
Introduction: why a *Research Handbook on Gender and Diversity in Sport Management*

Annelies Knoppers and Pirkko Markula

The involvement of women in sport and the excellence shown by women athletes is no longer headline news. The gender ratio of participants at the Olympic Games is near 50%. Although not all leaders in sport must have an athletic career, this significant number of female athletes suggests the presence of a large pool of women knowledgeable in sport who can take on leadership positions and work in sport management. However, in the growing sub-field of sport management research, gender is significantly less prominent as a research topic. Two recent and thorough reviews of the literature on the obstacles encountered by LGBTQ+ in sport revealed that most of this literature focused on athletes rather than on sport leaders or managers (Denison et al., 2021; Shaw & Cunningham, 2021). Similarly, a review of research about gender and sport organizations in five major sport sociology journals revealed that when articles have focused on gender, they have primarily, but not exclusively, explored the gendering of sport participation rather than the gendering of sport work/leadership (Knoppers et al., 2023). While much sport research currently champions the role of women athletes, Marissa Banu-Lawrence et al. (2020) add that “[t]he interaction between gender and leadership development remains an underexplored body of research” (p. 570). Other content analyses of the *Journal of Sport Management*, the *European Sport Management Quarterly*, and *Sport Management Review* (Knoppers, McLachlan et al., 2022; Pitts et al., 2014; Shaw & Hoerber, 2003) also revealed that relatively few papers in the social sciences of sport focus critically on gender and diversity in sport management/among sport workers. For example, when Annelies Knoppers, Fiona McLachlan et al. (2022) conducted a scoping review of these sport management journals on the topic of gender covering 1184 papers published between 2010 and 2020, they found that only 32 papers focused on gender and leadership in sport organizations.

While there are several edited books on gender diversity, sport management, and leadership in sport, such as work by Laura Burton and Sarah Leberman (2017) on women and sport leadership, Agnes Elling et al. (2019) on gender and sport governance, Leanne Norman (2021) on gender equity in coaching sport, and George Cunningham (2019) on diversity in sport organizations, there is no current handbook that brings together work by international scholars to explicitly address gender and diversity in sport management. Research going beyond social psychological theory that is often used to explain individual behavior in organizations or to analyze organizational processes in sport management is needed (e.g., Cunningham et al., 2015, 2021). In this book, the authors employ theoretical frameworks that focus on under-

standing how individuals or groups engaged in leading or managing sport are situated in the social world. This type of research provides insight into processes and practices that work to exclude certain groups and favor others. The use of such theoretical frameworks addresses a gap in sport management research to highlight how gendered ways of organizing sport are experienced and may be sustained, disrupted, and challenged. The authors of the various chapters in this book present original international research on gender and diversity from a variety of perspectives in sport management, sport organizations, and coaching. The topic of gender in sport management cannot, however, be arranged in separate boxes that neatly complement each other. The invisible labor of women in sport organizations, for example, may be situated within social reproduction, as the motherhood penalty, as being intersectional, and/or as part of the essentializing of women. Like looking through a kaleidoscope, each perspective gives a different view although based on a similar topic. In addition, an important feature of the handbook that should appeal to scholars in sport management is a discussion of the possibilities for feminist theories to expand the frameworks that have been and can be used for this research. Knoppers and McLachlan (2018) conclude that “[t]his lack of explicit feminist scholarship may have prevented scholars in sport management ... to challenge and disrupt normative gendered ways of managing and organizing sport” (p. 174).

The handbook contains work by international scholars who explicitly address gender-based marginalization in sport organizations, but also reveal how gender, as it intersects with other identity categories such as race, (dis)ability, and sexuality, shapes not only sport organizations and their practices and organizational processes but also the career trajectories of women (and men) working in these organizations. An explicit and substantial discussion of the possibilities for feminist theory (Chapters 22–28; concluding chapter) is an important feature of the handbook that should appeal to scholars in sport management and can serve as an invaluable reference source for both students and faculty who wish to research this topic as well as for policy makers keen to engage with academic discussions on gender.

In this introduction, we highlight specifically how the authors have used various feminist perspectives, or how they may be used, to examine women’s positions and experiences in sport organizations by weaving the topics of the various chapters together to highlight the complexity of the subject matter. We have then arranged the chapters in the book to trace the development of research and ideas about women and gender in sport management (see Table of Contents). We also want to note that we use the words “leader” and “leadership” to refer to all those who hold decision-making positions in sport organizations such as, but not limited to, managers, directors, chairs, presidents, and coaches.

ACCESSING LEADERSHIP AND DECISION-MAKING POSITIONS IN SPORT

The existing research demonstrates that women continue to be significantly underrepresented in positions of leadership and in sport organizations, especially at the national and international levels. For example, Johanna Adriaanse (2019), using the Olympic Scoreboard, documented that 18% of those governing sport at the national level in 2018 were women while only 8% of the positions of chair were filled by them. The research in both the sport and nonsport literature that has focused on women in leadership positions includes explanation for such underrepresentation and situates those explanations within organizations.

