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Abstract

While gendered participation in sport is widely researched, less is known about the culture of women in leadership roles at recreational level sporting clubs. Women are not traditionally associated with leadership roles in sport and the culture of sport is often a space where males are in positions of power. This manuscript explores the experiences of women from two mixed-gendered and one female-only recreational level field hockey clubs in Melbourne, Australia, and examines the gendered leadership (specifically male dominance), at these hockey clubs. The principal aim of this study is to examine (using Connell’s theory of gender relations, which focuses on gender imbalances of power) the differences in the level of involvement of women in leadership roles between mixed-gendered and single-gendered hockey clubs, the culture of patriarchal power at play at all three hockey clubs and how such power affected the opportunities for women in leadership roles.

Introduction

Most women in positions of power, such as female politicians and business leaders challenge the ‘normal’ idea of male dominance in society. Women athletes are also in this position in sport.¹ Sport provides a space that is inherently male and has long been associated with strength and toughness.² In the late 1970s, Jane English proposed that the very concept of sport contains a masculine bias. English suggested that if women had historically been the dominant sex, sport may have evolved differently over history. Traits such as flexibility, balance and timing may have been traditionally valued over speed, strength and toughness.³ As speed, strength and toughness are traditionally associated with masculinity, by definition these characteristics form the basis of a process whereby women can be excluded from sport.⁴

This research studied the manifestation of the male dominance in sport by examining the lived experiences of women in sport, and in particular the involvement of women in club leadership roles. This study examined the experiences of women from three separate field hockey clubs in Melbourne, Australia.⁵ The research aim is to examine the differences in the level of involvement of women in leadership roles between mixed-gendered and single-gendered hockey clubs, and to investigate the culture of patriarchal power at play at all three hockey clubs and how such power affected the opportunities for women in leadership roles. Additionally, the motivations of women to take on leadership roles in hockey clubs and any barriers they have may encountered to prevent them from taking on such roles was considered.

The research participants were all women playing in recreational level hockey in the regular 2006⁶ hockey season. Two hockey clubs were mixed-gendered clubs and one hockey club was an all female club. At the two mixed gendered hockey clubs in this research, male governance at the club and in coaching positions was common practice. On many occasions in sport, the predominance of male
leadership is not reflective of the overall gendered membership of a sport or sporting club. Despite the current manuscript focusing on the opportunities and cultures of females in mixed gendered hockey clubs, the all-female hockey club was included as a case study also, as males have also traditionally played a large role in the leadership of female sporting clubs and female sporting organisations. The experiences of participants were explored through semi-structured interviews and analysed using a critical feminist theoretical framework and Connell’s (1987) theory of gender relations, whereby gender imbalances of power, particularly the institutional arrangements both between and among men and women are examined.

**Literature Review**

**Gender and Power in Sport**

Gender as an organising discourse involves hierarchy as well as difference. Hannagan (2008) explains that there are widely held assumptions that ‘women’s biology, intelligence, contributions to evolution, historical or cultural change are inferior to men’s’. Similarly, Paechter (2006) observes that the relationship of masculinity and femininity in relation to each other is dualistic. Importantly, ‘a dualistic relation is one in which the subordinate term is negated, rather than the two sides being in equal balance. Femininity is, thus, defined as a lack, an absence of masculinity’. Therefore, ‘female’ and ‘femininity’ are viewed as different and subordinate to ‘male’ and ‘masculinity’.

While acknowledging the dichotomy between masculine and feminine, as well as multiple masculinities and femininities, there is also a hierarchy within forms of masculinities. Connell suggests that most masculinities ‘commonly involve hierarchy and exclusion, in which one (or more) pattern of masculinity is socially dominant and other patterns are dishonoured or marginalised’ (2007). The dominant form of masculinity is labelled as ‘hegemonic masculinity’. Connell best describes it as: ‘The configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women’. Connell (2005) adds that this definition in some cases can have exceptions, as the most ‘visible bearers of hegemonic masculinity are not necessarily the most powerful people’. Easily recognised and visible, examples of these bearers of hegemonic masculinity can include film actors, action heroes, and especially male athletes who demonstrate traits such as strength, courage, and aggression. Hegemonic masculinity is nowhere more apparent than in sport. Sport offers a medium for reproducing dominant forms of masculinity by shaping an aggressive, competitive, and on occasion, hostile environment for those who do not adhere to the hegemonic norm (e.g., non-sporting males, athletic women, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) individuals).
Along with multiple masculinities, there exists multiple femininities, with some (e.g., ‘hegemonic femininity’) valued more than others. In various areas of social life, suspicion surrounds members of either sex who do not conform to the gendered stereotypes. Crosset (1995) explains that ‘the questioning of one’s membership in a sex category had often been used to discredit people’s accomplishments in many fields in order to defend the dominant social order from a perceived threat of deviance’. On this view, it is assumed that influential women in politics, business or sport cannot be ‘real’ women. Hegemonic femininity, a term originally coined by Lenskyj (1994) and revisited by Krane (1999), is explained by Choi (2000) in relation to sport:

In the world of women’s sport, femininity can be seen to be exalted as hegemonic through the greater celebration of the ‘feminine’ female athlete. For example, female athletes who do not appear ‘feminine’ and/or who take part in sports perceived as male, or masculine, are likely to be treated more negatively by coaches and sport administrators, by competition judges and officials, by the media, by potential sponsors and by sports fans.

