a significant level of complacency about addressing inequities. This suggested that the appearance of consensus in organizations was maintained to some extent and that hegemony was at work because the meanings and practices were taken for granted regardless of the history and structure of the sport. It could be that alternative vocabularies about gender equity were not available to organizational members that allowed them to go beyond more mainstream liberal feminist ideas. Fletcher (1999a) identified a similar struggle faced by both herself and organizational members in her

study in trying to redefine or re-label relational practices without reinforcing a connection to femininity.

One should not be discouraged by this conclusion. The findings from this study could generate a discussion on gender equity, by suggesting that it is no longer acceptable to only consider the numbers of male and female athletes as a measure of achieving gender equity. I plan to send the department a summary of the results in an electronic form, which under favourable conditions could start discussions about this issue. This could also be accomplished by offering to conduct a workshop as Meyerson and associates (2000) did in their study. Although I would like to present the findings from this study to the administrators, coaches, and athletes, many of them are no longer with the athletic department. Voicing alternative understandings might encourage re-thinking about the underlying mechanisms that have been taken for granted, which in turn could disrupt the belief in consensus and shared meanings (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

*Using Truth Rules to Rationalize the Gaps Between Meaning and Practice*

Since previous research on gender equity in sport that is based on a liberal feminist perspective often unconditionally accepts the current rules of the game, substantial, transformative changes have not occurred (Hall, 1996; Hargreaves, 1990; Nilges, 1998). According to Alvesson and Deetz (2000), "the more serious issues posed by modern analyses [of organizations] are the invisible constraints that are disguised as neutral and self-evident" (p. 178). These rules are so taken for granted that they go unquestioned and are seen as natural and unremarkable. In turn, they marginalize other potential understandings of reality by privileging some discourses over others and closing off discussion about alternatives, resulting in discursive closure (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

In this study, there was much talk about equality of opportunities, which appeared to be influenced by the fact that historically, gender equity initiatives from the CIAU have centred on the equalization of playing opportunities (CIS, n.d.; Inglis, 1988; Pomfret, 1986). In contrast, discussions and practices that related to fairness and justice were virtually non-existent. No one suggested that the department should provide the same budgets to teams in the same sport or that teams should share the same space and staff. There was little discussion or practice that acknowledged that gender equity intersected with other forms of identity such as ethnicity, ability, race, age, social class, or sexuality (Bryson & de Castell, 1993; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). The lack of discussion of this conceptualization of equity

was interesting given that in 2001 the CIAU institutionalized definitions of equity and equality that encompassed these other forms of identity.<sup>ii</sup> Their definition of equality was that “all persons enjoy the same status regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, language, disability, income and other diversities. It means that that all persons have equal conditions for realizing their full rights and potential and to benefit from the results,” while equity “refers to treatment that is fair and just. This definition of equity includes gender, race, ethnicity, language, disability, income and other diversities” (CIAU, 2000, p. 8). Given the timeframe of this research, it was unlikely that these understandings could have been incorporated into formal documents and everyday conversations at this particular athletic department. However, they do suggest the potential for new meanings and practices at the local level.

In spite of examples of gender inequities, respondents used dominant, recurring, and self-evident arguments to justify and maintain the status quo. These are referred to as mental models (Rao et al., 1999) or truth rules (Fletcher, 1999a), which are tacit beliefs or self-evident truths that frame our understandings of organizational reality and are revealed in structures, practices, and everyday routines. They are powerful in that they become taken for granted as common sense knowledge, instead of being seen as one version of reality that is open to discussion and change (Fletcher, 1999a; Rao et al., 1999).

From the findings, there were three dominant truth rules. First, administrators, coaches, and athletes largely assumed that the department and the selected sports operated in a gender neutral manner even though men’s sports were generally seen as inherently superior to women’s sports. Second, respondents emphasized that the sports were equitable, that men and women had appropriate access to opportunities and resources, and that any inequities that did exist were the result of justifiable circumstances. Yet, findings suggested there was a prioritization of men’s teams over women’s teams. Third, it was also clear that while it was socially acceptable to espouse gender equity as an organizational value, other competing values such as athletic performance excellence and revenue generation were really driving organizational decision making and this was assumed to be rational and logical by most organizational members. This, in part, had to do with the department’s shift to operating as an ancillary enterprise and espousing a new public management ideology that requires them to be financially self sufficient (Armstrong-Doherty, 1995b; Frisby et al., 2004; Schneider, 1997; Thibault et al., 2004). While both mass participation and excellence are

valued to some extent by federal government and universities (Hinings et al., 1996; Slack & Thibault, 1988; Whitson & Macintosh, 1990), winning national championships is highly valued. This study also showed that men's teams still seem to get supported even if they have a string of unsuccessful years.

Various arguments and practices reinforced the idea that the athletic department did not discriminate on the basis of gender, even though several examples of inequities were revealed. This supported a growing body of research demonstrating that while organizations claim that their practices are gender neutral, there are patterns in practices and structures that reinforce asymmetrical power relations (Acker, 1990, 2000; Benschop & Doorewaard, 1998; Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a; Martin, 1994). As Benschop and Doorewaard (1998) found in their study, "while the dominant organizational discourse is based on neutrality and equality, the persistence of gender asymmetries indicates the continuation or even reinforcement of gender inequality in organizations" (p. 787). For example, although respondents generally agreed that gender equity was a shared organizational value, many of them also argued that it was the responsibility of women, implying that it was not truly shared. Some administrators argued that the selected sports were promoted equally in news releases, yet the finding of asymmetrical gender marking suggested that men's teams were more valued. The power of this truth rule was that although examples of inequities could be identified, there was seldom a discussion about how these practices reflected a gender bias or how new gender equity strategies could address the issue. Thus, female athletes' experiences of fewer programming opportunities, a lack of media attention, under-funding, or being treated as a second-class athlete were discounted. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) argued that research such as this must continue to focus on gender inequities as it provides a counter-discourse to organizational members' claims of gender equity and neutrality.

Tied to the notion of gender neutrality were the socially constructed truths about what sports were most valued by the athletic department. Fletcher (1999a) and Rao et al. (1999) argued that while organizations claimed they valued all employees, in actuality the ideal worker was someone who worked overtime and independently and made personal sacrifices for work. Despite claims that employees who were supportive and engaged in collaborative initiatives were valued, males who best represented masculinity by performing tasks in an individualistic and rational manner were rewarded (Rao et al., 1999). Although it could be argued that all sports were valued by the athletes who participated in them, it was

apparent that generally men's teams were more important than women's teams. For example, it was considered common sense and logical that men's teams attracted more spectators and media attention because male athletes displayed the type of physicality and athleticism that they were inherently more interested (Hargreaves, 1990; McKay, 1997). It went unquestioned that fundraising for men's teams was easier because they were well connected in the community (Staurowsky, 1996b). Respondents were unable to produce a version of truth that did not privilege men's teams over women's teams. It was not common knowledge that women's teams have strong networks in the community. It was not taken for granted that spectators appreciate male and female athletes who emphasize style, cooperativeness, and finesse as well as power, aggression, and competitiveness. It was not assumed that women's teams have equal rights to equal funding. Until these alternative truths become normalized it is unlikely that gender equity will be more fully recognized in this athletic department and others like it.

It was also taken for granted that gender equity was less important than other organizational values, particularly revenue generation and winning. The fact that administrators and coaches paid lip service to gender equity by "following the letter but not the spirit" (Liff & Cameron, 1997, p. 44) suggested that it was not seen as a top priority of the department. Meyerson and associates (2000) strove to maintain what they called "a dual agenda" by showing that improving gender equity was not necessarily incommensurate with improving the economic bottom line. Despite their efforts to produce a new body of knowledge about gender equity through action research with organizational members, the company's focus on business-oriented values overshadowed the researchers' emphasis on this socially conscious-oriented value. In my study, the dominant knowledge that gender equity was not important allowed male administrators, coaches, and athletes to abdicate responsibility for it. It was also possible that some women downplayed inequities because they recognized that their claims would not be given much attention, given the greater importance placed on winning and the generation of financial resources. Even if organizational members believed that the athletic department should fundamentally be concerned about gender equity, their versions of the truth were dismissed as being irrational or unfounded because they conflicted with what was considered the normal way of conducting business in sport.

Interestingly, the case study of swimming illustrated one exception to this truth rule. Overall, the swim program was gender equitable with the two teams sharing resources and being promoted equally. The teams were highly successful in terms of athletic performances and they generated some revenues from swim fees and alumni support. This suggested that the organizational values of gender equity, revenue generation, and athletic performance excellence can co-exist and this potential exists for the other sports as well. Yet, the organizational members did not point to this program to show that gender equity was an important value. Instead, they drew attention to the other three sports to illustrate the difficulties in maintaining a commitment to gender equity, while also having successful performances and generating revenues. The implication of this is that organizational members were not considering new ways of offering sports or of elevating the importance of gender equity. This study illustrates that the creation of knowledge and truth was powerful in that it created a hegemonic system in which certain ideas were positioned as common sense and other ideas were dismissed or ignored (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a).

*Complacency and a Lack of Interest in Changing Meanings and Practices*

In their work on gender equity in the Australian education system, Kenway et al. (1998) assumed that teachers:

... will be so indignant – even shocked – by their discovery of the hard facts about gender inequality and about their complicity in producing such inequality that they will feel compelled to change; they will feel professionally obligated and be responsible for bringing about change in the interests of gender justice. (p. 167)

I too hoped this would happen. I expected female athletes and coaches to be vocal in their disapproval of the under-funding and under-appreciation of women's sports. I expected administrators to be taking an active and on-going role in addressing gender equity concerns and monitoring their progress toward a more gender equitable athletic department. I expected to find alternative discourses that challenged the dominant ways of thinking about gender equity, because as Halford and Leonard (2001, p. 100) argued, "culture provides opportunities for individual people to resist the dominant power relations, by drawing on alternative sets of value ... systems and ways of doing things." Instead I found that most organizational members had a blasé attitude towards gender equity.

The narrow understandings of gender equity and the dominance of particular truth rules contributed to a general understanding within the selected sports and the athletic department that discussions of gender equity were unnecessary. Respondents appeared content with the current situation and even those most adversely affected by gendered practices seemed to condone it, an example of how hegemonic forces are assured when subordinates accept their roles as natural or inevitable (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Donaldson, 1993). From this, one can conclude that the organizational culture of the athletic department was not receptive to change. In spite of this lack of receptivity to change, recent research provides a number of strategies to engage organizational members in the process of encouraging alternatives to the current power relations and to the “discourses embedded in the gender regime of the culture” (Kenway et al., 1998, p. 188).

### ***Recommendations for Change***

In light of findings from this study and from other recent studies demonstrating that gender inequities continue to exist, it is apparent that legislation and structural changes are not enough to effect real change. According to Fletcher (1999a, p. 11), “real change would require a change of heart and a discussion of these issues at a much deeper level than current discourse allowed.” This deeper discussion can come about by engaging in dialogues with the members of the sports with the aim of developing discourses that can affect meaningful change. As well, it recognizes that changes must be directed at the culture of the organization, such as ensuring that values are enacted in practice (Hall et al., 1990; Liff & Cameron, 1997).

Although the impetus for change is currently lacking, if organizational members are given opportunities, along with some guidance, to reflect on and critique the dominant logic underpinning this organizational value, it is possible that alternative narratives could be brought forth. I do not feel it is my position as the researcher to be offering this department “grand truths” in a patronizing way. Rather, my role is to provide a strategy to assist them in engaging in discussions to develop alternative discourses of gender equity and to re-think the rules of the game of university athletics.

#### *Develop Alternative Discourses*

A common complaint about post-structuralist studies is that while they uncover and critique dominant discourses, they do little to offer alternatives. However, more recent work



(cf. Fletcher, 1999a; Kenway et al. 1998; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999; Rao et al., 1999) has offered approaches to disrupt existing discourses and develop alternative meanings and new ways of addressing gender equity in sport without reinforcing historical and mainstream ideas. This speaks to Alvesson and Deetz's (2000) suggestion about the need for transformative redefinitions in management research on the basis "that insight and critique without support for social action leaves research detached and sterile" (p. 17). Here the goal is to establish, through a collaborative process, conditions in which individuals can establish or draw upon alternative vocabularies and counter-discourses to produce new meanings of the phenomenon or ways for understanding reality in local contexts (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). This will be challenging however, as these departments are situated in larger historical, economic and political contexts that reinforces dominant discourses. Yet, Foucault (1980) contended that meaningful change can begin with micro practices in local sites where broader power relations are inscribed.

Rao et al. (1999) described a number of strategies for developing alternative or rewriting existing discourses such as conducting a needs assessment, identification and analysis of mental models, and holding up the mirror.<sup>iii</sup> The needs assessment is used to bring people together to evaluate the status of gender equity in the organization by posing questions to the organizational members such as were there inequities between men and women and why were they treated differently? While some of these questions were addressed in the interviews in this study, individuals saw examples of inequities as isolated incidents. A needs assessment could be conducted in a focus group format, thus drawing participants across the department together with the aim of illustrating the systemic nature of the inequities.

Mental models are ingrained assumptions about how the organization works. For this study, mental models reveal the tacit rules of the game about the functions of university athletics and the roles of male and female athletes. Rao et al. (1999) suggested that identifying and naming these mental models is an important step to understand how the organization and its culture, structure, and practices are gendered and to disrupt the status quo. One way to uncover these is by having a facilitator ask organizational members to describe various norms of the workplace, which in turn reveal different aspects of their organizational culture and shed light on organizational values. For example, organizational members can be asked to describe the best practices of the organization, how the success of

the organization is determined, and what the norms of communication and decision making are. This exercise would help to expose the arbitrary nature of the belief that the athletic department is gender neutral, to reveal the actual organizational values that are driving decisions in the athletic department, and the underlying gender biased expectations for male and female athletes that perpetuate gender inequities.

Another technique is the holding up the mirror strategy (Rao et al., 1999). This occurs after the results of the needs assessment and mental models are analyzed and thus can be provided to the organizational members in various formats, including workshops, focus groups, or presentations. With this technique, the members are presented with the findings and they are encouraged to react to them. In the summary report that I will submit to the department, I will highlight the existence of multiple meanings, that gender equity was not fully enacted in the selected sports, and that numerous arguments were presented by different stakeholders to justify the inequities. Hopefully, from these findings, they would recognize that gender equity was not a shared value, nor was it fully enacted. A facilitator could work with the organizational members to develop alternative meanings of this value that challenge the status quo, to formulate strategies to ensure a stronger connection between what was espoused and enacted, and to deconstruct their justifications (cf. Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Coleman & Rippin, 2000; Fletcher, 1999a; Rao et al., 1999).

It is important that the organizational members be actively engaged in these activities because real change comes from a concerted effort and shared investment in altering the organizational culture. This sentiment is illustrated in the following quotation from Anita Roddick, the founder of The Body Shop. Roddick (2000, p. 70) advocated that her employees buy into a values-based organization:

How can we change from a system which values endless increasing profit and materialism to one in which the core values are community, caring for the environment, creating, growing things and personal development?  
 Answer: we empower people. And in an organization, empowerment meant that each staff member is responsible for creating that organization's culture.

This process must be a collaborative and on-going effort involving male and female athletes, coaches, and administrators, as it is apparent that they understood gender equity in different, albeit narrow, ways. It is not sufficient to suggest that these exercises can be conducted once and expect that appropriate changes will be implemented immediately. Just like annual meetings to discuss budgets and organizational policies, gender equity should be discussed,

evaluated and monitored on a regular basis. To do so, an environment must be established in which open dialogues are fostered such that self-evident assumptions that sustain inequities are questioned and alternative discourses are created. The development of a favourable environment for dialogue to occur could provide a legitimate space for alternative narratives to be voiced and exposed that “counter deep-structure values that hinder gender-equality objectives” (Rao & Kelleher, 2000, p. 78).

However, if a collaborative approach is unlikely, ethical auditing can be used to assess the organization’s implementation of gender equity. This tool is important particularly in light of findings that other values were driving decisions, even though organizational members still espoused gender equity. Ethical auditing is “an independently verified assessment of the company’s performance against ... stated values” (Roddick, 2000, p. 68). From this audit, a values report is produced that indicates the organization’s progress toward achieving certain targets and following particular values. This report could be used to identify additional gaps between meanings and practices and suggest areas for improvements. For example, in this study changes could be made to structural components such as including explicit value statements in the department’s mission and equalizing the budgets of men’s and women’s teams to ensure greater consistency between meanings and practices.

#### *Change the Formal Practices*

Rao and Kelleher (2000) argued that the challenge of feminist work is that feminists are “interested in changing the rules of the game, not playing by them” (p. 74). They added that, “in order to make lasting changes to what an organisation does, both formal rules and informal norms need to change” (p. 75). The development of alternative truths of gender equity addresses the deep structure and the informal norms of the athletic department. More immediately, I would recommend that organizational members critically examine formal aspects of their organizational culture which would force them “to hold open to scrutiny many of the most fundamental aspects of the organization – its language, meaning systems, values, norms, and practices” (Ely & Meyerson, 2000, p. 600). They must consider implementing changes to the “formal institutional systems and procedures” (Rao & Kelleher, 2000, p. 74), which serve as manifestations of the formal rules of the game that privilege men over women.

One of the most obvious formal aspects that can be changed is having more athletes actively involved in formal decision making processes. Currently, they do not have a formal presence at regular athletic department meetings and thus, have little access to forums and dialogues to express their opinions, to share their experiences and insight, and to be actively involved in the production of knowledge about gender equity. Generally, it is believed that athletes should be excluded from this process because they constantly turn over and have little time to devote to it. Their exclusion from this practice suggests that their voices are not valued or that it is feared that their comments would significantly disrupt the status quo. The current practice reflects Alvesson and Deetz's (2000) notion of discursive closure, where potential conflicts and challenges are suppressed in part by disqualifying the participation of some members and limiting their access to discussions and decision making.

The question that needs to be asked is why not include more athletes in decision making (Clarke et al., 1994; Kidd & Donnelly, 2000). Their voices may not be so different from those currently included, but having the space to be heard may provide the impetus for them to accept more responsibility for gender equity and for coaches and administrators to really hear from the intended beneficiaries of their actions, instead of merely claiming that they do. Opening up the discussions to include athletes may also facilitate the uncovering of hidden discourses or competing positions. Rao and Kelleher (2000, p. 78-79) argued that a social justice agenda for organizations is promoted through having clients more involved in decision making:

Clients and beneficiaries often have little if any access to mechanisms that are intended to make organisations accountable, and other mechanisms to ensure good governance. It is obvious that this renders organisations poor vehicles for promoting values of gender justice and new paradigms of sustainable development!