Knoppers and McLachlan (2018) discovered that liberal feminism that advocates equal opportunities for men and women is the most frequently, albeit implicitly, used approach to investigate the relative lack of women in organizational leadership and management. Liberal feminism, one of the most dominant forms of feminist thought and action, “advocate[s] equal access, equal opportunity, equal reward structures, equal pay for equal work, comparable worth and similar equal rights for women” (Birrell, 2000, p. 65). Susan Birrell (2000) specifies that as a perspective for advocacy, liberal feminism draws from the humanist position that women and men are more alike than different, yet have “come to live different lives, with different experiences, different opportunities and different expectations, because society erects barriers that restrict their equal participation in society” (p. 65). The research following this approach focuses on such topics as women’s access to coaching or athletic administration, the underrepresentation of women in sport leadership positions, gendered leadership styles, and life–work balance in sport management and organizations (see, for example, Burton & Leberman, 2017; Elling et al., 2019). Clearly demonstrating the relative absence of women in sport leadership positions, these researchers document inequalities in sport governance and management to then argue for more opportunities for women to participate and work in sport organizations by increasing access and by changing work culture that includes enhancing life–work balance. The main assumption is that a balanced gender ratio, that is, a similar number of women and men in sport governance and administration, will lead to a general gender equality in sport, and, consequently, “creating equal access and equal opportunity to sport is also among the most tangible points of action for decision-makers at the higher levels of international sporting organisations” (Markula, 2009, p. 4).

The liberal feminist oriented research has, indeed, been successful in creating policy initiatives for expanded representation of women in sport governance. For example, in 2020, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) initiated the IOC Gender Equality Review Project that is implicitly situated within this approach. Several of its recommendations refer to the need for a gender balance in the number of coaches and members on boards of governance. Much scholarly research that takes a liberal feminist approach to increasing the number of women working in management in sport organizations is based on the idea of proportionality and proportional representation (Dahlerup, 2013; Kanter, 1977), that is, the gender ratio.

Jorid Hovden et al. (2019) have argued that a just proportional representation is a marker of democracy, and that this percentage should be 50% if a quota is based on equal representation. This argument about the need for proportionality has led to quota policies in several countries requiring women to comprise 30–40% of those in leadership positions in sport. These policies have had relatively little long-term effect unless accompanied by penalties for noncompliance. In this book, Adriaanse (Chapter 1) examines women's participation in the governance of International Sport Federations. She reports only a small increase over time in the percentage of women in positions of power in these federations.

Women's actual presence on boards of governance does not necessarily translate into decision-making power, however. Adriaanse (Chapter 1) reveals how women on these boards lack positional power through their low representation in the positions of president and of secretary general in these federations. Lucy Piggott and Jordan Matthews (Chapter 2) sketch the minimal representation of women/former Paralympians as members of boards of governance in Paralympic organizations. Erin Pearson and Laura Misener (Chapter 3) extend this research to describe how women with disabilities have been and continue to be greatly underrepresented in leadership and decision-making positions within sport organizations. Together, these chapters produce an overall global picture of women's limited role in the leading and governing of sport based on a liberal feminist perspective.

Pointing to the tardy pace of change, some researchers have also questioned if the mere increase in numbers of women in sport governance can activate more equal sporting and leadership opportunities for all women. Some critics argue that the liberal feminist perspective ignores individual women's experiences in governance and, thus, is unable to capture how their bodies gain meaning in interactions with others in everyday lived situations. An analysis of these experiences can reveal, for example, how traditional notions of gender become imprinted on individual bodies, leaving the traditional gender relations unchanged even with a proportional representation of women in sport organizations. Feminist phenomenology, thus, considers these experiences not as neutral, but as deeply gendered.

ASSESSING LIVED BODY EXPERIENCES IN SPORT MANAGEMENT

How the body is integral to the lived experience in sport management has rarely been addressed in research, yet it is always there and plays an important part in how people see others and themselves and present themselves through impression management (van Amsterdam et al., 2017). Alison Pullen and Sheena Vachhani (2013) have observed that if the body is considered in organizational research, the focus is on the exteriority of the body (image, forms of dress), not its interiority (flesh and fluids). Feminist phenomenologists, instead, base their work on the assumption that the body is not experienced as gender, race, or (dis)ability neutral (Gardiner, 2018; Seawright, 2018; Weiss, 2015).