The implications of hegemonic masculinity and hegemonic femininity result in a situation where ‘masculine’ women and ‘feminine’ men can often be subordinated and oppressed.

Both hegemonic masculinity and (to a lesser extent) hegemonic femininity, are defined by the power of one group over another. Connell (1987) describes power as a social structure, and McKay (1997) defines power as a ‘control of most sites of organised coercion and surveillance in society (e.g., the police, military, judiciary)’. As McKay suggests, power is often maintained through institutions such the courts, military or police and this maintenance is often carried out through violence. Connell explains that those who are affected by violence and subordination in society are usually women and gay men. Hegemonic power also involves cultural processes that ‘persuades both men and women that the ascendancy of (heterosexual) men’s values, interests and privileges is both natural and legitimate’. In fact, ascendancy achieved purely through violence is not hegemony. This ascendant masculinity is continually expressed and reinforced through religion, the mass media, gendered labour relations and wage structures, government social policy and, for the purposes of this paper, pre-eminently enacted and celebrated in sport. Hence, this ideological power reproduces the naturalisation of and consent to the dominant gender order, in which women are subordinated (and gay men and lesbians are stigmatised). Furthermore, hegemonic power can also undermine the ability or attempts by subordinate groups such as women and homosexuals to marshal power to subvert or transgress dominant modes of gender and sexuality. In a sporting context, the cultural power of hegemonic masculinity is enacted within the foundation of sport as well as in the media and economics.
However, Young and White suggest that hegemonic masculinity is an ideological construct, and that many men ‘do not conform to the blueprint of hegemonic masculinity’. Similarly, Connell (1995) suggests that:

> The number of men rigorously practicing the hegemonic pattern in its entirety may be quite small. Yet the majority of men benefit from its hegemony, because they benefit from the patriarchal dividend, the advantage men in general gain from the overall subordination of women.

Therefore, while not all males in sport practice hegemonic masculinity, most males benefit from the very real practice and culture of hegemonic masculinity, and importantly, hegemonic masculinity often denies women opportunities, freedom and privilege that most men readily benefit from.

The media also plays a part in this culture. Numerous studies have investigated the various forms of overt and covert power that exist in the practice, management and media coverage of sport, particularly hegemonic masculinity. Since the discourse of hegemonic masculinity thrives in elite sport, it is easy to assume that similar power relations are also played out at the local club level of sport.

**Women in leadership roles at sporting clubs and sporting organisations**

Women are often underrepresented in leadership roles in all facets of society. Affirmative action is used to benefit an underrepresented group, usually as a means to contradict a history of discrimination and oppression. While more proactive than anti-discrimination policy, affirmative action policies are in place for women in some sporting organisations. Although McKay’s (1997) research is over a decade old, his findings and recommendations for sporting organisations are still extremely relevant. McKay (1997) acknowledges that affirmative action policies are generally adopted by organisations to counter the effects of a history of discrimination, which in this case, involve women’s employment opportunities in sporting organisations. However, McKay’s research found that only a few [of these sporting] organisations (operated by state and federal governments in Australia, New Zealand and Canada), had written affirmative action policies. According to McKay (1997) sporting organisations can respond to affirmative action policies in a variety of ways, which include; ‘pro-action, reaction, and benign neglect’. Proactive organisations traditionally use affirmative action even if no legislation exists, reactive organisations only respond to affirmative action in order to avoid legal action or because there are financial gains to do so, and organisations characterised by benign neglect implement affirmative action policies only if they are legally required to. Following this logic, if
more sporting organisations were proactive in implementing affirmative action policies for employing women, there would be more women in leadership roles in sporting organisations in Australia.

McKay explains that through his research, he discovered that very few organisations had affirmative action policies written down, and most (male) managers believed that all employees were treated equally. According to McKay, ‘[i]nsofar as affirmative action was pursued, it was always in terms of getting individual women to the same starting line as men, rather than responding strategically to gendered, structural inequalities at work and home’. Therefore, many sport organisations’ policies were based on liberal feminism which aims to get women to the same starting line as men, and very few were based on critical feminism, which acknowledges systemic inequalities. The immediate problem is countered without looking deeper into the roots of such inequalities, such as the hegemonic power dimensions endemic within so many sporting organisations.

Issues such as childcare, domestic duties, travel and prolonged working hours had ‘relatively little impact on married men’s careers’ in McKay’s study. This contention is also explored in more recent research conducted by Craig and Sawriker (2009); Knoppers and Anthonissen’s (2008); and Shaw and Hoeber (2003). McKay (1997) further suggests that ‘most married men could separate their work and family duties and give priority to the former, [while] most married women had to combine them’.