The irony of this situation is that athletes are taught about traditional gendered roles for men and women in their athletic careers within the broader context of higher education where progressive and critical thinking are encouraged.

While there were many gaps between meanings and practice in basketball, ice hockey, and rugby, the integrated swimming program could serve as a template for other sports to emulate, although this would challenge deeply entrenched traditions. For example, the athletic department could explore the possibility of having the men's and women's basketball teams practice together. Stories on the men's and women's ice hockey teams

could be included in the same paragraph and given the same level of attention in the departmental news releases. The men's and women's rugby teams could be allocated equal operating budgets. This is not to say that the swimming model was without flaws, as there was room to improve the gender balance in the coaching staff and to challenge the gendered expectations of body image. Nevertheless, the integrated operating model of the swim program illustrated an alternative structure and programming format that other sports could emulate. While these recommendations would require the organizational members to reassess their practices, simple changes like eliminating asymmetrical gender marking in news releases would go some way toward promoting equity.

### ***Areas of Future Research***

This study of gender equity as an organizational value reveals several potential directions for future research. As a researcher, I situated understandings of this organizational value based on the analytical categories of gender, sport affiliation, and position in the organization. Although there are other markers of social inequality (e.g., race, age, ability, sexuality), organizational values typically only refer to gender equity, if at all. The experiences of administrators, coaches, and athletes with respect to the intersection between gender and other subjectivities and to examine implications for policies and practices is an important area of study. This can be accomplished by contextualizing the backgrounds of key stakeholders, including those who decline to participate in such studies. While I provided detailed information about the athletic department and the case study sports to situate the findings (see chapter 4), future research should include more thorough descriptions about the respondents and their identities. Additionally, recognizing the interconnections between various subjectivities should provide more nuanced analysis of the findings.

Second, while this dissertation is one example of more critical and reflective research in sport management, I would encourage more researchers to consider conducting their research from this perspective as it would heighten their sensitivity to the arbitrariness of dominant discourses. Critical management research and more specifically, feminist post-structuralist research, attempts to question what is seen as self-evident and to make strange that which is seen as familiar (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Foley, 1992). This type of reflective work is best achieved if researchers go into unfamiliar sites and settings, or if they go into

familiar settings and attempt to detach themselves from their own taken for granted assumptions. It requires researchers to deconstruct and de-familiarize what is obvious, normal, self-evident, mundane, and unremarkable. While I was cognizant of the need to constantly and diligently question what I was seeing and hearing, this was a difficult task for me to accomplish since I was familiar with the functioning of an athletic department and the sport of basketball. My ever-evolving and detailed description of the sports and the athletic department in chapter 4 challenged me to explain aspects of this culture that were self-evident to me (e.g., what a red-shirt is, the tradition of scheduling women's games before men's games). Through this process and the analysis of the findings, I became aware of many of my assumptions; however I recognize that there are many more that are still evident in the dissertation. For example, more work needs to be undertaken to challenge the myth of revenue generating status that some men's teams maintain. With little evidence to support this claim, it remains a common and unquestioned justification of inequities in athletic departments (Eitzen, 2003).

Third, I recommend that future work examine the informal manifestations of the organizational culture such as informal practices (e.g., networking), norms (e.g., social interactions, humour), and artifacts and symbols (e.g., physical configurations, jargon) as these also contribute to the gendered structure of sport organizations. Additionally, the informal and formal rules of the game are manifested in these along with the formal work practices under examination in this study (Acker, 1990; Martin, 2002; Rao et al., 1999). As well, identifying that gender inequity is embedded in the informal aspects of organizational cultures, which makes it appear to be a normal and expected part of university athletics, would help to disrupt the apparent and preferred consensus and harmony that currently exists (Korvajärvi, 2000). This work would require more observations of social processes and a research method that encouraged researchers to spend significant periods of time immersed in the culture (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000).

Fourth, studying the gendering of organizational practices, values, and cultures could be more adequately addressed by using more time intensive and culturally sensitive research designs, such as ethnography. Fletcher's (1999a) ethnography of female engineers and the role of relational work is a good example of this type of research in which the assumptions that underlie practices, values, and other aspects of organizational cultures can be identified and critiqued, and alternative understandings can be developed. Being immersed in a setting

over a longer period of time would also provide the researcher with the opportunity to develop a more sensitive understanding of the historical and social contexts, observe and witness seemingly normal and mundane situations in the institutional conditions, and interview those who appear ambivalent to or openly resentful to the research topic.

This study was a snapshot of an athletic department and four sport programs over two years. I was able to interview men and women from different stakeholder groups and sport affiliations, to observe common practices and institutional conditions, and to review recent organizational documents. However, to delve further into meanings and into assumptions underpinning practices, a fifth recommendation is to conduct multiple interviews with each respondent and observe multiple practices over many years. With one interview for each respondent, it is difficult to know if the respondents are answering in a manner that they consider to be socially acceptable or expected (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). Additionally, researchers must acknowledge that interview responses “are produced in a specific social situation and that language games are important” (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000, p. 195). Spending more time in the athletic department, in the settings of the sports, and with the participants would have allowed me to track changes over time. This is especially important given that changes to gender equity take time. Longitudinal research could critically examine this truth rule.

In this study, the findings suggested that organizational values other than gender equity appeared to be influencing decisions in the athletic department. It was also evident that some respondents positioned gender equity as a competing value with athletic performance excellence and revenue generation, as if focusing on it would compromise the department’s fiscal management strategies and goals for success on the field. Yet, the case study of swimming suggested that it does not have to be a zero sum game. In this sport, the teams were equally successful, demonstrated similar revenue generating potential, and generally operated in a gender equitable manner. This suggested that gender equity does not have to be positioned as a compromise to achieving the goals of the athletic department (Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). Buenger et al. (1996) indicated that an effective organization is one that can balance values, even if some are more central to the functioning of the organization, and others are less significant. Thus, another direction to explore, from a qualitative perspective, is the prioritization of gender equity in sport organizations in conjunction with other organizational values. It would be particularly insightful to conduct

research in sites where gender equity is espoused and more fully enacted. It should be possible for organizations to attend to gender equity along with other values without having to sacrifice one to achieve another (Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999).

A number of researchers have argued that gender equity should be connected to other organizational values and objectives through a dual agenda, whereby the success of traditional and mainstream organizational values is intimately connected to gender equity (cf. Ely & Meyerson, 2000; Kolb & Meyerson, 1999; Liff & Cameron, 1997; McKay, 1994, 1999; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). For example, McKay (1999) found that affirmative action managers in national sport organizations tied equal opportunity initiatives to other incentives such as illustrating the potential for costly legal battles or indicating the possibility of capitalizing on a largely untapped portion of the population, as it could not be sold on its own merit. A sixth recommendation then is to undertake research, which is more focused on social change (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000), and which could be accomplished by conducting action research in which those who are researched are actively involved in designing intervention strategies and assessing if they work (Frisby et al., in press; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000). This type of research is also conducive to seeking out examples of counter-discourses or practices. Furthermore, in action research, the onus for change is invested with the organizational members, instead of solely on the researchers who at some point leave the research site. However, since change is a goal of action research, this type of research would only work if the organizational members were convinced that change was necessary (Frisby et al., in press; Meyerson & Kolb, 2000).

### ***Concluding Comments***

Drawing on the recent work of post-structuralist feminists this study attempted to challenge what was considered normal and expected with respect to gender equity in university sports. It illustrated that meanings of this value were not shared, that it was not fully implemented, and that truth rules were embedded in the culture, which worked to diminish gender equity strategies and initiatives. Gender equity was not a fully espoused and enacted value in the selected sport programs. Despite a common knowledge in Canadian universities that gender equity has been accomplished, this study clearly shows that we still have a long way to go to achieve it.



If athletic departments wish to move further with a gender equity agenda, more research needs to be done that exposes gendered practices and questions other seemingly self-evident truths. Why is it normal to schedule the women's games before the men's? What are the consequences of alternating the schedule or having them play on separate evenings? Why do men's and women's teams require separate coaching staff? On the academic side, men and women are not expected to enroll in separate laboratories and classes based on their gender, yet it appears that there is something inherently different about coaching men and women that requires the services and expertise of different staff. What is stopping gender equity from being taken for granted as a value that drives everyday decisions and practices in the athletic department? I have raised these questions as examples of what is considered normal in university athletics, but for real change to occur these questions must be raised by the members of the athletic department.

---

<sup>i</sup> For example, if respondents had discussed equity in broader terms, the recruitment and selection of athletes in the relation to ability or age or the distribution of scholarships in relation to social class could have been studied. If they had spoken about fairness and justice, the involvement of athletes in decision making or disciplining other athletes could have been examined in relation to that meaning.

<sup>ii</sup> It was unlikely that these definitions were incorporated into formal documents and everyday conversations at the university level yet. Nevertheless, I included them as it illustrated that these two terms were understood and institutionalized as two different ideas.

<sup>iii</sup> In addition to these strategies, Rao et al. (1999) also presented two other tools that can be used to identify multiple perspectives of gender equity: 'the fourth frame' and seeing invisible work. All five of these tools could be used for this purpose, however, I chose to present the first three (needs assessment, mental models, holding up the mirror) because they set the stage for more reflective exercises. This is important for organizations, such as this department, that deny there is a problem and that are resistant to changes.

## References<sup>1</sup>

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4, 139-158.
- Acker, J. (2000). Gendered contradictions in organizational equity projects. *Organization*, 7, 625-632.
- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2000). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study twenty three year update 1977-2000. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 9(2), 141-144.
- Agle, B. R., & Caldwell, C. B. (1999). Understanding research on values in business: A level of analysis framework. *Business & Society*, 38, 326-387.
- Alvesson, M. (1987). Organizations, culture, and ideology. *International Studies of Management*, XVII(3), 4-18.
- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y. D. (1997). *Understanding gender and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (1996). Critical theory and postmodern approaches to organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 191-217). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing critical management research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldbberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Armstrong-Doherty, A. J. (1995a). Athletic directors' perceptions of environmental control over interuniversity athletics. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 75-95.
- Armstrong-Doherty, A. J. (1995b). The structure of funding in Canadian interuniversity athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 59-69.
- Armstrong-Doherty, A. J. (1996). Resource dependence-based perceived control: An examination of Canadian interuniversity athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 49-64.
- Ashford, S. J. (1998). Championing charged issues: The case of gender equity within organizations. In R. M. Kramer, & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 349-380). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ashford, S. J., Rothbard, N. P., Piderit, S. K., & Dutton, J. E. (1998). Out on a limb: The role of context and impression management in selling gender-equity issues. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 23-57.
- Athletic Department. (1992-1993). *Media guide*.

- Athletic Department. (1997). *Men's rugby*. Retrieved from [www.athletics.lcu.ca](http://www.athletics.lcu.ca)
- Athletic Department. (1999-2000). *Men's and women's basketball program*.
- Athletic Department. (2000a, February 11 & 12). *Game day line up [men's and women's basketball]*.
- Athletic Department. (2000b, October 20 & 21). *Game day line up [women's ice hockey]*.
- Athletic Department. (2000-2001). [*Athletic department web site*].
- Athletic Department. (2001a, January 12 & 13). *Game day line up [men's ice hockey]*.
- Athletic Department. (2001b). *Job postings: Women's rugby coach*. Retrieved June 18, 2001, from [www.athletics.lcu.ca/jobpostings/womensrugbycoach.htm](http://www.athletics.lcu.ca/jobpostings/womensrugbycoach.htm)
- Athletic Department. (2001-2002). [*Athletic department web site*].
- Author A, & Author B. (1997, November 12-18). Your student athletic fee. Are you really getting something for your money? *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 17.
- Author C. (n.d.). *Organizational chart: Vice president students*. Retrieved on August 8, 2001, from [www.pair.lcu.ca/AboutLCU/vpstud.htm](http://www.pair.lcu.ca/AboutLCU/vpstud.htm)
- Author C. (2001). *Fast facts 2000/01*. Retrieved May 14, 2002, from [www.pair.lcu.ca/fastfact00.htm](http://www.pair.lcu.ca/fastfact00.htm)
- Author D. (n.d.). *Rugby's first 80 years. Highlights of varsity rugby 1906-1985*. Retrieved January 24, 2001, from [www.library.lcu.ca](http://www.library.lcu.ca)
- Author D. (2000, November 30). Women's hockey past and present. *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 14.
- Author D. (2001, February 7). [Gymnasium] reflections. *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 18.
- Author E. (2001, March 2). Let's get loud: The new face of women's sports. *Campus Newspaper A*, p. 12.
- Author F. (2000, February 28). Golden. *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 3.
- Author G. (1997, October 16). Program counts on more than cheers. *Campus Newspaper C*, p. 5.
- Author H. (1998, April 1-7). March referendum: Students say 'yes', but what does that mean? *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 2.

- Author I. (n.d.). LCU Athletics – Supporting LCU. Retrieved March 16, 2001, from [www.supporting.lcu.ca/faculties/athletics/index.html](http://www.supporting.lcu.ca/faculties/athletics/index.html)
- Author J. (2000, January 26). 1999-2000 women's and men's basketball. *Campus Newspaper B*.
- Author K. (2000a, December 1). The price of a good team. *Campus Newspaper A*, p. 3.
- Author K. (2000b, October 20). Hockey women seek redemption after disappointment. *Campus Newspaper A*, p. 12.
- Author L. (1999, December 2). 1999-2000 men's and women's hockey. *Campus Newspaper B*.
- Author M. (1999a, October 22). Women's hockey hits the ice. *Campus Newspaper A*, p. 11.
- Author M. (1999b, March 12). Women's rugby has been widely discounted as a sport. But there's love, grit and dedication filling those cleats. *Campus Newspaper A*, p. 5.
- Author N. (1999, October 20). Women's varsity hockey – home opener (fighting for two). *Campus Newspaper B*, p. 15.
- Author O. (1999, December 3). Rugby and the CIAU: Little sister goes to the show as big brother looks on [Electronic version]. *Campus Newspaper B*.
- Author O, & Author Q. (1997, October 15). Men's rugby: Building a history [Electronic version]. *Campus Newspaper B*.
- Author P. (1998, October 30). A season can turn on one game for some teams. But for LCU women's rugby, one game last week meant more than that. It meant everything. *Campus Newspaper A*, pp. 1, 5.
- Author R. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from Community Swim Club web site.
- Bagilhole, B. (2002). Challenging equal opportunities: Changing and adapting male hegemony in academia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23, 19-33.
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic careers and gender equity: Lessons learned from MIT. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10, 137-153.
- Bartunek, J. M. (1994). Wanted: A more participative role for research participants. *Organization*, 1(1), 39-43.
- Bell-Altenstad, K., & Vail, S. (1995). Developing public policy for women in sport: A discourse analysis. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 15(4), 109-112.
- Benschop, Y., & Doorewaard, H. (1998). Covered by equality: The gender subtext of organizations. *Organization Studies*, 19, 787-805.
- Benschop, Y., Halsema, L., & Schreurs, P. (2001). The division of labour and inequalities between the sexes: An ideological dilemma. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 8, 1-18.

- Bernard, R. (1994). *Research methods in anthropology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beyer, J. M. (1981). Ideologies, values, and decision making in organizations. In P. C. Nystrom, & W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 162-202). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14(2), 105-131.
- Birrell, S.J., & Cole, C.L. (Eds.). (1994). *Women, sport, and culture*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Blinde, E. M., & Greendorfer, S. L. (1992). Conflict and the college sport experience of women athletes. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 1(1), 97-113.
- Blinde, E. M., Taub, D. E., & Han, L. (1993). Sport participation and women's personal empowerment: Experiences of the college athlete. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 17, 47-60.
- Blinde, E. M., Taub, D. E., & Han, L. (1994). Sport as a site for women's group and societal empowerment: Perspectives from the college athlete. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 11, 51-59.
- Boostrom, R. (1994). Learning to pay attention. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 7(1), 51-64.
- Bradshaw, P. (1996). Women as constituent directors: Re-reading current texts using a feminist-postmodernist approach. In D. M. Boje, R. P. Gephart Jr., & T. J. Thatchenkery (Eds.), *Postmodern management and organization theory* (pp. 95-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bryson, M., & de Castell, S. (1993). En/gendering equity: On some paradoxical consequences of institutionalized programs of emancipation. *Educational Theory*, 43, 341-355.
- Buenger, V., Daft, R. L., Conlon, E. J., & Austin, J. (1996). Competing values in organizations: Contextual influences and structural consequences. *Organization Science*, 7, 557-576.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 294-311.
- Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1997). Interviewers' perceptions of person-organization fit and organizational selection decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 546-561.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1996). From 'the woman's' point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 218-257). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative

- directions. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 649-671.
- Chatman, J. A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 459-484.
- CIAU. (1998). *Operations manual*. Gloucester, ON: CIAU.
- CIAU. (1999). *CIAU comparative study 1998-99*.
- CIAU. (2000). *Equity and equality committee meeting minutes*. Retrieved on April 19, 2004, from [www.cisport.ca/e/student/documents/eq\\_00dec\\_minutes.PDF](http://www.cisport.ca/e/student/documents/eq_00dec_minutes.PDF)
- CIS. (n.d.). *Historical snapshot*. Retrieved from [www.cisport.ca/about/history.htm](http://www.cisport.ca/about/history.htm)
- CIS. (2001a). *CIS guideline on athletic awards* [Electronic version]. Retrieved May 17, 2002, from [www.cisport.ca/awards/awards\\_criteria.htm](http://www.cisport.ca/awards/awards_criteria.htm)
- CIS. (2001b). *2001 media guide & almanac*.
- CIS. (2002a). *CIS web site*. Retrieved from [www.universitysport.ca/home.asp](http://www.universitysport.ca/home.asp)
- CIS. (2002b). *Statistics on athletic-related university administered awards – 2001-2002*. Retrieved May 17, 2002, from <http://www.cisport.ca/awards-stats021217.htm>
- Clarke, H., Smith, D., & Thibault, G. (1994). *Athlete-centred sport discussion paper* [Electronic version]. Prepared for the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Sport Policy Steering Committee.
- Coleman, G., & Rippin, A. (2000). Putting feminist theory to work: Collaboration as a means towards organizational change. *Organization*, 7, 573-587.
- Collins, J., & Porras, J. (1996). Building your company's vision. *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 65-77.
- Connell, R. W. (1985). Theorising gender. *Sociology*, 19, 260-272.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1990). An iron man: The body and some contradiction of hegemonic masculinity. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order* (pp. 83-95). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Côté, J., Salmela, J. H., Baria, A., & Russell, S. J. (1993). Organizing and interpreting unstructured qualitative data. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7, 127-137.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- CTV Specialty to close WTSN on September 30, 2003. (2003, August 29). Retrieved on March 18, 2004, from <http://micro.newswire.ca/release.cgi?rkey=1108295916&view=62877-0&Start=0>
- Danylchuk, K. E., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). The nature of managerial work in Canadian intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 148-166.
- Danylchuk, K. E., & MacLean, J. (2001). Intercollegiate athletics in Canadian universities: Perspectives on the future. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 364-379.
- Davies, A., & Thomas, R. (2001, July). *From passive to active subjects: Gender, restructuring and professional/managerial identities in the UK public sector*. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Critical Management Studies, Manchester, UK. Retrieved on March 18, 2004, from [www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/cmsconference/2001/Papers/Gender/thomas.pdf](http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/cmsconference/2001/Papers/Gender/thomas.pdf)
- Disch, L., & Kane, M. J. (1996). When a looker is really a bitch: Lisa Olson, sport, and the heterosexual matrix. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 21, 278-308.
- Dobni, D., Ritchie, J. R. B., & Zerbe, W. (2000). Organizational values: The inside view of service productivity. *Journal of Business Research*, 47, 91-107.
- Doherty, A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). Managing cultural diversity in sport organizations: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 280-297.
- Doherty, A., & Varpalotai, A. (2000). Theory-policy interface: The case of gender equity in sport. *Avante*, 7(1), 32-49.
- Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society*, 22, 643-657.
- Drake Group. (n.d.). *The Drake Group proposals*. Retrieved on April 19, 2004, from <http://www.westga.edu/~drake/home.html>
- Dryden, K. (1997, September). *A review of athletics and recreation*. Report for Queen's University, Kingston, ON.
- Duncan, M. C., & Messner, M. A. (1998). The media image of sport and gender. In L. A. Wenner (Ed.), *MediaSport* (pp. 170-185). London: Routledge.
- Eitzen, S. (2003). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ely, R. J., & Meyerson, D. E. (2000). Advancing gender equity in organizations: The challenge and importance of maintaining a gender narrative. *Organization*, 7, 589-608.
- Enz, C. A. (1988). The role of value congruity in intraorganizational power. *Administrative*

*Science Quarterly*, 33, 284-304.

- Ferguson, K. E. (1994). On bringing more theory, more voices and more politics to the study of organization. *Organization*, 1, 81-99.
- Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1996). Writing the "wrongs" of fieldwork: Confronting our own research/writing dilemmas in urban ethnographies. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 2, 251-274.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 107-131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fink, J. S., & Pastore, D. L. (1997). Gender equity? Differences in athletes' perceptions of equity in sport. *Journal of the Legal Aspects of Sport*, 7, 130-144.
- Fink, J. S., & Pastore, D. L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest*, 51, 310-327.
- Fink, J. S., Pastore, D. L., & Riemer, H. A. (2001). Do differences make a difference? Managing diversity in Division IA intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 10-50.
- Flax, J. (1987). Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 12, 621-643.
- Fletcher, J. (1998). Relational practice: A feminist reconstruction of work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7, 163-186.
- Fletcher, J. (1999a). *Disappearing acts: Gender, power, and relational practice at work*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Fletcher, J. (1999b). A radical perspective on power, gender and organizational change [Electronic version]. *CGO Insights*, No. 5. Retrieved April 3, 2002, from [www.simmons.edu/gsm/cgo/radical.html](http://www.simmons.edu/gsm/cgo/radical.html)
- Fletcher, J., & Merrill-Sands, D. (1999). Looking below the surface: The gendered nature of organizations. *CGO Insights*, No. 2. Retrieved April 3, 2002, from [www.simmons.edu/gsm/cgo/looking.html](http://www.simmons.edu/gsm/cgo/looking.html)
- Foley, D. E. (1992). Making the familiar strange: Writing critical sports narratives. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9, 36-47.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foreman, J. (2001). Organizational change. In E. Wilson (Ed.), *Organizational behaviour reassessed: The impact of gender* (pp. 215-237). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 109-134). New York: Harvester.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the 'postsocialist' condition*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, N., & Nicholson, L. J. (1990). Social criticism without philosophy: An encounter between feminism and postmodernism. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 19-38). New York: Routledge.
- Frisby, W. (1995). Broadening perspectives on leisure service management and research: What does organization theory offer? *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 13(1), 58-72.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C., Millar, S., & Hoeber, L. (in press). Putting 'participatory' into participatory forms of action research. *Journal of Sport Management*.
- Frisby, W., Thibault, L., & Kikulis, L. (2004). The organizational dynamics of under-managed partnerships in leisure service departments. *Leisure Studies*, 23(4), 109-126.
- Frost, P. J., Moore, L. F., Louis, M. R., Lundberg, C. C., & Martin, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Reframing organizational culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Frost, P., & Stablein, R. E. (1992). Beyond exemplars: Some reflections on the meaning and practice of research in the 1990s. In P. Frost, & R. Stablein (Eds.), *Doing exemplary research* (pp. 270-292). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gagliardi, P. (1986). The creation and change of organizational cultures: A conceptual framework. *Organization Studies*, 7, 117-134.
- Gamble, P. R., & Gibson, D. A. (1999). Executive values and decision making: The relationship of culture and information flows. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36, 217-240.
- Garnsey, E., & Rees, B. (1996). Discourse and enactment: Gender inequality in text and context. *Human Relations*, 49, 1041-1064.
- Gergen, M. M., & Gergen, K. J. (2000). Qualitative inquiry: Tensions and transformations. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 1025-1046). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gherardi, S. (1994). The gender we think, the gender we do in our everyday organizational lives. *Human Relations*, 47, 591-610.
- Gherardi, S. (1995). *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gherardi, S., & Poggio, B. (2001). Creating and recreating gender order in organizations. *Journal of World Business*, 36, 245-259.

- Grace, B. (1997). Researching a women's sport organisation. In G. Clarke & B. Humberstone (Eds.), *Researching women and sport* (pp. 17-35). Suffolk: Ipswich.
- Green, L., Parkin, W., & Hearn, J. (2001). Power. In E. Wilson (Ed.), *Organizational behaviour reassessed: The impact of gender* (pp. 188-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Greendorfer, S. L. (1998). Title IX gender equity, backlash and ideology. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 7(1), 69-93.
- Gruneau, R., & Whitson, D. (1993). *Hockey night in Canada: Sport, identities and cultural politics*. Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.
- Hall, M. A. (1996). *Feminism and sporting bodies: Essays on theory and practice*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hall, M. A. (1997). Feminist activism in sport: A comparative study of women's sport advocacy organizations. In A. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Gender, sport and leisure* (pp. 217-250). Aachen: Meyer & Meyer Verlag.
- Hall, M. A., Cullen, D., & Slack, T. (1989). Organizational elites recreating themselves: The gender structure of National Sport Organizations. *Quest*, 41, 28-45.
- Hall, M. A., Cullen, D., & Slack, T. (1990). The gender structure of National Sport Organizations. *Sport Canada Occasional Papers*, 2(1).
- Halford, S., & Leonard, P. (2001). *Gender, power and organisations*. New York: Palgrave.
- Hardy, C., & Clegg, S.R. (1996). Some dare call it power. In S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W.R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 622-641). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hargreaves, J. (1990). Gender on the sports agenda. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 25, 287-305.
- Hargreaves, J. (1994). *Sporting females: Critical issues in the history and sociology of women's sports*. London: Routledge.
- Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (1993). Organizations, multiple oppressions and postmodernism. In J. Hassard, & M. Parker (Eds.), *Postmodernism and organizations* (pp. 148-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hill, L. (1996). *Strategic decision making in the western Canadian university athletic system: A case study*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan.
- Hill, L., & Kikulis, L. M. (1999). Contemplating restructuring: A case study of strategic decision making in interuniversity athletic conferences. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 18-44.
- Hinings, C. R., Thibault, L., Slack, T., & Kikulis, L. M. (1996). Values and organizational structure. *Human Relations*, 49, 885-916.

- Hodder, I. (2000). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 703-715). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoeber, L., & Frisby, W. (2001). Gender equity for athletes: Rewriting the narrative for this organizational value. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 1, 179-209.
- Hoffman, A. (1995). Women's access to sport and physical activity. *Avante*, 1(1), 77-92.
- Hovden, J. (2000). Gender and leadership selection processes in Norwegian sporting organizations. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35, 75-82.
- Hughes, C. (1994). From field notes to dissertation: analyzing the stepfamily. In A. Bryman, & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data* (pp. 35-46). New York: Routledge.
- Hums, M. A., MacLean, J., Richman, J. M., & Pastore, D. L. (1994). Influences on women's intercollegiate sport in the United States and Canada. *Journal of the International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport and Dance*, 31(1), 34-37.
- Inglis, S. (1988). The representation of women in university athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 2, 14-25.
- Inglis, S. (1991). Influence in and around interuniversity athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 5, 18-33.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. (1996). Understanding retention factors in coaching and athletic management positions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 237-249.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 9(2), 1-26.
- Jacob, M., & Mathes, S. (1996). College women athletes' knowledge and perceptions of Title IX. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 6, 34-42.
- Jacobson, S. W., & Jacques, R. (1997). Destabilizing the field: Poststructuralist knowledge-making strategies in a postindustrial era. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 6, 42-59.
- Kane, M. J. (1996). Media coverage of the post Title IX female athlete: a feminist analysis of sport, gender, and power. *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 3(1), 95-127.
- Kay, T. (1996). Just do it? Turning sports policy into sports practice. *Managing Leisure*, 1, 233-247.
- Kearins, K. (1996). Power in organizational analysis: Delineating and contrasting a Foucauldian perspective. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organisation Theory*, II(2). Retrieved May 17, 2000 from [http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/depts/sml/journal/vol\\_3/kate.htm](http://www.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/depts/sml/journal/vol_3/kate.htm)

- Kent, J., & Robertson, S. (Eds.) (1995). *Towards gender equity for women in sport: A handbook for sport organizations*. Gloucester, ON: CAAWS.
- Kenway, J., Willis, S., Blackmore, J., & Rennie, L. (1994). Making 'hope practical' rather than 'despair convincing': Feminist post-structuralism, gender reform, and educational change. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15, 187-210.
- Kenway, J., Willis, S., Blackmore, J., & Rennie, L. (1998). *Answering back: Girls, boys and feminism in schools*. New York: Routledge.
- Keyes, M. E. (1974). The administration of the Canadian Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Union. *CAHPER Journal*, 40(6), 21-23; 32-33.
- Kidd, B. (1995). Confronting inequality in sport and physical activity. *Avante*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Kidd, B., & Donnelly, P. (2000). Human rights in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35(2), 131-148.
- Kolb, D. M., & Meyerson, D. (1999). Keeping gender in the plot: A case study of The Body Shop. In A. Rao, R. Stuart, & D. Kelleher (Eds.), *Gender at work: Organizational change for equality* (pp. 129-154). West Hartford, CN: Kumarian Press.
- Korvajärvi, P. (2002). Locating gender neutrality in formal and informal aspects of organizational cultures. *Culture and Organization*, 8(2), 101-115.
- Labianca, G., Gray, B., & Brass, D. J. (2000). A grounded model of organizational schema change during empowerment. *Organization Science*, 11(2), 235-257.
- LCU. (n.d.). *Facilities*. Retrieved from [www.aquatics.lcu.ca](http://www.aquatics.lcu.ca)
- LCU. (1999, March 31). *Financial statements*.
- LCU. (2000a). *2000 LCU policy handbook*.
- LCU. (2000b, March 31). *Financial statements*.
- LCU. (2002, May). *Annual salary matrix*. Retrieved May 21, 2002, from [www.lcu.ca/aaps/terms/annualmatrix.htm](http://www.lcu.ca/aaps/terms/annualmatrix.htm)
- Lenskyj, H. (1994). Girl-friendly sport and female values. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 3(1), 35-46.
- Liff, S., & Cameron, I. (1997). Changing equality cultures to move beyond 'women's problems'. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 4, 35-46.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Linstead, S., & Grafton-Small, R. (1992). On reading organizational culture. *Organization Studies*, 13, 331-355.

- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A radical view*. Hong Kong: The Macmillan Press.
- MacDonald, G. (1992). The meaning of equity. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 12(3), 8-13.
- Malloy, D. C., & Taylor, M. (1999). A qualitative inquiry of athletes' perception of the ethical climate in sport: A Canadian context. *International Sports Journal*, 3(2), 112-131.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J. (1990a). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organization Science*, 1, 339-359.
- Martin, J. (1990b). Breaking up the mono-method monopolies in organizational analysis. In J. Hassard, & D. Pym (Eds.), *The theory and philosophy of organizations: Critical issues and new perspectives* (pp. 31-43). New York: Routledge.
- Martin, J. (1991). A personal journal: From integration to differentiation to fragmentation to feminism. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 352-355). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J. (1992). *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. (1994). The organization of exclusion: Institutionalization of sex inequality, gendered faculty jobs and gendered knowledge in organizational theory and research. *Organization*, 1, 401-431.
- Martin, J. (2000). Hidden gendered assumptions in mainstream organizational theory and research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9, 207-216.
- Martin, J. (2002). *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J., & Frost, P. (1996). The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 599-621). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, J., & Meyerson, D. (1998). Conformity, resistance, and disorganized coaction. In R. M. Kramer, & M. A. Neale (Eds.), *Power and influence in organizations* (pp. 311-348). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, P. Y. (1996). Gendering and evaluating dynamics: Men, masculinities, and managements. In D. Collinson, & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Men as managers, managers as men: Critical perspectives on men, masculinities and management* (pp. 186-209). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Matthews, A. W. (1974). *Athletics in Canadian universities*. Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada.

- McClung, L. R., & Blinde, E. M. (2002). Sensitivity to gender issues: Accounts of women intercollegiate athletes. *International Sports Journal*, 6(1), 117-133.
- McDonald, M. G., & Birrell, S. (1999). Reading sport critically: A methodology for interrogating power. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 283-300.
- McDonald, P. (1991). The Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee: Developing organizational culture in the short run. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 26-38). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McKay, J. (1994). Masculine hegemony, the state and the incorporation of gender equity discourse: The case of Australian sport. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 29, 82-95.
- McKay, J. (1997). *Managing gender: Affirmative action and organizational power in Australian, Canadian, and New Zealand sport*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- McKay, J. (1999). Gender and organizational power in Canadian sport. In P. White, & K. Young (Eds.), *Sport and gender in Canada* (pp. 197-214). Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Mean, L. (2001). Identity and discursive practice: Doing gender on the football pitch. *Discourse & Society*, 12, 789-815.
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24, 351-389.
- Merriam, S. B. (1991). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Messner, M. A. (1988). Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 197-211.
- Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (1990). Introduction: Toward a critical feminist reappraisal of sport, men, and the gender order. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.), *Sport, men, and the gender order* (pp. 1-15). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Meyerson, D. (1991a). "Normal" ambiguity? A glimpse of an occupational culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 131-144). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyerson, D. (1991b). Acknowledging and uncovering ambiguities in culture. In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 254-270). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyerson, D., & Kolb, D. M. (2000). Moving out of the 'armchair': Developing a framework to bridge the gap between feminist theory and practice. *Organization*, 7, 553-571.
- Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: An integration of three different views.

*Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 623-647.

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Millen, D. (1997). Some methodological and epistemological issues raised by doing feminist research on non-feminist women. *Sociological Research Online*, 2(3). Retrieved on August 3, 2000, from [www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/3/3.html](http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/3/3.html)
- Mills, S. (2003). Caught between sexism, anti-sexism and 'political correctness': feminist women's negotiations with naming practices. *Discourse & Society*, 14(1), 87-110.
- Mohr, L. E. (1986). Funding interuniversity athletics in Canada: A student's perspective. In A.W. Taylor (Ed.), *The role of interuniversity athletics: A Canadian perspective* (pp. 95-103). London, ON: Sport Dynamics.
- Moriarty, D., & Holman-Prpich, M. (1987). Canadian interuniversity athletics: A model and method for analyzing conflict and change. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 57-73.
- Mumby, D. K. (1996). Feminism, postmodernism, and organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 9, 259-295.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Toronto, ON: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nilges, L. M. (1998). I thought only fairy tales had supernatural powers: A radical feminist analysis of Title IX in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17, 172-194.
- Nilges, L. M. (2001). The twice-told tale of Alice's physical life in wonderland: Writing qualitative research in the 21st century. *Quest*, 53, 231-259.
- Olesen, V. L. (2000). Feminisms and qualitative research at and into the millennium. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 215-255). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Opie, A. (1992). Qualitative research, appropriation of the 'other' and empowerment. *Feminist Review*, 40, 52-69.
- Oswick, C., Keenoy, T., & Grant, D. (1997). Managerial discourses: Words speak louder than actions? *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 6, 5-12.
- Padilla, A., & Baumer, D. (1994). Big-time college sports: Management and economic issues. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 18, 123-143.
- Pant, P. N., & Lachman, R. (1998). Value incongruity and strategic choice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 35, 195-212.
- Parks, J. B., & Robertson, M. A. (1998). Influence of age, gender, and context on attitudes toward sexist/nonsexist language: Is sport a special case? *Sex Roles*, 38, 477-494.