In a recent study, Sundstrom, Marchart and Symons (2011) found that gender imbalances still exist in Australian sport. At the 2010 Commonwealth Games, only 14% of Australian coaches were female, and many of these women played a secondary role to the (male) ‘Head Coach’ in their respective sports. According to Sundstrom et al. (2011), women are underrepresented in sport ‘…as administrators, coaches and officials to a greater degree than women in many other industries’. Sundstrom et al. also report on the ‘increased participation, decreased representation’ paradox in Australia. This paradox is explained by the steady increase in participation rates in sport of girls and women, and the gradual decrease of women in leadership positions in sport. Also in Australia, Sibson’s (2010) research focussed on members of a Board of Directors of a recreational level sporting organisation. Sibson explained that even though the Board of Directors numbered equally male and female, ‘certain men on this Board have used practices of exclusionary power to limit the voice and participation of the women and their interests’. Sibson (2010) further explains that despite there being gender equity in numerical distributions, ‘the gendering of sports organisations’ still exits.

In the Netherlands, Claringbould and Knoppers (2007) interviewed male and female board members of national sport associations. They explained that most of the boards were dominated by male board members, with few females sitting on these boards. Additionally, Claringbould and Knoppers
suggested that most of their participants “did gender” by assuming that men are more suitable than women to carry out certain tasks related to the management of sport organisations. Pfister and Radtke (2009) have also recently investigated the gendered culture of executive positions in elite level sport in Germany. Their research participants included 341 males and 72 women in executive positions, and despite the fact that the male and female participants had similar qualifications and a similar commitment to sport; women did not have the same positions and the same status as men on the executive boards of these sport organisations.

**Theoretical Framework**

Connell’s theory of gender relations, which focuses on gender imbalances of power is used in the current manuscript. Connell’s framework emphasises gender as a large-scale social structure and not just a matter of personal identity, in particular, it focuses on the ‘institutional arrangements between men and women’. According to McKay, Connell’s theory of gender relations concentrates on how ‘relations at both the macro and micro levels are characterised by obdurate, hierarchal, and exploitative structure that set limits on how gender is “done”’. Such ‘institutional arrangements’ between men and women are found in various social institutions, including religion, education, the economy, the judiciary and armed services. According to McKay, ‘given that men control the most power in social institutions, and their values are more highly esteemed than women’s, then women must continually “do” gender under disadvantaged conditions’. Connell (1987) adopts a structural approach to such power discrepancies and gender relations, and explains this theory in further detail in terms of ‘labour’, ‘power’ and ‘cathexis’.

There are a variety of factors that may affect the prominence of women in leadership positions in recreational level sport. As outlined in the Literature Review, one of these factors is women’s domestic duties/arrangements (i.e., childcare). However, even more prominent, are the gendered power structures so ingrained in sporting club cultures and sporting organisations. As Connell outlines, this power is found in many structures of society and is entrenched in male supremacy. This type of culture results in a lack of women in leadership positions in Australian and International sport, particularly at the elite level of sport. This study is important to the field of gendered sport leadership at a local sporting club level as it examines the level of involvement of women in leadership roles at both mixed-gendered and single-gendered hockey clubs, and investigates the culture of hegemonic power at play at all three hockey clubs and how such power affects the opportunities for women in leadership roles.
Research Approach

Data Collection

The participants were recruited via a combination of both snowball and purposive sampling. Typically, snowball sampling refers to ‘cases of interest from sampling people who know people, who know people, who know what cases are information rich, that is, good examples for study, good interview participants’. The significance of purposive sampling, lies in selecting information-rich participants/cases or pre-defined groups for in-depth analysis that are related to the central issues being studied.

The experiences of participants and the cultures of each club were explored through both semi-structured interviews and researcher observations. described the interview process as a ‘means by which the researcher can gain access to, and subsequently understand, the private interpretations of social reality that individuals hold’. The participants were interviewed after matches, training sessions or other times and locations that were convenient to the participant. In-depth interviews were used to explore the participants’ lived experiences of belonging and identity at their hockey club. Additional topics included their sporting backgrounds, community, safe spaces in sport, and club culture. Sample questions included:

- Can you describe your current involvement with local sport? (Other sport involvement, main sports played, organisations, roles, interests, motivations, achievements, etc);
- How would you best describe the experience of playing sport at this club?
- How would you best describe the club or team environment? (i.e.; is it friendly and welcoming of all ages, genders, sexualities and ethnic backgrounds, etc?)

The interviews were audio-recorded and lasted between 30 and 70 minutes each.

The researcher also engaged in overt ‘participant observation’ by observing a number of training sessions and matches from each hockey club over a period of time. The aim of participant observation is for the researcher ‘to understand how the cultures they are studying ‘work’, that is, to grasp what the world looks like...’ to the group being studied. A number of pertinent factors related to the study were observed during this period of data collection, including the training times for male and female teams, the hockey equipment facilities available to men’s and women’s teams and the training process in place for the women’s team compared to the men’s team.