- Parks, J. B., & Robertson, M. A. (2002). The gender gap in student attitudes towards sexist/nonsexist language: Implications for sport management education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 190-208.
- Parks, J. B., Russell, R. L., Wood, P. H., Robertson, M. A., & Shewokis, P. A. (1995). The paradox of the contented working woman in intercollegiate athletics administration. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 73-79.
- Peterson, L. W., & Albrecht, T. L. (1999). Where gender/power/politics collide: Deconstructing organizational maternity leave policy. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8, 168-181.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Phillips, S. D., & Orsini, M. (2002). *Mapping the links: Citizen involvement in policy processes* [Electronic version]. CPRN Discussion Paper No. F/21. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Pomfret, M. (1986). Toward equivalence of opportunities. In A.W. Taylor (Ed.), *The role of interuniversity athletics: A Canadian perspective* (pp. 83-89.) London, ON: Sport Dynamics.
- Putler, D., & Wolfe, R. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 301-325.
- Rail, G. (1998). Introduction. In G. Rail (Ed.), *Sport in postmodern times* (p. ix-xxi). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley, & G. Salaman (Eds.), *The international yearbook of organization studies* (pp. 197-221). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rao, A., & Kelleher, D. (2000). Leadership for social transformation: Some ideas and questions on institutions and feminist leadership. *Gender and Development*, 8(3), 74-79.
- Rao, A., Stuart, R., & Kelleher, D. (1999). *Gender at work: Organizational change for equality*. West Hartford, CN: Kumarian Press.
- Regional Conference. (1999). *[Regional Conference] Operations manual 1999-2000*.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 516-529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Satisfaction and commitment of Canadian



- university athletes: The effects of gender and tenure. *Avante*, 8(1), 27-50.
- Ristock, J. L., & Pennell, J. (1996). *Community research as empowerment: Feminist links, postmodern interruptions*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Roddick, A. (2000). *Business as unusual*. London: Thorsons.
- Sabo, D. (1988). Psychosocial impacts on athletic participation on American women: Facts and fables. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 12, 83-96.
- Sack, A., & Staurowsky, E. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CN: Praeger.
- Salzer-Morling, M. (1998). As God created the earth ... a saga that makes sense? In D. Grant, T. Keenoy, & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Discourse & organization* (pp. 104-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sanger, K., & Mathes, S. (1997). Athletic directors, faculty athletic representatives, and women's basketball coaches perceptions of Title IX compliance at NCAA division III institutions. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 7, 12-23.
- Sanjek, R. (1990). A vocabulary for fieldnotes. In R. Sanjek (Ed.), *Fieldnotes: The making of anthropology* (pp. 92-121). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Schacht, S. P. (1996). Misogyny on and off the "pitch": The gendered world of male rugby players. *Gender & Society*, 10, 550-565.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, V. E. (1997). Interuniversity athletics: Separation from physical education. *Avante*, 3(2), 88-97.
- Scott, J. W. (1990). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. In M. Hirsch, & E. Fox Keller (Eds.), *Conflicts in feminism* (pp. 134-148). New York: Routledge.
- Shaw, S. (2001). *The construction of gender relations in sport organizations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, De Montfort University.
- Shaw, S., & Amis, J. (2001). Image and investment: Sponsorship and women's sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 219-246.
- Shaw, S., & Hoerber, L. (2003). 'A strong man is a direct and a direct woman is a bitch.': Gendered discourses and their influence on employment roles in sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 347-375.
- Shaw, S., & Slack, T. (2002). 'It's been like that for donkey's years': The construction of gender relations and the cultures of sports organizations. *Culture, Sport, Society*, 5(1), 86-106.

- Sinclair, A. (1993). Approaches to organisational culture and ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12, 63-73.
- Slack, T., & Thibault, L. (1988). Values and beliefs: Their role in the structuring of national sport organizations. *Arena Review*, 12(2), 140-155.
- Snyder, E. E. (1986). Athletics and higher education: A symbolic interaction perspective. In C. R. Rees, & A. W. Miracle (Eds.), *Sport and social theory* (pp. 211-226). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Stackman, R. W., Pinder, C. C., & Connor, P. E. (2000). Values lost: Redirecting research on values in the workplace. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture & climate* (pp. 37-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1995). Examining the roots of a gendered division of labor in intercollegiate athletics: insights into the gender equity debate. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 19, 28-44.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1996a). Blaming the victim: Resistance in the battle over gender equity in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 20, 194-210.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1996b). Women and athletic fund raising: Exploring the connection between gender and giving. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 401-416.
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1998). Critiquing the language of the gender equity debate. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 22, 7-26.
- Steinbach, P. (2000). Opening doors to equity. *Athletic Business*, 24(12), 109, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118.
- Stern, B. B. (1996). Textual analysis in advertising research: Construction and deconstruction of meanings. *Journal of Advertising*, 25(3), 61-73.
- Strauss, A. (1994). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, A. W. (Ed.). (1986). *The role of interuniversity athletics: A Canadian perspective*. London, ON: Sport Dynamics.
- Taylor, T. (2001). Gender and cultural diversity in sport organisations. *World Leisure*, 43(3), 31-41.

- Taylor, T., & Toohey, K. (1999). Sport, gender, and cultural diversity: Exploring the nexus. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13(1), 1-17.
- Theberge, N. (1987). Sport and women's empowerment. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10, 387-393.
- Theberge, N. (2000a). Gender and sport. In J. Coakley, & E. Dunning (Eds.), *Handbook of sport studies* (pp. 322-333). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Theberge, N. (2000b). *Higher goals: Women's ice hockey and the politics of power*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Thibault, L., Kikulis, L., & Frisby, W. (2004). Partnerships between local government sport and leisure departments and the commercial sector: Changes, complexities and consequences. In T. Slack (Ed.), *The commercialization of sport* (pp. 119-140). London: Frank Cass.
- Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972, Title 20 U.S.C. §1681-1688. (1972).
- Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2000). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 154-178.
- Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1993). *The cultures of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vertinsky, P. (1992). Reclaiming space, revisioning the body: The quest for gender-sensitive physical education. *Quest*, 44, 373-396.
- Vertinsky, P. (2000, August). *A 'sense of place': Reading the landscape of sporting life*. Paper presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> Biennial Conference of the International Society for Comparative Physical Education and Sport, Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia.
- Voss, G. B., Cable, D. M., & Voss, Z. G. (2000). Linking organizational values to relationships with external constituents: A study of nonprofit professional theatres. *Organization Science*, 11, 330-347.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1990). Equity vs. high performance in Canadian amateur sport: policy tensions. *CAHPER Journal*, 56(3), 27-30.
- Wiener, Y. (1988). Forms of value systems: A focus on organizational effectiveness and cultural change and maintenance. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 534-545.
- Wilensky, A. S., & Hansen, C. D. (2001). Understanding the work beliefs of nonprofit executives through organizational stories. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 223-239.

- Wilkins, A. L. (1983). The culture audit: A tool for understanding organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3, 24-38.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 515-552.
- Wilson, E. M. (2001). Organizational culture. In E. Wilson (Ed.), *Organizational behaviour reassessed: The impact of gender* (pp. 168-187). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wolf, D. L. (1996). Situating feminist dilemmas in fieldwork. In D. L. Wolf (Ed.), *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork* (pp. 1-55). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wolfe, R., Hoeber, L., & Babiak, K. (2002). Perceptions of the effectiveness of sport organizations: The case of intercollegiate athletics. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2, 135-156.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yule, J. (1997). Engendered ideologies and leisure policy in the UK. Part 1: Gender ideologies. *Leisure Studies*, 16, 61-84.
- Young, E. (1989). On the naming of the rose: Interests and multiple meanings as elements of organizational culture. *Organization Studies*, 10, 187-206.

---

<sup>i</sup> To maintain the confidentiality of the athletic department and the university, any articles or papers published by the athletic department, on-campus newspapers, or regional conferences were cited to sources with pseudonyms (see table 17).

Table 17.

*Pseudonyms of Selected Authors*

Pseudonym	Source
Author A	University department
Author B	University sport historian
Author C	Writer for campus newspaper A
Author D	Editor for campus newspaper B
Author E	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author F	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author G	Writer for campus newspaper C
Author H	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author I	University department
Author J	Unauthored article in campus newspaper B
Author K	Writer for campus newspaper A
Author L	Unauthored article in campus newspaper B
Author M	Writer for campus newspaper A
Author N	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author O	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author P	Writer for campus newspaper A
Author Q	Writer for campus newspaper B
Author R	Swim club

## APPENDICES

## **Appendix A**

### **Department of Athletics Gender Equity Policy**

#### **Athletics and Recreation**

#### **Awards and Scholarships Report**

August 27, 1999

#### **Background**

The University approves the Department of Athletics goal to provide awards to student-athletes, yet the task to elicit financial support has just begun. Fund-raising for athletic awards is a relatively new practice at LCU. Considering the age of LCU and the athletic department, the concept for student/athlete awards is surprisingly young; the majority of the awards currently in place are less than a decade.

Access to funding for student/athletes is primarily dependent on the alumni base. Alumni donations are typically sport and/or gender specific. Based on the stronger tradition of men in sport and historically higher income for graduating men, designated funding in proportionately greater to men's teams. Currently, Athletics is able to offset imbalances in award opportunities with the help of "undesignated" awards, such as the \_\_\_\_\_ Endowment.

The Department of Athletics recognizes and acknowledges the necessity for gender equity in sport, including awards. Gender specific teams help both men and women to achieve a competitive advantage that encourages growth. Awards provide the Department of Athletics with the opportunity to maximize these human resources in sport.

#### **External awards**

Traditionally, athletic alumni have formed external organizations that raise funds independent of the university. These organizations then funnel awards through LCU to student/athletes of their choice. With the exception of the LCU Golf Society, all external groups are alumni of men's teams: [men's football] Society and [men's ice hockey] Society are examples of these external organizations.

It is university policy to motivate external organizations to donate their funds to LCU, so that LCU controls the awards given to student/athletes. A recent incentive was the offer of match, through the President's Fund. Through the promise of match, the external

organization doubles the value of their funds, thereby increasing the opportunity to place money in the hands of students. In addition, due to the volume of LCU endowments and financial management, the funds have a greater opportunity for growth. The department of athletics has been successful in internalizing the majority of these awards with the assistance of the match available.

### **Athletics Gender Equity Policy**

The Department of Athletics is committed to increasing award opportunities for women, however, gender equity requires a transition phase. To manage the transition, Athletics has a gender equity plan, which includes encouraging either undesignated or non-gender specific donations from the community. The involvement of Athletic staff is integral to creating and sustaining organizational awareness and commitment to the gender equity plan. All coaches participate in fund-raising efforts and help to increase the awareness of the need for gender equity in sport. Most relevant, the coaches of the women's teams are active in their community outreach, and alumni development. Each coach has a long-term plan to engage alumni in the generation of revenue for sustainable growth that includes increased award opportunities for women in sport.

The department of athletics is committed to diversity, equity and support of women in sport. Fundraising goals include:

- To establish a funding base for both men and women's varsity teams that will ensure equal opportunity for male and female athletes;
- To promote award opportunities to support women in sport to potential donors;
- To acquire undesignated funds that will allow for flexibility in the allocation of awards/scholarships, and thereby facilitate gender equity in awards;
- To acquire non-gender specific funds that will allow for gender equity in awards within a specific sport.

## Appendix B

### Observation Categories

Table 18

*List of Observation Categories*

Observation Categories	Examples
Surroundings	<p>facility – description of playing or practice facility</p> <p>décor – evidence of banners, decorations, colours</p>
Artifacts	<p>clothing - quality of clothing, uniforms, street clothes, hats, bags, shoes worn and used by athletes, coaches</p> <p>equipment – quality and quantity of equipment used by the athletes</p> <p>other artifacts – evidence of other artifacts, such as signs, posters, programs</p>
People	<p>staff – description of staff, including coaches, managers and trainers</p> <p>interactions – description of interactions between staff, athletes, and spectators</p> <p>spectators – description of spectators at practices and games</p>
Rituals	<p>pre-game – description of rituals that occurred prior to the game</p> <p>game - description of rituals that occurred during the game</p> <p>post-game - description of rituals that occurred following the game</p>



## **Appendix C**

### **Interview Guide**

#### **Interview questions for athletes**

##### **Preliminary questions**

- ☐ How long have you been a participant within the athletic department?
- ☐ Could you explain to me how you became involved in the sport you currently compete in?
  - ☐ How long have you been competing in this particular sport?
  - ☐ Why did you choose to come to this university?
  - ☐ Is it a sport that you have competed in at a recreational level as well?
- ☐ Have you been an athlete at any other universities or colleges?
- ☐ Do you have any other roles within the athletic department? [e.g., athlete representative; student worker?]

##### **Impressions of gender equity**

- ☐ From your experience, what are the organizational values of the athletic department?
  - ☐ Is gender equity one of those values?
  - ☐ Should it be?
- ☐ Could you provide me with your definition of gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ Do you think the athletic department is gender equitable?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ Could you provide evidence of that?
  - ☐ What about gender equity with regards to media attention? access to support staff such as athletic trainers? access to facilities? educational priorities?
- ☐ Do you think the men's and women's [name of specific sport] teams are gender equitable?
- ☐ How does gender equity affect you as an athlete?
- ☐ Has your impression of gender equity changed over time?
  - ☐ If so, how and why?

##### **Gender equity policies**

- ☐ Are you aware of rules or regulations that govern gender equity for athletes?
  - ☐ Could you describe those policies for me?

- ☐ If you could change those policies, would you?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ How?

**Power and gender equity**

- ☐ What input or role do you have in determining gender equity for athletes in this athletic department?
- ☐ If you had a proposal regarding gender equity for athletes, and you wanted to ensure that it would be approved and successfully implemented in this athletic department, whose support would you enlist?

**Gender equity actions**

- ☐ What is being done in the athletic department to achieve or maintain gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ Are you aware of any examples of gender differences for athletes at this university?

**Conclusions**

- ☐ Could you describe your vision of the ideal situation of gender equity for athletes in university athletics?
  - ☐ What would have to change to meet that ideal situation?
- ☐ Is there anything else that you would like to discuss with regards to gender equity for athletes or with anything that was mentioned in this interview?

## ***Interview questions for coaches***

### **Preliminary questions**

- ☐ What is your role in the athletic department?
- ☐ How long have you been involved / associated with the athletic department?

### **Impressions of gender equity**

- ☐ What are the organizational values of the athletic department?
- ☐ Do you think that gender equity is an organizational value in this athletic department?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
- ☐ How did gender equity become an organizational value?
- ☐ Could you provide me with your definition of gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ Has your impression of gender equity changed over time?
  - ☐ If so, how and why?
- ☐ Do you think the athletic department is gender equitable with regards to athletes?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ Could you provide evidence of that?
  - ☐ What about gender equity with regards to media attention? access to support staff? access to facilities?
- ☐ Is there gender equity with the [name of specific sport] teams?
  - ☐ What is the relationship between the men's and women's [name of specific sport] teams like?

### **Gender equity policies**

- ☐ Are you aware of rules or regulations that govern gender equity for athletes?
  - ☐ Specifically, are you aware of university / regional conference / national conference rules and policies?
- ☐ How do those policies apply to you as an administrator or coach?
- ☐ What is your impression of those policies?
- ☐ If you could change those policies, would you?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ How?

### **Power and gender equity**

- ☐ What input or role do you have in determining gender equity for athletes in this athletic department?
- ☐ If you had a proposal regarding gender equity for athletes, and you wanted to ensure that it would be approved and successfully implemented in this athletic department, whose support would you enlist?
- ☐ Who decides if gender equity has been achieved?
  - ☐ What criteria are used to determine if gender equity has been achieved?

### **Gender equity actions**

- ☐ What is being done in the athletic department to achieve or maintain gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ What is your assessment of those practices?
- ☐ If you could change those practices, would you?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ How?
- ☐ Have you tried to implement gender equity initiatives before?
  - ☐ Have they been successful?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
- ☐ Are you aware of any examples of gender inequities / differences with regards to athletes in this department?
  - ☐ Could you describe them for me?
  - ☐ What is being done to deal with those inequities?

### **Conclusions**

- ☐ Could you describe your vision of the ideal situation of gender equity for athletes in university athletics?
- ☐ Is there anything else that you would like to discuss with regards to gender equity for athletes or with anything that was mentioned in this interview?

## ***Interview questions for administrators***

### **Preliminary questions**

- ☐ What is your role in the athletic department?
- ☐ How long have you been involved / associated with the athletic department?

### **Impressions of gender equity**

- ☐ What are the organizational values of the athletic department?
  - ☐ Is gender equity one of those values?
  - ☐ Should it be?
- ☐ If yes, how did gender equity become an organizational value?
- ☐ Could you provide me with your definition of gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ Has your impression of gender equity changed over time?
  - ☐ If so, how and why?
- ☐ Do you think the athletic department is gender equitable with regards to athletes?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ Could you provide evidence of that?

### **Gender equity policies**

- ☐ Are you aware of rules or regulations that govern gender equity for athletes?
  - ☐ Specifically, are you aware of university / regional conference / national conference rules and policies?
  - ☐ Do these policies have implications for you?
- ☐ What is your impression of those policies?
- ☐ If you could change those policies, would you?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ How?

### **Power and gender equity**

- ☐ Do you have some input with respect to gender equity for athletes in this athletic department?
- ☐ If you had a proposal regarding gender equity for athletes, and you wanted to ensure that it would be approved and successfully implemented in this athletic department, whose support would you enlist?

- ☐ Who decides if gender equity is being adequately addressed?
- ☐ What criteria are used to determine if gender equity has been achieved?

### **Gender equity actions**

- ☐ What is being done in the athletic department to achieve or maintain gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ What is your assessment of those practices?
- ☐ If you could change those practices, would you?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
  - ☐ How?
- ☐ Have you tried to implement gender equity initiatives before?
  - ☐ Have they been successful?
  - ☐ Why or why not?
- ☐ Are you aware of any examples of gender inequities / differences with regards to athletes in this department?
  - ☐ Could you describe them for me?
  - ☐ What is being done to deal with those inequities?

### **Conclusions**

- ☐ What is your impression of the current situation with regards to gender equity for athletes?
- ☐ Could you describe your vision of the ideal situation of gender equity for athletes in university athletics?
  - ☐ Can you think of any disadvantages / downsides of this ideal notion of gender equity for athletes?
  - ☐ What would have to be done to achieve this ideal situation?
- ☐ Is there anything else that you would like to discuss with regards to gender equity for athletes or with anything that was mentioned in this interview?

## **Appendix D**

### ***Department of Athletics and Recreation Mission Statement***

The Department of Athletics and Recreation at LCU reflects the university's dedication to excellence through the development and delivery of sport-related programs and services to both the university and general public it serves. The department strives to instill a sense of identity and ownership on the part of those who interact with the programs and, at the same time, to earn for the programs and the university, a feeling of purpose, commitment and responsibility.

The mandate of the Department embraces the concept of providing representative, participatory and educational programs in order to enhance the academic, social, cultural and health environment of the University as well as to provide a vehicle for public involvement, benefit and appreciation.

Guided by institutional and societal needs, supported by traditional and contemporary values and driven by an attitude of pride and enthusiasm, the Department of Athletics and Recreation is committed to projecting an air of excitement, innovation and progress which will ensure its current national and international reputation.

## Appendix E

### Analysis of Mission Statement

Table 19

#### *Analysis of Department's Mission Statement*

Paragraph	Lines	Context	Analysis
1	3-7	description of the connection between LCU and the athletic department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-value of excellence is highlighted</li> <li>-organizational practice of programming (development and delivery) is noted</li> <li>-no mention of gender equity at all</li> </ul>
2	8-11	description of the mandate of the athletic department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-emphasizes the practice of programming</li> <li>-no mention of gender equity, although the idea of 'representative programs' could be an indirect reference to it</li> </ul>
3	12-15	description of the athletic department's organizational commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-responsive to "institutional and societal needs" – not clear how they deal with competing needs</li> <li>-does gender equity fit into the category of "traditional and contemporary values"? An all-encompassing description of values – any values could fit into that description. Anyone could read into that statement the values they felt were important.</li> <li>-no mention of gender equity</li> </ul>

Note: Gender equity was not identified or referred to in the mission statement, despite claims from two administrators (A3 & A5) that it was.