The Participants

The female participants in this study came from a field hockey competition based in suburban Melbourne, Australia. All twenty-one participants competed at a recreational level in the regular
winter season of 2006, operated by Hockey Victoria (the State Sporting Association). Participants from three separate hockey clubs were interviewed. These women ranged in ages from 20 to 53 years of age, and most of these women identified as white and middle class. The details of the hockey clubs are outlined below.

- **Melbourne Central Hockey Club (MCHC)**

  MCHC is a large university based hockey club situated in central Melbourne. MCHC was a mixed gendered hockey club that consisted of two clubs (one women’s club and one men’s club) who amalgamated in the 1970s. The original women’s hockey club was formed around 1907 and the men’s club shortly after in 1908. The large club has a variety of teams competing in many different competitions and at many different playing levels with several men’s, women’s, juniors, veterans and mixed teams. At the time of the study, there were approximately 400 members, with an even spread of male and female members at the club. The interview participants from MCHC were a group of seven predominantly heterosexually identified young women (six women identified as heterosexual and one woman identified as lesbian). The interviewed participants were aged between 20 years and 35 years old, with an average age around 24 years. Many of the participants from MCHC were current or recently graduated university students.

- **South Eastern Hockey Club (SEHC)**

  SEHC is another large mixed gendered hockey club situated in the south eastern suburbs of Melbourne. Similar to the beginnings of MCHC, SEHC was formed in 1993 after two separate hockey clubs (one male and one female club) from the south eastern region of Melbourne decided to amalgamate. In 2006, SEHC consisted of a total of 24 teams, with around 80 female members in the season of 2006. The club had teams representing various divisions in the men’s, women’s, veterans and junior competitions. The six interview participants in this study were aged between 24 and 53 with an average age around 30 years. All of the research participants at SEHC identified as ‘heterosexuals’. Unlike the other two clubs, SEHC had club rooms available to them through the hockey season, where photographs of successful teams hung on the walls and premiership trophies were displayed.

- **Northern Central Hockey Club (NCHC)**

  Northern Central Hockey Club (NCHC) is a small, one-team women’s only hockey club in suburban Melbourne. In 1985, the creation of NCHC occurred during the latter stages of second wave feminism in Australia (see Freedman, 2003). NCHC was deliberately created by women and for women and the current membership maintained this configuration, so that the hockey participants could participate at a club without the governance and leadership of male members. Hargreaves (1994) stated that during
this period, some women chose to participate in sport in a ‘separatist all-female strategy’. During the study, the hockey club had fifteen women members. The interview participants from NCHC were aged between 32 years and 52 years, with an average age around 42 years. Of the eight participants interviewed, seven women identified openly as lesbian and the remaining participant identified as heterosexual. Homophobia, along with the challenges of being ‘out’ as a lesbian in sport, were obstacles that many of the women at NCHC faced regularly by playing hockey at the club.

Data Analysis

This research project utilised a qualitative multiple case study approach. The qualitative case study method provides an opportunity ‘to examine contemporary real-life situations and provide the basis for the application of ideas and extension of methods’. Stake (2005) refers to this kind of specific case study method as a ‘collective case study’ or ‘multiple case studies’. According to Stake, a collective case study is undertaken by studying a number of case studies jointly, ‘in order to inquire into the phenomenon, population or general condition’.

Specifically, the multiple/collective case study method was chosen as this method identifies the similarities between cases. These similarities include shared experiences that are common to the members of all hockey clubs, whilst also recognising the experiences that are unique to members of a specific club, ‘given factors such as age, sexual orientation, geographic location and gender politics’. Yin (2003) suggests that the use of multiple case studies adds to the strength and validity of a research project.

A process of ‘member checking’ was also undertaken. Member checking (also called ‘informant feedback’) is a ‘specific way that researchers test their own meaning making by going back to, and asking for feedback from, those studied’. After the process of transcribing interviews took place, the participants were invited to view their particular transcript of their interview. Participants were given the opportunity to read and edit any of their responses. The process of ‘peer review’ was also used to verify, validate and improve the research data, in particular the interview transcripts. Creswell (1998) describes the process of peer reviewing as a tool to provide an external check of the research process.

Limitations

As with all qualitative and quantitative research, limitations can often affect the full potential of a study. This study is a snapshot of a specific group of middle class, educated, economically independent women, and might not necessarily be the experience of all women from hockey clubs or
sporting clubs generally around Australia and/or internationally. Additionally, the experiences for women from other minority groups might also provide a different story.

Results

MCHC

Two of the participants held positions on the committee of MCHC. Hannah was the women’s secretary of the club, and she was in effect, in charge of much of the women’s administration. Another participant, Laura was a member of the general committee and chose not to elaborate on her responsibilities in this position. She was also an Equipment Officer (along with her male partner, who was also a member of MCHC). Apart from these two examples, the committee at MCHC was governed by the male members of the club.