## Appendix F

### Analysis of Policy Documents

Table 20

*Analysis of CIAU Operations Manual<sup>a</sup>*

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.c. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
Mission statement	BL/1	indirectly		Lists 5 organizational values Equity & equality are the 5 <sup>th</sup> values	no	Other social responsibility values (fair play, trust & mutual respect) Conception of equity broader than gender
Constitutional objectives	BL/2	indirectly		Lists 12 objectives and equity is the last objective	no	Conception of equity broader than gender
Organization: Board of Directors	BL/6	no		Policy 3.2.3 – “each university must nominate one male & one female to board of directors”	no	Relevant to administrators, but only mentioned by one administrator (A1)
Membership, fees & payment	OM/1	yes	1 line	Last condition of membership (A2.6): “members shall offer to their student bodies, CIAU competition in one or more sports for men, and in one or more sports for women”	no	Does the last condition imply the least importance? Minimal conditions to be met
Eligibility Rules	OM/12	indirectly		9 athlete eligibility principles. First principle – “The CIAU shall promote ethics, fair play, and the opportunity for all eligible athletes to participate in interuniversity sport while pursuing their education.”	no	“Opportunity for all” is a broad conception of equity

Table 20 - Continued

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.e. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
Athletic Awards	OM/25	yes	3 lines	7 principles relevant to the allocation of athletic awards Principles #3 (equal opportunity) & #5 (ensuring gender equity in the implementation of awards policy) relate to gender equity	no	How does the CIAU ensure equal opportunity with respect to athletic awards? How are 'equal opportunity' and 'gender equity' different as they are mentioned in separate principles? No indication of how gender equity is implemented with respect to the awards policy. One of the few policies that specifically relates to gender equity for student-athletes, but it was not mentioned by any interviewees
Code of Ethics	OM/34 & 35	yes	6 lines	4 principles in the code of ethics Principle #1 and its' sub-components relate to gender equity A.1 – respect for all participants A.1.5 – treat all equitably regardless of gender, race, and other conditions A.1.6 – use of gender neutral language A.1.7 – do not discriminate	no	No indication of how these codes are enforced. These code of ethics "reflect values, attitudes and behaviours desired and accepted by all CIAU members." However, none of the members of the athletic department mentioned these values or the code of ethics. Last principle – "advocate the fundamental values of sport" – gender equity is not included here. Is it not considered a value of sport?

Table 20 - Continued

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.e. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
Harassment & Discrimination Policy p. OM/40 - 46		yes	6 pages	Key definitions are provided, and procedures for handling cases are detailed. Policy guarantees "right to participate and work in an environment which promotes equal opportunity and prohibit unlawful discrimination and harassment"	discrimination = "differential adverse treatment of an individual or group that is not based on individual or group performance"	If there is unlawful discrimination, is there lawful discrimination? Lacks clear guidelines for ensuring equal opportunities. Since men and women usually compete on separate teams and achieve different performances, how can differential treatment be assessed? Although this is the most thoroughly developed gender equity policy by the CIAU, there is little mention by participants of discrimination or of this policy. This policy is similar in content and purpose to the discrimination and harassment policy outlined by LCU. Probably a reflection of the Canada Human Rights Act & Provincial Human Rights Act.
Equity & Equality Committee	OM/87 - 88	yes	0.5 pages	Structure and responsibilities of the committee are outlined. The committee should include "one person with expertise in gender issues" Responsibilities of the committee are to develop policies and plans to address barriers; to act as a resource; and to educate. Meets 1-2 times a year	No definition of 'equity' or 'equality'	Falls under the direction of the Research & Development Council. Obscure connection. What are the criteria for being an 'expert on gender issues'? How effective are committees that meet 1-2 times a year? No mention of this committee by the interviewees.

Table 20 - Continued

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.e. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
		yes	1 page	Out of 13 gender equity goals stated, 4 are relevant to student-athletes <sup>b</sup> Goal #2 – increase marketability & profile of women's teams Goal #7 – equitable portrayal of both genders in promotional materials Goal #9 – ensure safe & welcoming environment for women Goal #12 – create educational awareness materials to address barriers that women face in sport	no	Gender equity is positioned as helping out the women's programs (i.e., women's programs lack a profile in comparison to men's programs). No mention of men specifically in any of the goals. (7 goals directed specifically at or for women; 4 goals directed at both genders) Goal #9 - Presumes that all men feel comfortable in the existing environment, or that men are privileged in the existing environment. Relevant to athletes, coaches & administrators. Lacks guidelines on implementation of goals. No mention of these gender equity goals by any of the interviewees.
Organization of National Champ. – Policy on Publications (D.2)	OM/109	yes	5 lines	Policy ensures that both genders are represented in publications and communications, and that publications are "free of sexism, and portray both genders in a positive manner"	no	Policy is relevant to the CIAU and host institutions. Policy is limited to national championship promotions. No mention of ensuring gender equity with regular season publications.

Notes:

There are 17 sections in the operations manual (not including the bylaws). Gender equity is mentioned in six sections: membership, fees & payment, eligibility rules, athletic awards, code of ethics, councils, groups & committees, national championships (sections 13 – 16). Gender equity for student-athletes is not mentioned in the following sections: meetings & elections, eligibility registration, drug education & doping, discipline of members, athletes & others, organizational structure, marketing, media & public relations, and CIAU awards & trophies.

Gender equity could be mentioned in the discipline section, specifically outlining penalties for not meeting gender equity guidelines.

With regards to the organizational structure section, gender equity is identified as a committee's responsibility, not an individual responsibility. Although gender equity with respect to marketing and publications is identified as one of the gender equity goals (increasing the marketability and profile of women's programs) and is mentioned in the section on national championships, it is not specifically identified within the section on marketing, media & public relations. Gender equity is not defined in the operations manual.

<sup>a</sup> The CIAU Operations Manual was published in 1998 and consists of 18 pages of bylaws (BL); and 153 pages of the operations manual (OM).

<sup>b</sup> The other goals deal with areas such as committees and decision making, support staff, coaching, leadership, and research and development.

Table 21.

*Analysis of Regional Conference Operations Manual<sup>a</sup>*

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.c. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
Constitutional objectives	1 - C	yes	2.5 lines	12 objectives identified. Gender equity is the last objective. 2.12 "To ensure gender equity and equality of opportunity through progressive action, program development and delivery and [Regional Conference] organizational and decision making structure."	no	How are gender equity and equality of opportunity related, but different?
Conditions of Membership	1 - BL	yes	2.5 lines	Policy outlines conditions of membership. "Each Member institution must participate annually in a minimum of two (2) male and two (2) female Association league sports, and should attempt to operate with gender equity."	Identifies the number of sport programs to be offered. No guidelines re: 'operating with gender equity'.	The Regional Conference requires that members participate in at least two sports - one more than required by the CIAU. "Attempt to operate with gender equity" - leaves room for universities to claim they have tried to be gender equitable but can not.
Application for Membership	5 - BL	indirectly	1 line	#7 of 10 conditions to being a member (Policy 2.3.2) is to demonstrate "evidence of a commitment towards gender equity"	No guidelines re: 'evidence of commitment to gender equity'	Commitment to gender equity is left open for interpretation. Not clear if the commitment to gender equity extends to administrators, coaches, and athletes. This condition of membership was not mentioned by the athletic director or intercollegiate coordinator, who are

accountable for meeting these conditions.

Table 21 - Continued

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.c. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
	6 - BL	no		No reference to "evidence of a commitment towards gender equity" in the Application to Become an Associate Member.	n/a	Since 'a commitment to gender equity' is not a requirement for Associate Members, there may be discrepancies within the Conference in regards to the level of commitment to gender equity.
Organization – General Assembly	8 – BL	no	4 lines	Each member institution of the general assembly shall be represented by two voting delegates (one male, one female).	n/a	Requirements are consistent with CIAU regulations regarding decision making.
Sanctioned Activities	1 – GTR	yes	4 lines	Identifies men's, women's, and combined sports sanctioned by the Regional Conference.	n/a	Identifies which sports men and women can participate in.
Competition – Allowable Number of Participants	2 – GTR	yes	12 lines	Outlines the maximum number of participants per team.	n/a	Different number of participants allowed for men's ice hockey (19) and women's ice hockey (18). For men's and women's basketball and swimming, the roster sizes are the same for each gender.
Men's & Women's Basketball – Team Composition	1 & 7 – PL	indirectly	2 lines	Team roster is limited to two players who have had basketball training outside of Canada	n/a	No similar regulations for women's basketball. Assumption is that the men's teams will recruit players from the United States and elsewhere to boost the quality of the team. Not an issue for women's basketball?
Ice-Hockey – Men & Women – Team	34 & 41 – PL	indirectly	4 lines	Home teams in men's ice hockey are permitted to dress 19 players, including 2 goaltenders. Women's home teams - dress 18	n/a	No explanation provided for the difference in maximum roster sizes for women's and men's ice hockey.

Composition				players, including 2 goaltenders.		
-------------	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

Note: C = constitution; BL = bylaws; GTR = general and technical regulations; PR = playing regulations

<sup>a</sup> The Regional Conference Operations Manual was published in July 1999. It contains four sections: the constitution (2 pages), the bylaws (25 pages), the general and technical regulations (29 pages), and the playing regulations (59 pages) for a total of 115 pages.



Table 22.

*Analysis of LCU Policy and Procedure Handbook<sup>a</sup>*

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.e. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
LCU's Vision for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	6	indirectly	1 line	Part of LCU's mission is to "create a working environment dedicated to excellence, equity, and mutual respect."	Equity is not defined.	Broad conception of equity – not specific to gender. People, learning, research, community and internationalization are the 5 goals of LCU. Athletics and equity are not specifically included with any of these goals. Does working environment refer to the competitive environment of university athletics?
Policy #2 – Employment Equity	7	no		Policy pertains to the equitable recruitment and retention of faculty and staff.		Not clear if athletes are considered employees like faculty and staff members (i.e., does this policy pertain to the recruitment of athletes?)

Table 22 - Continued

Section	Page #	Relevant to g.e. for athletes	# lines / pages	Context & highlights	Definition	Analysis
Policy #3 – Discrimination and Harassment	8 - 12	indirectly	5 pages	This section outlines the purpose of the policy, provides definitions of key terms, and describes the procedures for dealing with complaints. As well, the responsibilities of the Equity Office and the President's Advisory Committee on Discrimination and Harassment are outlined. Two purposes of the policy are: a) to prevent discrimination, and b) to provide procedures for dealing with complaints. “Every student and member of faculty and staff at LCU has the right to study and work in an environment free from discrimination and harassment”	Discrimination and harassment are defined as “intentional or unintentional behaviour for which there is no reasonable justification.”	The policy pertains to discrimination in the ‘work and study environment’. Not certain how it pertains to extra-curricular activities such as varsity athletics. Places significant responsibility on faculty or administrative staff who supervises others for ensuring an environment free of discrimination. Are coaches considered administrative staff? Extensive policy but not mentioned by interviewees.

Notes: Of 128 policies, two are relevant to equity. There are no policies specifically relating to gender equity for student-athletes.

Gender equity was not referred to in any other university policies. However, it could be addressed in the following policies: communications (policy #96), advertising (policy #112), endowment management (#113), donations (#114), and gifts (#115) – as they relate to resource allocations and promotions.

<sup>a</sup> The LCU Policy Handbook which was published in 2000 consisted of 128 policies and was 107 pages long.

Table 23.

*Analysis of Athletic Department Policy*

Paragraph	Lines	Summary of content	Analysis
1	8-12	Importance of fund-raising for athletic awards	Reinforces the importance of fundraising to the athletic department as noted by some interviewees
2	13-18	Fundraising and scholarships are sport & gender-specific The athletic department taking action to address systemic barriers with 'undesignated awards'	The history of men's higher earning potential & tradition of men in sport (lines 14 – 16) was noted as an explanation for the lack of scholarships for women's teams, and the difficulty in fundraising for women's teams. These are competing values to gender equity. Fundraising and availability of scholarships is gendered – favours men's teams Athletic department is being proactive in addressing systemic barriers – actively encouraging alumni groups to donate to women's teams, as well as men's teams.
3	19-22	Reinforces importance of gender equity in sport & highlights the department's practice of gender equity in programming.	Gender equity in programming (an organizational practice) does exist. Confirms other data. Gender equity in awards (resource allocation) does not currently exist, but is necessary for the continuance of gender equity in programming. No definition of gender equity.
4	25-29	External alumni groups establish own scholarships and are generally more supportive of men's teams	Highlights privileges accorded to men's teams based on the support of alumni groups
5	30-36	Recent incentive by LCU to match funds from external organizations	Funds / fundraising are important to growth of varsity sports. Those teams (i.e., men's teams) that are successful at fundraising will receive additional funds from LCU, which allows them to more easily recruit and retain athletes.
6	39-47	Outlines the athletic department's plan to encourage gender equity in award allocations	Gender equity positioned 3 times in this paragraph as something to help women – fits the discourse – gender equity is a women's issue. In particular, responsibility is placed on coaches of women's teams to fundraise (lines 39, 45, 47) Emphasizes the commitment from department staff in the plan to increase availability of awards to women. Despite this statement, no coaches spoke about their plan, or their role in the plan, for generating revenue for athletic awards, particularly for women. No definition of 'gender equity in awards' – Does it imply the same numbers of awards, or the same total amounts?

Table 23 Continued

Paragraph	Lines	Summary of content	Analysis
7	40-56	Describes the department's fundraising goals	Gender equity positioned twice in this paragraph as something to help women – fits the discourse – gender equity is a women's issue (lines 48, 52) Reinforces the idea that fundraising is necessary to ensure 'equal opportunities' for men and women 'Gender equity in awards' is not defined No guidelines for implementing the plan or for assessing progress

Note: Only one interviewee (A2) spoke about this policy document.

## Appendix G

### Analysis of Operating Budgets for the Four Sport Programs

Table 24.

*Detailed Operating Budgets for Four Sport Programs over Three Seasons*

	1998-1999 operating budget <sup>c</sup>	1998-1999 entire budgets <sup>d</sup>	1999-2000 operating budget	1999-2000 coaching staff budgets	1999-2000 entire budgets (salaries included)	2000-2001 operating budget	2000-2001 coaching staff budgets	2000-2001 entire budgets (salaries included)
Total budget <sup>a</sup>	1,045,024	n/a	1,381,784	1,121,008	2,502,792	1,566,323	1,054,206	2,620,529
Basketball (m)	48,675	n/a	56,600	82,761	139,361	51,269	82,161	133,430
Basketball (w)	47,677	n/a	53,077	68,250	121,327	49,594	67,650	117,244
Ice hockey (m)	129,886	n/a	144,690	73,230	217,920	149,881	70,230	220,111
Ice hockey (w)	31,075	n/a	41,085	10,250	51,335	51,319	9,000	60,319
Rugby (m)	27,495	n/a	23,115	40,590	63,705	23,141	40,873	64,014
Rugby (w)	5,500	n/a	7,500	4,600	12,100	7,500	4,000	11,500
Swimming <sup>b</sup>	81,880	n/a	119,780	20,800	140,580	145,432	n/a <sup>e</sup>	145,432
Football	108,275	n/a	126,270	169,939	296,209	120,004	186,561	306,565

Note:

All figures are in Canadian dollars.

<sup>a</sup> Includes operating budgets for all varsity sports, game management, administrative costs, national championships, and trainer services.

<sup>b</sup> While men's and women's swimming teams competed as separate teams, they operated as one team.

<sup>c</sup> Operational expenses included travel, sports operations, operating supplies, equipment / uniforms, rentals, telecommunications, and professional fees

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the athletic department's financial statement for the 1998-1999 season that I received did not include the 'salaries and benefits' budget line.

<sup>e</sup> Salaries for the coaching staff of the swimming program were noted under the budget line 'professional fees' instead of in the 'salaries and benefits' budget line.

Table 25.

*Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's and Women's Basketball Teams over Three Seasons*

	1998-1999 operating budget <sup>c</sup>	1998-1999 entire budgets <sup>d</sup>	1999-2000 operating budget	1999-2000 coaching staff budgets	1999-2000 entire budgets (salaries included)	2000-2001 operating budget	2000-2001 coaching staff budgets	2000-2001 entire budgets (salaries included)
Total budget <sup>a</sup>	1,045,024	n/a	1,381,784	1,121,008	2,502,792	1,566,323	1,054,206	2,620,529
Men	48,675	n/a	56,600	82,761	139,361	51,269	82,161	133,430
Women	47,677	n/a	53,077	68,250	121,327	49,594	67,650	117,244
Comparison	+998 (m) <sup>e</sup>	n/a	+3,523 (m)	+14,511 (m)	+18,034 (m)	+1,675 (m)	+14,511 (m)	+16,186 (m)

<sup>a</sup> Includes operating budgets for all varsity sports, game management, administrative costs, national championships, and trainer services.

<sup>b</sup> While men's and women's swimming teams competed as separate teams, they operated as one team.

<sup>c</sup> Operational expenses included travel, sports operations, operating supplies, equipment / uniforms, rentals, telecommunications, and professional fees.

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the athletic department's financial statement for the 1998-1999 season that I received did not include the 'salaries and benefits' budget line.

<sup>e</sup> The letter in parentheses indicates which team (i.e., m = men's team, w = women's team) received the greater share of budget.

Table 26.

*Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's and Women's Ice Hockey Teams over Three Seasons*

	1998-1999 operating budget <sup>c</sup>	1998-1999 entire budgets <sup>d</sup>	1999-2000 operating budget	1999-2000 coaching staff budgets	1999-2000 entire budgets (salaries included)	2000-2001 operating budget	2000-2001 coaching staff budgets	2000-2001 entire budgets (salaries included)
Total budget <sup>a</sup>	1,045,024	n/a	1,381,784	1,121,008	2,502,792	1,566,323	1,054,206	2,620,529
Men	129,886	n/a	144,690	73,230	217,920	149,881	70,230	220,111
Women	31,075	n/a	41,085	10,250	51,335	51,319	9,000	60,319
Comparison	+98,811 (m) <sup>e</sup>	n/a	+103,605 (m)	+62,980 (m)	+166,585 (m)	+98,562 (m)	+61,230 (m)	+159,792 (m)

<sup>a</sup> Includes operating budgets for all varsity sports, game management, administrative costs, national championships, and trainer services.

<sup>b</sup> While men's and women's swimming teams competed as separate teams, they operated as one team.

<sup>c</sup> Operational expenses included travel, sports operations, operating supplies, equipment / uniforms, rentals, telecommunications, and professional fees.

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the athletic department's financial statement for the 1998-1999 season that I received did not include the 'salaries and benefits' budget line.

<sup>e</sup> The letter in parentheses indicates which team (i.e., m = men's team, w = women's team) received the greater share of budget.

Table 27.

*Comparison of the Operating Budgets for Men's & Women's Rugby Teams over Three Seasons*

	1998-1999 operating budget <sup>c</sup>	1998-1999 entire budgets <sup>d</sup>	1999-2000 operating budget	1999-2000 coaching staff budgets	1999-2000 entire budgets (salaries included)	2000-2001 operating budget	2000-2001 coaching staff budgets	2000-2001 entire budgets (salaries included)
Total budget <sup>a</sup>	1,045,024	n/a	1,381,784	1,121,008	2,502,792	1,566,323	1,054,206	2,620,529
Men	27,495	n/a	23,115	40,590	63,705	23,141	40,873	64,014
Women	5,500	n/a	7,500	4,600	12,100	7,500	4,000	11,500
Comparison	+21,995 (m) <sup>e</sup>	n/a	+15,615 (m)	+35,990 (m)	+51,605 (m)	+15,641 (m)	+36,873 (m)	+52,514 (m)

<sup>a</sup> Includes operating budgets for all varsity sports, game management, administrative costs, national championships, and trainer services.

<sup>b</sup> While men's and women's swimming teams competed as separate teams, they operated as one team.

<sup>c</sup> Operational expenses included travel, sports operations, operating supplies, equipment / uniforms, rentals, telecommunications, and professional fees

<sup>d</sup> The copy of the athletic department's financial statement for the 1998-1999 season that I received did not include the 'salaries and benefits' budget line.

<sup>e</sup> The letter in parentheses indicates which team (i.e., m = men's team, w = women's team) received the greater share of budget.



## Appendix H

### Analysis of News Releases

Table 28  
*Analysis of News Releases*

Team & year	# stories <sup>c</sup>	#lead stories <sup>d</sup>	Shortest story <sup>e</sup>	Longest story <sup>f</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines	Notes	Regular season record
Men's basketball 1998-1999	45	18 (9)	1.5	53	414.5	9.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 stories on recruits and top prospects - no similar story for women<sup>g</sup></li> <li>• often mentioned with women's team under the title "Men's and women's basketball"</li> <li>• 5 stories on men were mentioned before women<sup>h</sup></li> <li>• 3 lead stories presented in a gender-neutral manner</li> </ul>	11-9
1999-2000	52	15 (6)	2	47	446	8.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 stories on men were mentioned before stories on women</li> <li>• 1 story on recruits - no similar story for women</li> </ul>	12-8
2000-2001	45	11 (6)	3	38	368.5	8.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 longer press releases because they hosted a tournament</li> <li>• 10 stories on men mentioned before women</li> </ul>	9-13
Women's basketball 1998-1999	46	12 (9)	1	54	340	7.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 stories on women were mentioned before stories on men</li> </ul>	10-10
1999-2000	50	17 (6)	1.5	44	410	8.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 26 stories on women were mentioned before stories on men.</li> </ul>	12-8
2000-2001	47	14 (6)	1	26	291.5	6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19 stories on women were mentioned before stories on men</li> </ul>	11-11

Table 28 – Continued

Team & year	# stories <sup>c</sup>	#lead stories <sup>d</sup>	Shortest story <sup>e</sup>	Longest story <sup>f</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines	Notes	Regular season record
Men's ice hockey 1998-1999	47	6	2	31.5	331	7.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8 stories presented in a gender-neutral manner</li> <li>3 stories on men were mentioned before women</li> <li>12 stories on men were presented before and separately from women</li> <li>1 story on new recruits - nothing similar for women</li> </ul>	7-18-3
1999-2000	56	10 (1)	1	123	606.5	10.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7 gender-neutral stories</li> <li>9 stories on men were mentioned before women</li> <li>2 stories on men were mentioned first and separately from women</li> <li>no mention of men's or women's ice hockey teams in the 'year in review' media release</li> </ul>	5-19-4
2000-2001	44	2	3	60	365.5	8.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 times title of the story - gender-neutral</li> <li>8 stories on men mentioned before women</li> <li>4 stories on men were mentioned before and separately from stories on women</li> </ul>	6-19-3
Women's ice hockey 1998-1999	29	3 (2)	1.5	17	158.5	5.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no announcement for first conference home game</li> <li>no results from first conference home game</li> <li>stories never mentioned before stories on men</li> <li>13 times mentioned as the last story</li> </ul>	3-1 record at the round robin regional conference tournament – 2 <sup>nd</sup> place
1999-2000	18	1	3	27	107.5	5.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 stories on women mentioned before stories on men</li> </ul>	2-10
2000-2001	24	0	2	16	117	4.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9 stories on women were mentioned before stories on men</li> </ul>	3-9

Table 28 – Continued

Team & year	# stories <sup>e</sup>	#lead stories <sup>d</sup>	Shortest story <sup>e</sup>	Longest story <sup>f</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines	Notes	Regular season record
Men's rugby 1998-1999	5	0	1	2	8	0.6		
1999-2000	2	0	1	8	9	4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no regular coverage of men's rugby in media releases but was mentioned in the 'year in review' media release</li> </ul>	
2000-2001	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
Women's rugby 1998-1999	5	1	1.5	8	16	3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>very little coverage despite winning conference title and advancing to national championship</li> </ul>	regional conference champions
1999-2000	5	0	4	22	55	11		2-1 record in regional round robin tournament
2000-2001	5	0	1	20	32	6.4		2-1 record in regional round robin tournament

Table 28 – Continued

Team & year	# stories <sup>c</sup>	#lead stories <sup>d</sup>	Shortest story <sup>e</sup>	Longest story <sup>f</sup>	Total # lines	Average # lines	Notes	Regular season record
Swimming <sup>a</sup> 1998-1999	25	6 (1)	1.5	29	207.5	8.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stories were consistently presented as 'swimming' instead of presented as 'men's swimming' and 'women's swimming'</li> </ul>	men's and women's teams were the national champs
1999-2000	18	5 (1)	2	46	263	14.6		men's and women's teams were the national champs
2000-2001	14	9 (1)	1	49	280	20		men's and women's teams were the national champs
Men's Football <sup>b</sup> 1998-1999	21	11						
1999-2000	20	17						
2000-2001	19							

<sup>a</sup> News releases for the swim program were devoted to the entire program as opposed to split up into separate stories on the men's and women's swim teams.

<sup>b</sup> Football was added as a reference point as it was one of the most often featured teams in the news releases despite their short season.

<sup>c</sup> There were 76 media releases in total in 1998-99, 81 media releases in 1999-2000, and 94 media releases in 2000-2001.

<sup>d</sup> The number in parentheses indicates the number of shared lead stories.

<sup>e</sup> & <sup>f</sup> Values in these columns represent the number of lines for a story.

<sup>g</sup> The majority of pieces on 'top prospects' were for men's teams such as football, basketball, and ice hockey. There was one story for swimming that did mention a top female swimmer prospect.

<sup>h</sup> This comment refers to the order of the stories. For example, one media release may have a story on women's basketball, followed by one on men's basketball, then men's ice hockey, then women's volleyball, men's volleyball, and then women's ice hockey. Most times, stories on the men's and women's teams from the same sport (i.e. volleyball, soccer, or basketball) followed one another. This was not always the case with ice hockey.

## Appendix I

### Analysis of Observations

Table 29.

#### Analysis of Basketball Observations

Observation categories	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
Surroundings	facility	played in main gym from 6:15 – 8:00 pm	played in main gym from 8:00 – 10:00 pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teams used the same space, but at different times in the day (mentioned by A1, A5, B1 – 7)</li> <li>no difference in the placement of banners for men's and women's basketball</li> </ul>	resource allocations - equitable programming - equitable
	décor	championship banners for the two basketball teams were displayed around the gymnasium			
Artifacts	clothing	athletes: adidas logo on shoes, jackets, backpacks, uniforms coach: pants with adidas logo	athletes: Nike logo on jackets, caps, uniforms, practice gear; most had the same Nike shoes numbers wearing off the uniforms (end of the season?) coaches: shirts and bags with Nike logos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>although the teams had different styles of uniforms, both sets of uniforms looked new and clean</li> <li>in practices, men's and women's teams used different sets of basketballs</li> <li>Why did they have different sponsors? (mentioned by B2, B3)</li> <li>both teams on 'front' cover of the program – both teams had equal coverage and visibility (mentioned by A3)</li> </ul>	resource allocations – equitable (generally) promotions - equitable
	Equipment and other artifacts	athletes brought their own balls? prominent adidas signs at games 1/2 printed program devoted to women's team	Nike logo on basketballs prominent Nike signs at games 1/2 printed program devoted to men's team		

Table 29 - Continued

Observation categories	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
People	staff	-male trainer, male manger, 1 male assistant coach, 1 female assistant coach -2 officials (male) -some cheerleaders (8 women, 2 men) at the game; 2 mascots in attendance -3 ball girls	-4 male assistants, 2 trainers (female), 2 managers (1 male; 1 female), 1 strength & conditioning coach (male) -3 officials (male) -more cheerleaders at the men's game; mascots still in attendance	-3 men involved as support staff for women's basketball; I doubt that women were as involved with the men's program -number of spectators fluctuated throughout game – but more at beginning of men's than beginning of women's (A1, A3, A5, B1 – 6) -athletic department staff, coaches did not attend the entire women's game – but came to watch the men's game-different number of officials – one more official for the men's game – institutionalized	resource allocations – generally equitable promotions – despite equitable promotion, more spectators at the men's game
	spectators	-70 – 200 spectators -campus radio station set up during second half -some varsity coaches & athletic department staff arrived during second half - 2 male basketball players hung out in the gym, during the women's practices, before their practice	-250 – 300 spectators -media personnel -athletic department staff female basketball players & coaches (home & away team) -4-6 female basketball players sat in stands during the practice, waiting for their practice time		

Table 29 - Continued

Observation categories	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
Rituals	pre-game	-rap music -player's name, eligibility, home town	-dramatic entrance when the team came in -rap music -same format as for women's game but more noise	-more drama in warm ups for men's game probably because more people at beginning of men's game -similar rituals during both games	promotions - equitable
	game	-gave away 4 Powerade bottles -half-time contest: shoot to win with 3 female participants	-gave away Power Bars half time contest: shoot to win - 3 male participants		



Table 30.

*Analysis of Ice Hockey Observations*

Observation category	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
Surroundings	facility (arena & locker rooms)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-used main rink for game</li> <li>-no heat during the game</li> <li>-a few cars in the parking lot</li> <li>-no music when arrived</li> <li>-athletes carried equipment from a change room to small room (storage?) near rink</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-used main rink for game</li> <li>-parking lot full when arrived</li> <li>-music playing when arrived</li> <li>-locker room adjacent to rink</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-used the same facility (main rink) for games (H1-6)</li> <li>-different access to locker rooms for games – men's room close to playing area, women's room more inconvenient access (H2)</li> <li>-more promotion for men's games than for women's games</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>resource allocations – inequitable access to facilities</li> <li>promotions - inequitable</li> </ul>
	décor		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-poster for next men's game; no poster for women's game</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-old looking banners for regional conference teams</li> <li>-no banners specifically for men's or women's championships</li> </ul>			

Table 30 - Continued

Observation category	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
Artifacts	uniform	-mismatched; multiple colours of equipment (some black, some blue) -no evidence of sponsorship	-coordinated, clean, new – all wore the same uniform -no evidence of sponsorship	-different quality of uniforms and equipment between the teams – women's team looked uncoordinated, men's teams looked coordinated (H2, 3, 5 – uniforms; H2 – 5 – quality and quantity of equipment)	resource allocations - inequitable promotions - inequitable
	equipment	-different brands of equipment	-same equipment	-printed programs were different in length and quality – contradicted comments from A3 that the programs were 'the same'	
	other artifacts	-8 ½ x 11 black & white printed program	-4 pages of a printed program, some sections were in colour		
People	staff	- 3 assistants coaches (2 male; 1 female), 1 trainer (female) -“no one at the door; no one selling tickets, no one handing out programs” at game -3 referees (male)	-1 male assistant, 2 trainers, 2 managers -8 game day staff members (gate, ticket takers, goal judges, announcers) 3 referees (male)	-more game-day staff members for men's hockey (greater demand because more spectators?) (H2 – 3) -fewer staff at women's game – didn't feel like a 'real' game -number of spectators for women's game contradicted claims by some interviewees that no one went to women's ice hockey (A1, 2, 5; B5), and confirmed comments from some women ice hockey players that they did have spectators (H3) -Do 300-400 spectators at the men's hockey game generate significant revenue?	resource allocations – inequitable promotions – inequitable
	spectators	-few people in arena when arrived -100 spectators (50 in the lounge, 50 in the stands)	-300-400 spectators (60-80 in stands, 80-100 in lounge at the start of the game)		

Table 30 - Continued

Observation category	Examples	Women	Men	Reflections	Organizational practices
Rituals	pre-game	-played national anthem (taped)	-a woman sang the national anthem	-more entertainment and promotions during at the men's game than at the women's game – despite only 200 – 300 people difference in numbers of spectators	resource allocations – inequitable promotions - inequitable
	game	-no giveaways or entertainment at intermissions	-gave away free pizza; Gatorade water bottles -half-time: young kids playing hockey		
	post-game		-some hockey players signed autographs for younger children		

Table 31.

*Analysis of Rugby Observations*

Observation category	Examples	Women's team	Men's team	Reflections	Organizational practices
Surroundings	facility	-no score or time clock -competition occurred in the enclosed area with bleachers	-competition occurred on an open field -no seating for spectators, coaches, or players (standing on sidelines instead)	- used different fields but enclosed facility with bleachers was available to the men's team – not clear why they weren't using it -seemed to contradict comments from A1 & R1 who indicated that the men's program had greater access to facilities	resource allocations – inequitable in comparison to other sports with indoor facilities, score clocks, and adequate seating for spectators
Artifacts	uniforms	-athletes wearing rugby shirts and toques with Athletic Department logo	-numbers pinned on to shirts -old and dingy looking rugby shirts	-women's teams had a cleaner, newer looking uniforms – could be newer because a newer team -no promotion of either team (A1, A3, A5, B3, R1 – 3)	resource allocations (staffing) – inequitable in comparison to basketball where game day staff (event manager) set up facility & puts away equipment resource allocations – inequitable for uniforms promotions – inequitable in comparison to basketball and ice hockey; equitable in comparison to each other
	equipment	-players put away equipment	-players put away equipment		
	other artifacts	-no printed program -no posters for games	-no printed program -no posters for games		

Table 31 - Continued

Observation category	Examples	Women's team	Men's team	Reflections	Organizational practices
People	staff	-1 male assistant coach, 1 female trainer -no admission fees	-no admission fees -one player from each team was 'officiating' -male referee	-lack of spectators at both games (A1, A3, A5, R1-3) -lack of game day staff hired by the athletic department -A1 indicated that women's team	promotions – inequitable in comparison to basketball and men's ice hockey
	interactions		lots of swearing; some sexist remarks		
	spectators	10-20	30-50		
Rituals	post-game	-cheers; shook hands (weaving pattern) -met with other team for a bbq	cheers; shook hands	-R2 & R3 also mentioned the social aspects of rugby with the home & visiting teams meeting together following a competition	

Table 32.

*Analysis of Swimming Observations*

Observation category	Examples	Men's & women's teams <sup>a</sup>	Reflections	Organizational practices
Surroundings	facility	-at the practices, male and female athletes swam in the same lanes (1 – 3 swimmers per lane)	-facility shared among men and women (A1, A5, S1-5)	resource allocations – equitable promotions – equitable in terms of displaying championship banners
	décor	-championship & meet banners for men and women displayed on far wall	-banners for both teams were displayed in a similar manner – neither gender took precedence (S3)	
Artifacts	uniforms	-many variations in swim suits – no consistency among athletes -casual attire when not competing – sweats, long sleeved shirts, flip flops -varsity bomber jackets	-bomber jackets supplied by athletic department (S1 –2) -different attire from basketball where male and female athletes expected to dress up (women post-game; men pre-game) -surprised there was no printed program because it was a regional championship meet	promotions – inequitable in comparison to basketball and men's ice hockey
	other artifacts	-no printed program -little evidence of sponsorship at the meet (no banners, pamphlets, signs, advertising on clothing)	-no posters for the meet, confirms comments from two administrators that minor sports were not promoted (A3 & A5)	

Table 32 - Continued

Observation category	Examples	Men's & women's teams <sup>a</sup>	Reflections	Organizational practices
People	staff	-2 male head coaches at the swim meet -1 male coach at the practice – not in the water -no game day staff & didn't pay admission to the swim meet	-male dominated coaching staff (S1) -more interactions between male and female athletes than observed in basketball, ice hockey and rugby (S1 – 5) -few spectators, but more athletic administrators and media than at ice hockey and rugby	resource allocations – inequitable in comparison to basketball and men's ice hockey (no game day staff)
	interactions	-male and female swimmers conversed with each other during practice -male and female athletes stood together on the deck, cheering on teammates	-presence of media signified important event, but event was not promoted	
	spectators	-30-40 spectators -athletic administrators at the meet (intercollegiate coordinator, communications coordinator, assistant comm. director) -media – reporters, videographers		
Rituals	game	-sequence of events during the meet interchange between men and women	-interchanging of events between men and women different from other case study sports, where competitions for men and women occurred at different times and /or days (S1)	programming - equitable

<sup>a</sup> Since the men's and women's swim teams practiced and competed in an integrated manner the observations reflected this integrated structure.

## Appendix J

### First-order and Second-order Codes

Table 33.