Despite the gender split at the club being half male members and half female members, all senior committee positions were held by men. It appeared from the outset that the dominance of the male members in positions of power and governance at the club were part of the culture of MCHC. It was a naturalised view at the hockey club that the males were those who occupied the positions on the committee and made the decisions that affected the club as a whole. This was evident during the initial communication with the women’s secretary and the first training session attended by the researcher. Hannah mentioned that she would need to get permission from the (male) president of the club for the researcher to recruit female members of the club. Hannah was effectively in charge of the women’s administration at the club, however, she was unable to make this decision.

Additionally, at the first training session there was a disparity in training space allocated to the male and female playing members. The men’s teams used over three quarters of the pitch for training sessions, while the women used less than one quarter of the pitch. This occurred on at least three occasions during the 2006 season, and was observed by the researcher. Other instances of gender inequality were observed by the researcher. In particular, at MCHC (and SEHC) the women’s training sessions were often held before or after the senior men’s training sessions – which were held at around 7pm. These times were often inconvenient for women with employment and family commitments. One participant from MCHC also explained that despite her team playing in a higher level competition than the men’s ‘firsts’ team, the men’s senior team often had a more experienced coach than the women’s team. These gender inequalities in sport in Australia are also explored by Coakley et al. (2009, pp. 256-257); Hargreaves (2000, pp. 3-7); Symons et al. (2010, p.42, pp. 53-55, Sundstrom et al. (2011, pp. 110-115); and Stell (1991, p. viii).
Laura explained how a similar culture existed within the committee at MCHC:

I’ll just say [they are] exclusive and almost misogynist (sic), like it just, yeah, it’s really frustrating. I mean there’s only a couple of women on the committee... There’s another woman who’s the juniors convener and then there’s me and sort of you know… so the president, treasurer, secretary, vice president they’re all blokes and they’re all sort of mates and don’t really give a shit about the other sort of twenty teams at the club that they don’t play in.56

Laura’s comments suggested that the hockey club’s culture did not practice equality for all, with her describing the committee as ‘misogynistic’.57 In contrast, Hannah (the women’s secretary at the club) did not share these feelings. She explained that she was approached by the president (male) of the club to take on an official role. However, Hannah’s role was to help with the women’s section of the club, not the overall club.58 All of the positions that the female members held on the committee were minor roles in major decision making processes. Therefore, most of the female participants at the club played little role and carried little influence in the running of the overall club, including some decisions that pertained to the women’s teams.

Similarly, Nat, who had been the captain of the ‘firsts’ women’s team felt that the males in the club dominated a large proportion of the administrative roles. She explained:

I perceive it to be a relatively blokey club I guess. Whether that’s the case of all hockey clubs I don’t really know, but there is a focus on them on the men’s teams and they tend to dominate all of the, most of the administrative roles, whether that’s because women haven’t put their names forward or otherwise, I don’t know...59

Nat suggested that the women in the club may not have nominated for committee membership, and that that may explain an uneven gendered membership on the committee.

Participants had different motivations for taking on administrative or extra roles within the club. Amanda, who was a previous member of the general committee, claimed that she became involved in an administrative role at the club as she was ‘talked into it’ by her coach. Laura, also on the committee and the Equipment Officer, felt that there needed to be a younger person on the committee, and that there were no other volunteers for the equipment officer job. The Women’s Secretary, Hannah, claimed that her motivations for taking on that role were varied. Firstly, her hockey playing fees were paid for the season, secondly, she had the opportunity to give something back to the club, and the third reason (as mentioned above), was that the president of the club (a male in a position of power) personally asked her to take on that role.60 She did not cite women’s equity as an abiding motivation of her tenure as the women’s secretary.
Policy was also not available to ensure that males and females were awarded the same opportunities at the club. Not one of the players interviewed were aware of any official anti-discrimination policies available at MCHC. Hannah, the women’s secretary at MCHC believed that there was a policy, but she was not aware of the details of it. While a former leader at the club, Amanda, assumed that there was a policy at the club, she had not seen it, therefore was not certain whether a policy actually existed or not. Therefore, even if the women at the club felt that they were not given equal access to leadership roles at the club, they could not use a complaints procedure that was linked to any sort of policy to express this.

SEHC

In 2006, the positions of ‘President’, ‘Vice President’ and ‘Treasurer’ were occupied by male members of the hockey club. Only one position on the executive committee, the ‘Secretary’ was occupied by a female member of the club (and research participant), Steph. Five of the six participants had been involved with SEHC in leadership roles, both on the field (captains) and off the field (committee members and women’s hockey coordinators). Both Helen and Rosie were former general committee members, Rosie held the role of the captain of the firsts (highest playing level) women’s team and as the ‘Women’s Coordinator’, Leah held the position of captain of the fourths team and was a member of the ‘Selection Committee’ for that team, Julie was the ‘Umpires Coordinator’ and Steph held the position of ‘Secretary’ for the hockey club. Jenny was the only participant who had not been involved in an official capacity at the club, however, 2006 was also Jenny’s first season playing at SEHC.

Like MCHC, the committee at SEHC was principally governed by the male members of the club and there was a natural association between the male members of the club and the positions on the committee. Most of the key positions on the hockey club’s committee (such as president and treasurer) were held by the male members. With an even distribution of male and female members at the club, this configuration was not necessarily the most fair or representative in regards to gender. It was implied by participants that this gendered hierarchy was normal practice within the club. None of the participants explained that this was an unusual occurrence.

Participants explained different motivations for taking on administrative or extra roles within the club. The most common response was that the women felt that they were ‘giving back to the club’ if they
carried out an extra role at the club. The Secretary, *Steph*, felt that she wanted to take on that particular role at the club, as most of her social circle was based at *SEHC*. She commented:

…I’d been involved with it [the hockey club] for so long, so I’ve got a lot of my social life…revolves around the hockey club… I took the role on because they were looking for a secretary and at that time I was separated and living by myself and my time was basically my own and I thought well that’s a pretty easy job… as it turns out it’s not as easy… as what I thought but I took that on and then we sort of had a good feel with it last year and I’ve continued it this year... 

Not unlike other sporting clubs, a heavy involvement within the club at both the competing and officiating level requires an immersion into the culture of the club. *Steph* explained that after she had separated from her previous partner, that the hockey club provided a space where she could socialise and occupy some of her spare time.

Similar to *MCHC*, not one of the interviewed participants was aware of any official anti-discrimination policies existing at *SEHC*. A leader at the club, *Steph*, suggested that while there was definitely a behavioural management code of conduct, as far as behaviour on the field, she was unaware of a specific anti-discrimination policy that could be used around discrimination or equality issues off the field.

### *NCHC*

In contrast to *MCHC* and *SEHC*, *NCHC* was founded on distinct feminist principles and was formed as a deliberately positive space for women who wanted to participate in hockey. *Dawn*, the only founding member still participating at the club, explained that the club was established in 1985, and that it “promoted and practiced feminist principles and the participation of sport.” *Dawn* further explained that the club started with sixteen participants and shared a commitment to honour mature-aged women’s participation in hockey. During her interview, *Dawn* highlighted both the liberal and radical feminist beliefs which informed those who founded the club, particularly as it related to equal opportunity for women and, indeed, for lesbians.

The feminist principles that *NCHC* was founded upon affected the possibility of male membership at the club. In fact, the opposition of male members at the club from at least two participants reinforced the club culture as a separatist feminist one. As a small, exclusively women’s hockey club, the administrative and leadership roles of *NCHC* were performed by only women. One of the consequences of belonging to a small hockey club was that a number of the participants interviewed
held administrative roles within the club. Two of the participants held positions on the committee of NCHC, Cassandra, the president of the club, and Karen, the treasurer of the club. Two other participants in the research, Summer and Connie, shared the role of a ‘playing coach’. Dawn and Claire were past committee members.

Each participant had a different motivation for taking on administrative roles within the club. Many suggested that it was simply an opportunity to give back to the club and hockey in general. Claire explained:

> Ah, I guess it’s just sort of an attitude I have to life generally, that you can take, take, take the whole time but you should put back as well. So, after being involved at the club for a while, it just became clear that it’s sort of your turn and that it’s an obligation if you are going to be getting that benefit of being involved in the team at the club, that you help run it at some point.\(^\text{50}\)

One of the coaches on the team, Summer, described her position on taking on a leadership role:

> I played top level for 15 years, and I thought well I could give something back to these women who… haven’t had any training really, so I wanted to give something back after having so much given to me.\(^\text{71}\)

It is clear that official involvement in the club was seen as an integral part of being a club member. Most of the women from NCHC felt a sense of responsibility and service with respect to the club’s operations and continued existence.

An example of this sense of responsibility was explained by the president of the club. Cassandra mentioned that she felt that there was a ‘crisis’ within the club when she stepped in as a committee member and that she stepped in to ‘fill a breach’.\(^\text{72}\) The only remaining original member of the club and past committee member, Dawn, explained that she had previously volunteered for administrative roles when the club was on the verge of folding. Involvement in a small sporting club appeared to make the members more active on an administrative level, which enabled members to claim ownership in the ‘running’ of the club. In effect, participating in the club’s administration had become part of the ‘culture’ of the club.

In terms of policy in place at the hockey club, not one of the players interviewed was aware of any official member protection or anti-discrimination policies available at NCHC. Even the president of the club, Cassandra, believed that there were no written official policies on anti-discrimination within the club.