*List of First-order and Second-order Codes*

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
ARE TEAMS GENDER EQUITABLE?	comments on the general state of gender equity between teams in the same sport	are teams ge? - can't compare (10) are teams ge? - not with ice hockey (7) are teams ge? - not always (2) are teams ge? - not sure (8) are teams ge? - yes, legally (2) are teams ge? - yes, most of the time (32)
DECISION MAKING	comments about the stakeholders' involvement in decision making	decision making - lack of / involvement (22) decision making - organizational priorities (21)
DEFINITION	respondents' definitions and understandings of gender equity	definition - equal opportunities (55) definition - equal resources (30) definition - equal rights (4) definition - equitable treatment (19) definition - fairness (7) definition - not sure (8) definition - reasonable equity (38) definition - respect (4)



Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
EFFECT OF GENDER EQUITY	comments on the impact of gender equity at an individual level	effect of ge - don't know (3) effect of ge - impact with job responsibilities (6) effect of ge - maintain status (1) effect of ge - make do with current situation (8) effect of ge - no effect (12) effect of ge - not enough support (3) effect of ge - socialization with both genders (5) effect of ge - subjected to stereotyping (20) effect of ge - there still are inequities (5) effect of ge - work as hard but fewer payoffs (8)
GENDER EQUITY AS AN ORG VALUE	comments on the state of gender equity as an organizational value	ge as org value - general development (1) ge as org value - development - from a sense of inequity (5) ge as org value - development - from a personal agenda (2) ge as org value - development - it was a policy elsewhere (3) ge as org value - development - it is a social issue (15) ge as org value - not / in action (16) ge as org value - not / mandated (8) ge as org value - not / shared (18) ge as org value - not / talked about (10) ge as org value - not sure (6) ge as org value - politically correct (6) ge as org value - yes it is a value (14)

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
GENDER EQUITY IMPRESSION	perceptions of the current situation for gender equity for athletes	<p>ge impression - perceptions are changing (51)</p> <p>ge impression - competing values (9)</p> <p>ge impression - don't know (9)</p> <p>ge impression - getting better (80)</p> <p>ge impression - inequities still exist (61)</p> <p>ge impression - is / not a significant issue (29)</p> <p>ge impression - making sacrifices to help women (19)</p> <p>ge impression - no inequities (72)</p> <p>ge impression - not good, not bad (14)</p> <p>ge impression - not qualified to judge (17)</p> <p>ge impression - opposed to current practices (82)</p> <p>ge impression - optimistic about practices (29)</p> <p>ge impression - responding to external pressures (6)</p> <p>ge impression - pessimistic about achieving 'true' equity (59)</p> <p>ge impression - room for improvement (23)</p> <p>ge impression - feel like a second class athlete (32)</p> <p>ge impression - seen as a women's issue (58)</p> <p>ge impression - sport reflects society (13)</p> <p>ge impression - taken for granted (24)</p> <p>ge impression - interested in what others have to say (5)</p>

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
GENDER EQUITY POLICIES	comments on gender equity policies	ge policies - aware of sport based policies (34) ge policies - aware of university based policies (3) ge policies - aware of Title IX (30) ge policies - they influence action (11) ge policies - need – mixed feelings (6) ge policies - need – no, already responsive (6) ge policies - need – no, creates inequities for men (2) ge policies - need - no, will just be broken (1) ge policies - need - should be tied to criteria (2) ge policies - need - yes, it's been researched (1) ge policies - need - yes, to create change (21) ge policies - need - yes, to reflect society (3) ge policies - need, yes, to safeguard current situation (3) ge policies - not enforced (4) ge policies - don't have specific awareness of any policies (50)
GENDER EQUITY ROLE	comments on individual's role in achieving or maintaining gender equity	ge role - advocate (36) ge role - fundraiser (15) ge role - lack of time – no role (17) ge role - leadership (14) ge role - no role (17) ge role - policing (51) ge role - provide opportunities (4) ge role - question the status quo (12) ge role - role model (15) ge role - student voice (25) ge role - do the best with the current situation (5) ge role - not sure (4) ge role - increase visibility of sport (5)

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
IN/ACTION	comments specifically related to the connection between gender equity and organizational practices	in/action - advocacy (4) in/action - awareness (9) in/action - best practices (45) in/action - CLAU (5) in/action - coaching styles (24) in/action - communicate (19) in/action - community service (3) in/action - decision / policy making (14) in/action - don't know (14) in/action - evaluate and discuss (35) in/action - facility access (9) in/action - gradual improvements (8) in/action - hard to be fair (4) in/action - long term planning (16) in/action - negotiate (12) in/action - policing (14) in/action - prioritization of marginalized sports (3) in/action - promotion and support (82) in/action - provide opportunities (91) in/action - remove traditional networks (8) in/action - resource support (145) in/action - socialization between teams (86)

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
INEQUALITY	examples of inequities between teams	<p>inequality - favouring big sports – promotion and media attention (22)</p> <p>inequality - favouring big sports – resource allocation (32)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – budget (29)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – coaching (34)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – comfortable environment (5)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – equipment (19)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – facility and space access (45)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – fan support (18)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – game / practice times (16)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – high calibre competition (14)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – league structure (9)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – media attention (17)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – other (30)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – promotion (9)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – respect and support (39)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – revenue generation (54)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – scholarship distribution (16)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – support staff (13)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – access to resources (6)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – fan support (3)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – high calibre competition (14)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – higher academic expectations (3)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – media attention (10)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – practice times (2)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – scholarship distribution (2)</p> <p>inequality - minor differences (8)</p> <p>inequality - no difference (22)</p> <p>inequality - not sure of differences (10)</p> <p>inequality - other type of difference (20)</p> <p>inequality - sure they exist, but aren't specifically aware of them (4)</p>

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
IS ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT GENDER EQUITABLE?	comments on the general state of gender equity within the athletic department	<p>is ad ge? - can't decide (13)</p> <p>is ad ge? - for some sports (21)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no (5)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no blatant inequities (3)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no, but it's better (2)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no, not in practice (6)</p> <p>is ad ge? - trying to be (15)</p> <p>is ad ge? - yes, legally (4)</p> <p>is ad ge? - yes, overall (19)</p>
OTHER ORG VALUES	comments regarding other significant organizational values	<p>other org values - achievement/ winning (65)</p> <p>other org values - athlete centered (16)</p> <p>other org values - broad based programming (15)</p> <p>other org values - community connection (5)</p> <p>other org values - conflicting values (11)</p> <p>other org values - don't know (12)</p> <p>other org values - education (24)</p> <p>other org values - fair play (3)</p> <p>other org values - financial viability (39)</p> <p>other org values - publicity / visibility (26)</p>
REMEDIES	recommendations to remedy inequities or make the department more gender equitable	<p>remedies - be more successful (1)</p> <p>remedies - build / change traditions (13)</p> <p>remedies - change societal attitudes (6)</p> <p>remedies - develop closeness between teams (1)</p> <p>remedies - collective changes through conferences (2)</p> <p>remedies - financial changes (25)</p> <p>remedies - being more proactive (11)</p> <p>remedies - be a role model (1)</p> <p>remedies - structural changes (23)</p> <p>remedies - more student involvement (12)</p>

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
SUPPORT FOR GE	comments regarding who supports gender equity initiatives	<p>support for ge - don't know (3)</p> <p>support for ge - external - CIAU (3)</p> <p>support for ge - external - ge advocates (8)</p> <p>support for ge - external - government (3)</p> <p>support for ge - external - media (1)</p> <p>support for ge - external - university (3)</p> <p>support for ge - internal - athletic department (6)</p> <p>support for ge - internal - coach (15)</p> <p>support for ge - internal - head of athletic department (16)</p> <p>support for ge - internal - intercollegiate coordinator (31)</p> <p>support for ge - other (4)</p> <p>support for ge - student body (13)</p> <p>support for ge - athletic council (8)</p>
VISION OF GE	comments on what gender equity could look like in the athletic department	<p>vision of ge - basketball / volleyball / swimming model (6)</p> <p>vision of ge - equal between teams (23)</p> <p>vision of ge - equal opportunity and outcome (21)</p> <p>vision of ge - fair treatment (4)</p> <p>vision of ge - less emphasis on body image (2)</p> <p>vision of ge - having a long term plan (2)</p> <p>vision of ge - more resources (11)</p> <p>vision of ge - more support for women (8)</p> <p>vision of ge - no / gender segregation (13)</p> <p>vision of ge - when it's no longer an issue (9)</p> <p>vision of ge - proactiveness (5)</p> <p>vision of ge - provide what's needed (5)</p> <p>vision of ge - respect (16)</p> <p>vision of ge - same expectations (3)</p>

Table 33 - Continued

First-order code	Description	Second-order codes
WHY IN/ACTION	reasons why gender equity has / has not been translated into practices	<p>           why in/action - change takes time (40)            why in/action - competing values (21)            why in/action - financial context (76)            why in/action - having a voice (4)            why in/action - institutional pressures (51)            why in/action - lack of / interest (72)            why in/action - just the way things are (94)            why in/action - leadership (33)            why in/action - networking (34)            why in/action - not a matter of gender (67)            why in/action - not a problem (8)            why in/action - not their responsibility (49)            why in/action - not/mandated (8)            why in/action - not/ proven their worth (94)            why in/action - to offset football (32)            why in/action - prestige and image (10)            why in/action - proactive / reactive (32)            why in/action - resource availability (93)            why in/action - increased awareness (17)            why in/action - societal attitudes (69)            why in/action - too much of a hassle (6)         </p>

Note: The number in parenthesis represents the number of quotations linked to that particular code.



## Appendix K

### Themes, Sub-themes, and Categories

Table 34.

*Identification of Themes, Sub-themes, and Categories*

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Meanings of gender equity			definition - fairness (7) definition – respect (4) vision of ge - fair treatment (4) vision of ge - no / gender segregation (13) vision of ge - when it's no longer an issue (9) vision of ge - respect (16)
	Equality	equal opportunities equal resources equal treatment	definition - equal opportunities (55) definition - equal resources (30) definition - equal rights (4) definition - equitable treatment (19) vision of ge - equal between teams (23) vision of ge - equal opportunity and outcome (21) vision of ge - same expectations (3)
	Conditional equality	conditional equality	definition - reasonable equity (38) ge impression - opposed to current practices (82) ge impression - pessimistic about achieving 'true' equity (59) ge policies - need – no, creates inequities for men (2) vision of ge - provide what's needed (5)

Table 34 - Continued

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Meanings of gender equity	Gender equity was a women's issue	women were undervalued for women, not men their responsibility	<p>ge impression - feel like a second class athlete (32)</p> <p>ge impression - making sacrifices to help women (19)</p> <p>ge impression - not qualified to judge (17)</p> <p>ge impression - seen as a women's issue (58)</p> <p>ge role - advocate (36)</p> <p>ge role - fundraiser (15)</p> <p>ge role - lack of time – no role (17)</p> <p>ge role - leadership (14)</p> <p>ge role - no role (17)</p> <p>ge role - policing (51)</p> <p>ge role - provide opportunities (4)</p> <p>ge role - question the status quo (12)</p> <p>ge role - role model (15)</p> <p>ge role - student voice (25)</p> <p>ge role - do the best with the current situation (5)</p> <p>ge role - not sure (4)</p> <p>ge role - increase visibility of sport (5)</p> <p>support for ge - external – ge advocates (8)</p> <p>support for ge - internal – intercollegiate coordinator (31)</p> <p>support for ge - other (4)</p> <p>support for ge - student body (13)</p> <p>vision of ge - more support for women (8)</p> <p>why in/action - lack of / interest (72)</p>

Table 34 - Continued

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Gender equity & organizational practices			<p>ge impression - inequities still exist (61)</p> <p>ge impression - opposed to current practices (82)</p> <p>ge impression - optimistic about practices (29)</p> <p>ge impression - room for improvement (23)</p> <p>ge policies - they influence action (11)</p> <p>ge ad ge? - for some sports (21)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no(5)</p>
	Programming	equitable inequitable dependent on the team	<p>ge role - provide opportunities (4)</p> <p>in/action - provide opportunities (91)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – high calibre competition (14)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – league structure (9)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – high calibre competition (14)</p>
	Resource allocation	equitable inequitable dependent on the team	<p>in/action - resource support (145)</p> <p>inequality - favouring big sports – coaching (5)</p> <p>inequality - favouring big sports – facilities (4)</p> <p>inequality - favouring big sports – resource allocation (32)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – budget (29)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – equipment (19)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – facility and space access (45)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – game / practice times (16)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – revenue generation (54)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – support staff (13)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – access to resources (6)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – practice times (2)</p>
	Promotion	equitable inequitable dependent on the team	<p>ge role - increase visibility of sport (5)</p> <p>in/action - promotion and support (82)</p> <p>inequality - favouring big sports – promotion and media attention (22)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – fan support (18)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – media attention (17)</p> <p>inequality - favouring men – promotion (9)</p> <p>inequality - favouring women – media attention (10)</p>

Table 34 - Continued

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Explanations of gaps between meanings and practices	Denying gender inequities	not a problem gradual improvements	<p>are teams ge? - yes, legally (2)</p> <p>are teams ge? - yes, most of the time (32)</p> <p>ge as org value - development – from a sense of inequity (5)</p> <p>ge as org value - development – from a personal agenda (2)</p> <p>ge as org value - development – it was a policy elsewhere (3)</p> <p>ge as org value - development – it is a social issue (15)</p> <p>ge as org value - yes it is a value (14)</p> <p>ge impression - perceptions are changing (51)</p> <p>ge impression - getting better (80)</p> <p>ge impression - is / not a significant issue (29)</p> <p>ge impression - no inequities (72)</p> <p>ge impression - opposed to current practices (82)</p> <p>ge impression - optimistic about practices (29)</p> <p>ge impression - responding to external pressures (6)</p> <p>ge impression - taken for granted (24)</p> <p>ge policies - need – no, already responsive (6)</p> <p>ge policies - need – no, creates inequities for men (2)</p> <p>ge policies - need - no, will just be broken (1)</p> <p>in/action - gradual improvements (8)</p> <p>inequality - minor differences (8)</p> <p>inequality - no difference (22)</p> <p>inequality - other type of difference (20)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no, but it's better (2)</p> <p>is ad ge? - trying to be (15)</p> <p>is ad ge? - yes, legally (4)</p> <p>is ad ge? - yes, overall (19)</p> <p>why in/action - change takes time (40)</p> <p>why in/action - not a matter of gender (67)</p> <p>why in/action - not a problem (8)</p>

Table 34 - Continued

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Explanations of gaps between meanings and practices	Rationalizing gender inequities	inequities were inconsequential other organizational values not their responsibility inequities were accepted and normalized	<p>are teams ge? - can't compare (10)</p> <p>are teams ge? - not with ice hockey (7)</p> <p>are teams ge? - not always (2)</p> <p>are teams ge? - not sure (8)</p> <p>effect of ge - make do with current situation (8)</p> <p>ge as org value - not / in action (16)</p> <p>ge as org value - not / mandated (8)</p> <p>ge as org value - not / shared (18)</p> <p>ge as org value - not / talked about (10)</p> <p>ge as org value - not sure (6)</p> <p>ge as org value - politically correct (6)</p> <p>ge impression - don't know (9)</p> <p>ge impression - inequities still exist (61)</p> <p>ge impression - is / not a significant issue (29)</p> <p>ge impression - not good, not bad (14)</p> <p>ge impression - not qualified to judge (17)</p> <p>ge impression - room for improvement (23)</p> <p>ge impression - sport reflects society (13)</p> <p>ge policies - need - should be tied to criteria (2)</p> <p>ge policies - need - yes, it's been researched (1)</p> <p>ge policies - need - yes, to create change (21)</p> <p>ge policies - need - yes, to reflect society (3)</p> <p>ge policies - need, yes, to safeguard current situation (3)</p> <p>ge policies - not enforced (4)</p> <p>ge role - lack of time - no role (17)</p> <p>ge role - do the best with the current situation (5)</p> <p>ge role - no role (17)</p> <p>inequality - sure they exist, but aren't specifically aware of them (4)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no (5)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no blatant inequities (3)</p> <p>is ad ge? - no, not in practice (6)</p>

Table 34 - Continued

Theme	Sub-theme	Categories	Second-order codes
Explanations of gaps between meanings and practices	Rationalizing gender inequities	inequities were inconsequential other organizational values not their responsibility inequities were accepted and normalized	remedies - build / change traditions (13) remedies - change societal attitudes (6) why in/action - change takes time (40) why in/action - financial context (76) why in/action - lack of / interest (72) why in/action - just the way things are (94) why in/action - not their responsibility (49) why in/action - not/ mandated (8) why in/action - societal attitudes (69)

## **Appendix M**

### **Consent Letter**

Date

Dear participant,

I am a Ph.D. student in [the faculty of ...] working on a study dealing with gender equity for student-athletes. The title of the study is "*Translating organizational values into action: A study of gender equity for Canadian student-athletes*". The project is designed to obtain a better understanding of the multiple meanings that gender equity may have for key stakeholder groups in an athletic department. The study will also focus on how gender equity for student-athletes has been translated into action.

The research portion of the study would involve your voluntary participation in one, audio-taped 40 – 90 minute personal interview with me.

The project has the potential to benefit your department by identifying strategies for successful implementation and commitment to gender equity policies and practices. The purpose of this letter is to inform you about the project and obtain your consent to participate. Please note that your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without jeopardizing your relationship with [the university athletic department]. Confidentiality is ensured as the names of study participants will not be identified and a pseudonym will be assigned to your department when results are reported. If you consent, please sign the attached form. A copy of this letter and consent form is included for your files. Once the study has been completed, you will receive a summary report. If you have any questions about this project now or during the course of the study, please contact me at [phone number] or [email address] or my advisor, [name and phone number]. If you have any questions about your treatment or rights as a participant, you may contact [the head of research services].

Thank you,

Larena Hill

### Informed Consent Form

I understand that my participation in the study (entitled "*Translating organizational values into action: A study of gender equity for Canadian student-athletes*") is entirely voluntary and that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without jeopardy to my relationship with [the university athletic department]. I have received a copy of this consent form for my own records.

**I consent to participate in this study.**

---

*Participant Signature*

*Date*

---

*Witness Signature*

*Date*

**I consent to having my responses tape-recorded.**

---

*Participant Signature*

*Date*

---

*Witness Signature*

*Date*



## Appendix N

### Meanings of Gender Equity

Table 35.

*Variations of Equality by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Number using a variation of equality		
		equal opportunity	equal resources	equal treatment
Female athletes	10	5 (50%)	9 (90%)	5 (50%)
Male athletes	7	7 (100%)	5 (71%)	0 (0%)
Total athletes	17	12 (71%)	14 (82%)	5 (29%)
Female coaches	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Male coaches	5	5 (100%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)
Total coaches	6	6 (100%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)
Female administrators	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)
Male administrators	2	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Total administrators	5	4 (80%)	5 (100%)	2 (20%)
Total women	14	9 (64%)	13 (93%)	7 (50%)
Total men	14	13 (93%)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)
Total interviewees	28	22 (79%)	21 (75%)	9 (32%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 36.

*Variations of Equality by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Number using a variation of equality		
		equal opportunity	equal resources	equal treatment
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
Total women's basketball	4	1 (25%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total men's basketball	3	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)
Total basketball	7	4 (57%)	5 (71%)	3 (43%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Total ice hockey	7	5 (71%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)

Table 36 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Number using a variation of equality		
		equal opportunity	equal resources	equal treatment
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Total women's rugby	3	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total swimming	5	5 (100%)	5 (100%)	1 (25%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 37.