**Discussion**
The principal differences from the outset were found to be between NCHC and the other two clubs in this research. SEHC and MCHC were similar in their structure and culture. By way of example, both clubs were predominantly led by the male members of the club and club culture resembled a space where female achievements and challenges appeared to take second place to male achievements and male team requirements. While it may not seem a particularly pertinent ‘finding’ that females are governing a female only hockey club, it is not uncommon to find males governing such clubs and other female sporting organisations. What makes the story of NCHC so pertinent is that the members of the club made a deliberate decision to ensure the club was only governed by women to accurately reflect the membership and culture of the hockey club.

Generally, the gendered make-up of the committee members of both SEHC and MCHC did not reflect the overall club membership. The Executive Committee at SEHC was male dominated, with males holding most of the positions of power at the club, such as president, vice president and treasurer. Despite there being equal numbers of female and male members at the club, only one position on the executive committee was occupied by a female member (secretary).

The committee at MCHC was also led predominantly by the male members of the club, despite the gender distribution at the club being roughly equal. Three of the participants held ‘minor’ positions on the committee of MCHC. The positions held were the ‘Women’s Secretary’ of the club (who was in charge of much of the women’s administration) and two minor positions on the general committee at MCHC. Not unlike SEHC, all senior positions for the club on the committee were held by men. This male dominance on the committee could represent the discursive power discussed by McKay (1997), whereby the sports arena valorises elite [male] performance so prominently. McKay (1997) questions whether women can be valued equally to men in such an environment. This is difficult when women must compete in a culture that is generally measured on men’s performances, and not on women’s performances and achievements. While there are some exceptions, this culture generally continues in this tradition when there are a majority of men playing and administering within sports and sporting organisations. Both SEHC and MCHC’s governance did not seem to result in a fair and proportionate representation of members at the club in regards to gender.

As discussed above, Connell’s (1987) theory of gender relations focuses on such gender imbalances of power, particularly the institutional arrangements both between and among men and women. According to McKay (1997), such a situation means that ‘men dominate executive positions, voting rights, and budgets’. McKay (1997) further suggests that the ‘vertical segregation’ of genders is evident in the small numbers of women in leadership positions at major sporting organisations. This dearth of women leaders is still prevalent in Australian sport. Hence, significant importance is
placed on men’s experiences, achievements and leadership of sports and sporting organisations and this comes to be viewed as natural, the ‘norm’ even, at the local level. This appeared to be the cultural and structural ‘norm’ at both SEHC and MCHC.

In stark contrast at NCHC, most of its members had played an integral role in the governing and administration processes of the one-team club, despite the fact that many female sporting organisations have a male presence in their leadership structures. Two of the participants held executive committee positions at the club (the president and treasurer), and a further two participants shared the role of a playing coach. Additionally, two other participants in the research were past executive committee members at the club. At mixed-gendered hockey clubs, it is common to find a culture which limits the available roles in leadership for women at club level. Apart from the subtle restrictions placed on women by club culture, women also face challenges such as domestic pressures, gender stereotypes, identity, and traditional roles and images of women and men. All of these factors affect the ability of women to take on leadership positions. According to Shaw and Hoeber (2003), there are numerous reasons explaining this under-representation of women in leading positions in sport:

\[\text{Assumptions about appropriate leadership characteristics, the organizational environment, and reward practices. To illustrate, a commonly held belief is that leadership roles entail a commitment of time and energy beyond minimum job requirements, but women are often expected to deal with child care and domestic responsibilities that must be negotiated above and beyond their public responsibilities.}\]

In contrast, many males are often able to commit more time at work and do not necessarily have the responsibility of contending with issues such as childcare.

Knoppers and Anthonissen (2008) explain the above point in further detail. They conducted research on executive directors/senior managers at 50 major sporting organisations in The Netherlands. At the time of this study, all of these positions were held by white males. The directors interviewed explained that they ensure that their domestic life (wife and children) did not interfere with their ‘business practices’. In many situations, the wives and partners of those interviewed had chosen to work part-time or not at all, to accommodate childcare challenges, school pickups and their male partner’s career choices. Knoppers and Anthonissen explained that ‘women’s domestic arrangements are often perceived to undermine women’s willingness to work many hours and to be available [for the family] at all times’. However, these ‘domestic arrangements are simply the ‘norm’ and what is expected of many women – decisions about workforce participation and caring for children are mediated through norms, values and perceptions of moral obligation’. McKay’s (1997) research with males and females in sport organisations in Australia, New Zealand and Canada found
similar results. McKay (1997) explains that most men interviewed at sport organisations viewed childcare as a ‘woman’s issue’. He further explained that ‘irrespective of their marital status, nearly all men had continuous career paths and only one had taken paternity leave’. Knoppers and Anthonissen’s (2008) and Craig and Sawriker’s (2009) research provides proof that conventional heterosexual relationships are common in these situations also. Additionally, Knoppers and Anthonissen’s (2008) and McKay’s (1997) research indicates that females are not traditionally associated with positions of power in sports organisation.

Gender stereotyping is also complicit in the reproduction of the disparate power relations in sporting clubs. For example, Sartore and Cunningham explain that a woman’s nature is perceived as ‘helpful, warm, kind and gentle’. However men are ‘commonly stereotyped as agentic (i.e., achievement orientated) in nature and include beliefs of being confident, strong, assertive, and independent’. Sartore and Cunningham (2007) explain that the characteristics used to commonly describe men are representative of competence and the higher social status and power of men. These descriptors help explain why males are often appointed to leadership roles, when women are not.

This is hardly surprising when males control most sites of organised surveillance. Connell (1987) explains this ‘structure of power’ as a social structure ‘deeply embedded in power inequalities and ideologies of male supremacy’.

For positions that require knowledge of, or expertise in a particular sport (such as executive positions, selectors or coaches), women are often overlooked in favour of a man. In mixed-gendered and male dominated playing cultures such as those of SEHC and MCHC, women find it difficult to be appointed in a leadership position. Men are generally seen to possess more knowledge, expertise (because of their involvement with sport), power and are often favoured over women with similar sporting experiences. Hegemonic power, involving persuasion rather than coercion, is also at play here.

Unlike NCHC, the culture of hockey clubs such as SEHC and MCHC privilege men as the natural leaders of the club, and this power appears to have been rarely questioned. In fact, the female members of both SEHC and MCHC were familiar with and largely consented to, this culture of male dominance of executive positions at the hockey club. This consent had been ongoing, with male members making up the vast majority of executive representation at the clubs for a long period of time.

Very few of the participants from either MCHC or SEHC discussed gendered equality within the hockey clubs. No participant from either club made mention of any feminist principles at play at their club. Essentially, even the most widespread and institutionalised form of feminism (liberal feminism)
within western society was not consciously played out at MCHC and SEHC. Most of the interviewed participants did not protest the unequal representation of male members governing the clubs, nor did they make reference to any perceived gender inequalities within the club. However, they had no reason to question the culture of these clubs, as this had been the dominant culture for a long period of time. Additionally, the process of hegemonic masculinity can undermine the ability of subordinate groups (such as women) to marshal power within such a culture. While very few of the male members at both MCHC and SEHC may have been actively practicing hegemonic masculinity, most males benefit from hegemonic masculinity, and importantly, this culture often denies women opportunities, freedom and privilege that most men readily benefit from (such as holding executive positions on sporting club committees).89 Alternatively, the participants from NCHC belonged to a hockey club exclusively for women. Consequently, there were no hierarchical issues based on gender at NCHC. In addition, the women leading the club were more highly aware (than any female leaders at the other two hockey clubs) of the issues relating to gender and equality predominately because these issues related to them personally in their club culture.

While it may be idealistic to expect an affirmative action policy at a local sporting club, similar to McKay’s (1997) research, there was no evidence of a policy at any of the hockey clubs promoting gender equality or equal opportunities. While all hockey clubs under the jurisdiction of Hockey Victoria and Hockey Australia were expected to implement a ‘code of conduct’ type of policy at the club level at the time of this research, this process did not occur at all hockey clubs and was certainly not policed by the head sporting association. Essentially all of these factors in the discussions above combine to produce a culture within sporting organisations where women are systematically disenfranchised from power structures. A critical awareness of this process will interrogate the power inequalities and privileges at play in sporting organisations and sporting clubs. Systematic policy and strategies to address such inequalities (such as the affirmative action policies) are required. While anti-discrimination policy is a legal requirement in sport, an active adoption (such as a community development model) of affirmative action in regards to gender discrimination and diversity is needed at organisation and club level to change this culture.

**Concluding Comments**

Despite legislative steps in recent times to ensure women are afforded the same rights as men to participate in all levels of sport, inequalities still remain. While NCHC provides a good case study, whereby women are expected to take on leadership roles at the hockey club, it is inconceivable (particularly financially) to suggest that community sport be broken into male only sporting clubs and female only sporting clubs so that women can become involved in leadership roles. This proposal may
undermine one of the reasons why some women participate in sport, that is, to play sport in an
environment with male partners, sons and families. It is also understood that not all clubs have the
opportunity and/or capacity to just have women leaders, however, this case shows that women can be
politically active in their involvement at sporting clubs at this level.

What can be learnt from these case studies is the potential for the governance structures at community
sporting clubs. This potential can only be realised by challenging the naturally associated gender roles
and cultures that exist in society. These gender roles include ideas of women as homemakers and
childcarers, as these roles are carried into the culture of sporting clubs. Whether it is perceived by
males that women cannot carry out leadership roles or if women themselves are too busy for/or not
inclined to take on a leadership role, is decidedly unknown. What is certain, is that while community
sporting clubs have the potential to share the leadership roles between genders, the elite sport
gendered culture of having more males than females in leadership roles is evident in some parts of
local level sport, and specifically in this case, hockey clubs. The community level of sport should be
seen as the crucial level to enforce and reinforce equal opportunities for women in all levels of sport
and sport governance. It is understood however, that challenging and dissolving this discourse is not
easy to accomplish, particularly when a history of gender discrimination exists in sports, sporting
associations and sporting clubs.
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