*Conditional Equality by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Number referring to conditional equality
Female athletes	10	3 (30%)
Male athletes	7	1 (14%)
Total athletes	17	4 (24%)
Female coaches	1	0 (0%)
Male coaches	5	4 (80%)
Total coaches	6	4 (67%)
Female administrators	3	1 (33%)
Male administrators	2	1 (50%)
Total administrators	5	2 (40%)
Total women	14	4 (29%)
Total men	14	6 (43%)
Total interviewees	28	10 (36%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 38.

*Conditional Equality by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Number referring to conditional equality
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	0 (0%)
Total women's basketball	4	1 (25%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)
Total men's basketball	3	3 (100%)
Total basketball	7	4 (57%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	3 (100%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	4 (100%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	2 (100%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	3 (100%)
Total ice hockey	7	7 (100%)

Table 38 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Number referring to conditional equality
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	0 (0%)
Total women's rugby	3	0 (0%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	0 (0%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	1 (100%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	0 (0%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	2 (100%)
Total swimming	5	3 (60%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table because they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 39.

*Variations of Gender Equity is a Women's Only Issue by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Number using a variation of 'women's issue'		
		women were undervalued	it was for women	it was their responsibility
Female athletes	10	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	7 (70%)
Male athletes	7	0 (0%)	5 (71%)	2 (29%)
Total athletes	17	5 (38%)	10 (59%)	9 (53%)
Female coaches	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Male coaches	5	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	5 (100%)
Total coaches	6	2 (33%)	5 (83%)	6 (100%)
Female administrators	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
Male administrators	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Total administrators	5	2 (40%)	5 (100%)	4 (80%)
Total women	14	8 (57%)	9 (64%)	10 (71%)
Total men	14	1 (7%)	11 (79%)	9 (64%)
Total interviewees	28	9 (32%)	20 (71%)	19 (68%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 40.

*Variations of Gender Equity is a Women's Issue by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Number using a variation of 'women's issue'		
		women were undervalued	it was for women	it was their responsibility
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Total women's basketball	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Total men's basketball	3	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	2 (67%)
Total basketball	7	2 (28%)	5 (71%)	4 (57%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)
Total ice hockey	7	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	6 (86%)



Table 40 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Number using a variation of 'women's issue'		
		women were undervalued	it was for women	it was their responsibility
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total women's rugby	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total swimming	5	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)

Note: The number in brackets represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 41.

*Individual Meanings of Gender Equity*

Meanings of Gender Equity							
	Equality			Conditional equality	It is a women's issue		
Respondents	opportunities	resources	treatment		undervalued	for women	their responsibility
B1		x	x		x	x	x
B2		x	x				
B3		x					
H1	x			x	x	x	x
H2		x		x		x	x
H3		x	x	x			x
R1	x	x			x	x	x
R2	x	x	x				
S1	x	x			x	x	x
S2	x	x	x		x		x
<b>Total female athletes</b>	<b>5 (0.5)</b>	<b>9 (0.9)</b>	<b>5 (0.5)</b>	<b>3 (0.3)</b>	<b>5 (0.5)</b>	<b>5 (0.5)</b>	<b>7 (0.7)</b>
B4	x			x		x	x
B5	x	x				x	
H4	x	x					
H5	x	x				x	x
R3	x					x	
S3	x	x				x	
S4	x	x					
<b>Total male athletes</b>	<b>7 (1.0)</b>	<b>5 (0.71)</b>	<b>0 (0)</b>	<b>1 (0.14)</b>	<b>0 (0)</b>	<b>5 (0.71)</b>	<b>2 (0.29)</b>
<b>Total athletes</b>	<b>12 (0.71)</b>	<b>14 (0.82)</b>	<b>5 (0.29)</b>	<b>4 (0.24)</b>	<b>5 (0.38)</b>	<b>10 (0.59)</b>	<b>9 (0.53)</b>

Table 41 - Continued

Meanings of Gender Equity							
	Equality			Conditional equality	It is a women's only issue		
Respondents	opportunities	resources	treatment		undervalued	for women	their responsibility
B6	x	x	x		x	x	x
Total female coaches	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)
B7	x			x		x	x
H6	x			x			x
H7	x			x		x	x
R4	x	x	x		x	x	x
S5	x	x		x		x	x
Total male coaches	5 (1.0)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	4 (0.8)	1 (0.2)	4 (0.8)	5 (1.0)
Total coaches	6 (1.0)	2 (0.33)	1 (0.17)	4 (0.67)	2 (0.33)	5 (0.83)	6 (1.0)
A1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
A2	x	x			x	x	x
A3	x	x				x	
Total female administrators	3 (1.0)	3 (1.0)	1 (0.33)	1 (0.33)	2 (0.67)	3 (1.0)	2 (0.67)
A4		x				x	x
A5	x	x	x	x		x	x
Total male administrators	1 (0.5)	2 (1.0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	2 (1.0)	2 (1.0)
Total administrators	4 (0.8)	5 (1.0)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.4)	5 (1.0)	4 (0.8)
Total women	9 (0.64)	13 (0.93)	7 (0.5)	4 (0.29)	8 (0.57)	9 (0.64)	10 (0.71)
Total men	13 (0.93)	8 (0.57)	2 (0.14)	6 (0.43)	1 (0.07)	11 (0.79)	9 (0.64)
Total respondents	22 (0.79)	21 (0.75)	9 (0.32)	10 (0.36)	9 (0.32)	20 (0.71)	19 (0.68)

Note: The number is parenthesis represents the percentage of total respondents.

## Appendix O

### Understandings of Organizational Practices

Table 42.

*Gender Equity and Programming by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Programming		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Female athletes	10	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)
Male athletes	7	6 (86%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)
Total athletes	17	11 (65%)	0 (0%)	7 (41%)
Female coaches	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Male coaches	5	3 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total coaches	6	4 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Female administrators	3	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Male administrators	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total administrators	5	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	3 (60%)
Total women	14	9 (64%)	0 (0%)	7 (50%)
Total men	14	9 (64%)	1 (7%)	3 (21%)
Total interviewees	28	18 (64%)	1 (4%)	10 (36%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 43.

*Gender Equity and Programming by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Programming		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total women's basketball	4	1 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total men's basketball	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Total basketball	7	3 (43%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	2 (50%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total ice hockey	7	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)

Table 43 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Programming		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total women's rugby	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total swimming	5	5 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 44.

*Gender Equity and Resource Allocations by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Resource allocations		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Female athletes	10	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)
Male athletes	7	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Total athletes	17	8 (47%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)
Female coaches	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Male coaches	5	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)
Total coaches	6	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)
Female administrators	3	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	2 (67%)
Male administrators	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total administrators	5	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	3 (60%)
Total women	14	6 (43%)	6 (43%)	5 (36%)
Total men	14	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)
Total interviewees	28	11 (39%)	9 (32%)	9 (32%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 45.

*Gender Equity and Resource Allocations by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Resource allocations		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Total women's basketball	4	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total men's basketball	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total basketball	7	5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	1 (33%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Total ice hockey	7	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	3 (43%)



Table 45 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Resource allocations		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total women's rugby	3	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total swimming	5	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 46.

*Gender Equity and Promotions by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Promotions		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Female athletes	10	5 (50%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
Male athletes	7	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
Total athletes	17	8 (47%)	5 (29%)	3 (18%)
Female coaches	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Male coaches	5	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)
Total coaches	6	0 (0%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)
Female administrators	3	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Male administrators	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total administrators	5	2 (40%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)
Total women	14	6 (43%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)
Total men	14	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)
Total interviewees	28	10 (36%)	6 (21%)	7 (25%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 47.

*Gender Equity and Promotions by Sport Team and Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Promotions		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)
Total women's basketball	4	2 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total men's basketball	3	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total basketball	7	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Total ice hockey	7	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)

Table 47 - Continued

Sport team	Number in sample	Promotions		
		equitable	inequitable	conditional
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total women's rugby	3	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Total rugby	4	0 (0%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total swimming	5	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they are not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 48.

*Individual Understandings of Gender Equity and Organizational Practices*

Organizational practices									
Respondents	Programming			Resource allocations			Promotions		
	e	ie	c	e	ie	c	e	ie	c
B1						x	x		
B2				x	x				
B3				x			x		x
H1	x		x			x	x		
H2	x				x			x	
H3			x		x			x	
R1	x				x			x	
R2	x					x			
S1	x			x			x		
S2				x			x		
Total female athletes	5 (0.5)	0 (0)	5 (0.5)	5 (0.5)	4 (0.4)	3 (0.3)	5 (0.5)	3 (0.3)	1 (0.1)
B4	x		x				x		
B5	x		x	x			x		
H4					x				x
H5	x								x
R3	x					x		x	
S3	x			x			x	x	
S4	x			x					
Total male athletes	6 (0.86)	0 (0)	2 (0.29)	3 (0.43)	1 (0.14)	1 (0.14)	3 (0.43)	2 (0.29)	2 (0.29)
Total athletes	11 (0.65)	0 (0)	7 (0.41)	8 (0.47)	5 (0.29)	4 (0.24)	8 (0.47)	5 (0.29)	3 (0.18)

Table 48 - Continued

		Organizational practices									
Respondents	Programming			Resource allocations			Promotions				
	e	ie	c	e	ie	c	e	ie	c		
B6	x			x							
Total female coaches	1 (1.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)		
B7				x							
H6	x				x	x					
H7	x					x					
R4				x				x			
S5	x										
Total male coaches	3 (0.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0.4)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.4)	0 (0)	1 (0.2)	0 (0)		
Total coaches	4 (0.67)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0.50)	1 (0.17)	2 (0.33)	0 (0)	1 (0.17)	0 (0)		
A1	x					x	x				
A2	x		x		x	x			x		
A3	x		x		x				x		
Total female administrators	3 (1.0)	0 (0)	2 (0.67)	0 (0)	2 (0.67)	2 (0.67)	1 (0.33)	0 (0)	2 (0.67)		
A4									x		
A5		x	x		x	x	x		x		
Total male administrators	0 (0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	2 (1.0)		
T total administrators	3 (0.6)	1 (0.2)	3 (0.6)	0 (0)	3 (0.6)	3 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	0 (0)	4 (0.8)		
Total women	9 (0.64)	0 (0)	7 (0.5)	6 (0.43)	6 (0.43)	5 (0.36)	6 (0.43)	3 (0.21)	3 (0.21)		
Total men	9 (0.64)	1 (0.07)	3 (0.21)	5 (0.36)	3 (0.21)	4 (0.29)	4 (0.29)	3 (0.21)	4 (0.29)		
Total respondents	18 (0.64)	1 (0.04)	10 (0.36)	11 (0.39)	9 (0.32)	9 (0.32)	10 (0.36)	6 (0.21)	7 (0.25)		

Note: e = equal; ie = inequality; c = conditional equality

## Appendix P

### Explanations For Gaps Between Meanings and Practices

Table 49.

*Denial of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholders	Number in sample	Number of respondents using a related argument	
		not a problem	gradual improvements
Female athletes	10	2 (20%)	7 (70%)
Male athletes	7	6 (86%)	4 (57%)
Total athletes	17	8 (47%)	11 (64%)
Female coaches	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Male coaches	5	1 (20%)	5 (100%)
Total coaches	6	1 (17%)	6 (100%)
Female administrators	3	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Male administrators	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)
Total administrators	5	2 (40%)	4 (80%)
Total women	14	3 (21%)	11 (79%)
Total men	14	8 (57%)	10 (71%)
Total interviewees	28	11 (39%)	21 (75%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 50.

*Denial of Gender Inequities by Sport Team & Stakeholder Group*

Sport team	Number in sample	Number of respondents using a related argument	
		not a problem	gradual improvements
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
Total women's basketball	4	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Total men's basketball	3	2 (67%)	3 (100%)
Total basketball	7	3 (43%)	6 (86%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	0 (0%)	3 (100%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	1 (50%)	0 (0%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	1 (33%)	1 (33%)
Total ice hockey	7	2 (29%)	5 (71%)
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Total women's rugby	3	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Total rugby	4	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Total swimming	5	4 (80%)	3 (60%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees. Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.



Table 51.

*Rationalization of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Stakeholder	Number in sample	Number using a related argument			
		inconsequential	other values	not their responsibility	accepted as normal
Female athletes	10	10 (100%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)
Male athletes	7	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	5 (71%)
Total athletes	17	12 (71%)	5 (29%)	6 (35%)	13 (76%)
Female coaches	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Male coaches	5	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	4 (80%)
Total coaches	6	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%)
Female administrators	3	1 (33%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)
Male administrators	2	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
Total administrators	5	2 (40%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)
Total women	14	12 (86%)	7 (50%)	3 (21%)	11 (79%)
Total men	14	5 (36%)	6 (43%)	8 (57%)	11 (79%)
Total interviewees	28	17 (61%)	13 (46%)	11 (39%)	22 (79%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Table 52.

*Rationalization of Gender Inequities by Sport Team and Stakeholder Grouping*

Sport	Number in sample	Number using a related argument			
		inconsequential	other values	not their responsibility	accepted
Women's basketball - coach (w)	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Women's basketball - athletes	3	3 (100%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Total women's basketball	4	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	4 (100%)
Men's basketball – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
Men's basketball - athletes	2	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
Total men's basketball	3	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%)
Total basketball	7	6 (86%)	4 (57%)	5 (71%)	7 (100%)
Women's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Women's ice hockey - athletes	3	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	3 (100%)
Total women's ice hockey	4	4 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Men's ice hockey – coach (m)	1	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Men's ice hockey - athletes	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)
Total men's ice hockey	3	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	1 (33%)
Total ice hockey	7	5 (71%)	0 (0%)	4 (57%)	4 (57%)
Women's rugby – coach (m)	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)
Women's rugby – athletes	2	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total women's rugby	3	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
Men's rugby – athletes <sup>a</sup>	1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Total rugby	4	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
Swimming – coach (m) <sup>b</sup>	1	0 (0%)	1 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (100%)
Swimming – female athletes	2	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)
Swimming – male athletes	2	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)
Total swimming	5	2 (40%)	4 (80%)	0 (0%)	4 (80%)

Note: The number in parentheses represents the percentage of the total number of interviewees.

Administrators are excluded from this table as they were not directly affiliated with a particular sport team.

<sup>a</sup> No coaches for men's rugby were interviewed.

<sup>b</sup> This individual coached male and female athletes.

Table 53.

*Individual Denials by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Respondents	not a problem	gradual improvement
B1		
B2		x
B3		
H1		x
H2		x
H3		x
R1		x
R2		x
S1	x	
S2	x	x
<b>Total female athletes</b>	<b>2 (0.2)</b>	<b>7 (0.7)</b>
B4	x	x
B5	x	x
H4	x	
H5		
R3	x	x
S3	x	x
S4	x	
<b>Total male athletes</b>	<b>6 (0.86)</b>	<b>4 (0.57)</b>
<b>Total athletes</b>	<b>8 (0.47)</b>	<b>11 (0.64)</b>
B6		x
<b>Total female coaches</b>	<b>0 (0)</b>	<b>1 (1.0)</b>
B7		x
H6	x	x
H7		x
R4		x
S5		x
<b>Total male coaches</b>	<b>1 (0.2)</b>	<b>5 (1.0)</b>
<b>Total coaches</b>	<b>1 (0.17)</b>	<b>6 (0.86)</b>
A1	x	x
A2		x
A3		x
<b>Total female administrators</b>	<b>1 (0.33)</b>	<b>3 (1.0)</b>
A4		
A5	x	x
<b>Total male administrators</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>
<b>Total administrators</b>	<b>2 (0.4)</b>	<b>4 (0.8)</b>
<b>Total women</b>	<b>3 (0.21)</b>	<b>11 (0.79)</b>
<b>Total men</b>	<b>8 (0.57)</b>	<b>10 (0.71)</b>
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>11 (0.39)</b>	<b>21 (0.75)</b>

Table 54.

*Individual Rationalizations of Gender Inequities by Gender and Stakeholder Group*

Respondents	inconsequential	other values	not their responsibility	accepted
B1	x	x	x	x
B2	x			x
B3	x			x
H1	x			x
H2	x			x
H3	x		x	x
R1	x			x
R2	x			
S1	x	x		
S2	x	x		x
<b>Total female athletes</b>	<b>10 (1.0)</b>	<b>3 (0.3)</b>	<b>2 (0.2)</b>	<b>8 (0.8)</b>
B4	x		x	x
B5	x	x	x	x
H4			x	
H5			x	x
R3				
S3		x		x
S4				x
<b>Total male athletes</b>	<b>2 (0.29)</b>	<b>2 (0.29)</b>	<b>4 (0.57)</b>	<b>5 (0.71)</b>
<b>Total athletes</b>	<b>12 (0.71)</b>	<b>5 (0.29)</b>	<b>6 (0.35)</b>	<b>13 (0.76)</b>
B6	x	x	x	x
<b>Total female coaches</b>	<b>1 (1.0)</b>	<b>1 (1.0)</b>	<b>1 (1.0)</b>	<b>1 (1.0)</b>
B7		x	x	
H6	x			
H7	x		x	
R4		x	x	
S5		x		x
<b>Total male coaches</b>	<b>2 (0.4)</b>	<b>2 (0.4)</b>	<b>3 (0.6)</b>	<b>1 (0.2)</b>
<b>Total coaches</b>	<b>3 (0.5)</b>	<b>3 (0.5)</b>	<b>4 (0.67)</b>	<b>2 (0.33)</b>
A1	x	x		
A2		x		x
A3		x		x
<b>Total female administrators</b>	<b>1 (0.33)</b>	<b>3 (1.0)</b>	<b>0 (0)</b>	<b>2 (0.67)</b>
A4	x		x	
A5		x		x
<b>Total male administrators</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>	<b>1 (0.5)</b>
<b>Total administrators</b>	<b>2 (0.4)</b>	<b>4 (0.8)</b>	<b>1 (0.2)</b>	<b>3 (0.6)</b>
<b>Total women</b>	<b>12 (0.86)</b>	<b>7 (0.5)</b>	<b>3 (0.21)</b>	<b>11 (0.79)</b>
<b>Total men</b>	<b>5 (0.36)</b>	<b>6 (0.43)</b>	<b>8 (0.57)</b>	<b>7 (0.5)</b>
<b>Total respondents</b>	<b>17 (0.61)</b>	<b>13 (0.46)</b>	<b>11 (0.39)</b>	<b>18 (0.64)</b>