Addressing the importance of body experiences in management research, Rita Gardiner (2018) has described how various women such as Simone de Beauvoir, Iris Young, and Sara Ahmed have challenged the gender-neutrality of the body in phenomenological theorizing. Although de Beauvoir (1974) agreed with Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the creator of phenomenology of perception (see also Chapter 27), regarding the centrality of the lived body or embodiment, she argued that he implicitly assumed that this body was actually male and that, therefore, a feminist phenomenological analysis was needed that included women's experiences and their embodiment. De Beauvoir (1974) explores how structural limitations and daily microaggressions can work on women's bodies and in so doing shape women into their ways of being, often reducing their confidence in their bodies. De Beauvoir interrogates her own lived experience and uses the voices of other women to describe everyday interactions and her self-reflection on her bodily experiences of being a woman. This focus on lived experience rather than on incidences is a feature of phenomenology (Chapter 27).

Gardiner (2018) contends that rather than focusing on abstract concepts such as gender and sex, Young's feminist phenomenology engages with the lived bodily experiences of women in concrete situations. Young (1980) drew on work by both de Beauvoir and Merleau-Ponty to argue that a central part of lived experience and the life world of women means they inhabit a sexed body. She applied this concept to sport and physical movement in her essay "throwing like a girl" in which she reflects on the ways a woman's movement is curtailed and inhibited and is reflected in her enactment of embodiment. Young argues that scholars need to identify the structural processes that enable the flourishing of some bodies while others are constrained. Specific to the sport context, Dianne Chisholm (2008) reflects on how Lucy Hill, a free climber, experienced her body in a world of male climbers. Hill had to find and devise her own ways of climbing that were more suited to her body than those devised by her male colleagues. De Beauvoir, Young, and Chisholm, therefore, made the case that embodiment is not a gender-neutral process but shaped by the context. In the coaching context, Michael Miller et al. (2007), who explored touch between coaches and athletes, drew on Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological assumption that humans engage with the world through embodiment. They also found that the context, gender, and perceived thoughts of members of the audience shaped the ways touch was used for inter-body interaction.

According to Gardiner (2018), Ahmed extends these arguments and describes the potential a queer phenomenology could have for understanding how individuals experience their bodies. Ahmed (2006b) addresses how gender becomes imprinted on bodies that are sedimented in their histories. Bodies are concrete entities that are shaped by encounters that make an impression, but how they impress is based on how they are read (Ahmed, 2006a, 2006b; Berggren, 2014; Gardiner, 2018). Ahmed's queer feminist phenomenological perspective suggests that the categories of men/women or masculinity/femininity are not in themselves the problem but what these practices do to individuals and how embodiment is experienced as a result needs to be carefully analyzed. Ahmed (2007) further queers phenomenology to explore

the lived experience of race, of a nonwhite body in a white world/organization. She argues that the use of a phenomenology of whiteness can reveal institutional habits. This idea has rarely been applied to women working in male-dominated sport organizations. Such a phenomenology of gender could help “us to notice institutional habits; it brings what is behind, what does not get seen as the background to social action, to the surface in a certain way. It does not teach us how to change those habits and that is partly the point” (p. 165).

Feminist phenomenologists emphasize that humans engage with the world through their bodies (Weiss, 2015) and “through the connection between our body and space, we obtain knowledge of the world. That knowledge is not only unique to each of us, because of our specific experiences, but is also fully embodied” (Gardiner, 2018, p. 293). Therefore, “it is vital to attend to our embodied existence in the world, and how this affects our understanding” (Gardiner, 2018, p. 293) of how sport is managed and led. We return to this discussion in several chapters (Chapter 27; concluding chapter). While feminist phenomenologists assess the interior, individual experiences of the body, other sport feminist scholars have focused on how relations of dominance are maintained in sport management. This handbook attempts to address this gap in sport management research through a focus on the social nexuses that are embedded in organizational structures and cultures. These structures and cultures of sport organizations are supported by many assumptions about women/men, leadership/management, and sport (Burton, 2015; Fink, 2016; Hindman & Walker, 2020).

ASSESSING SYSTEMATIC RELATIONS OF DOMINANCE IN SPORT MANAGEMENT

If the phenomenological feminists pointed to the absence of individual embodied experiences in liberal feminism, other critics of liberal feminist perspectives have argued that possibilities for equal access to leadership positions and equal opportunities to participate in governance do not necessarily end discrimination because their advocates do not question the underlying structure and culture of both organizations and competitive sport that continue to favor men (e.g., Birrell, 2000; Knoppers & McLachlan, 2018; Markula, 2009). Advocating that women are allowed to take equal place alongside men in sport leadership/management does not consider the dominant ways of seeing the world that keep the structure of sport unchanged (Birrell, 2000). A scholarly focus on the *numbers* of women who work in sport organizations and/or develop sport policies has not produced a robust body of knowledge that has significantly added to understandings of *why* women continue to be excluded and organizations are so resistant to change. In addition to the phenomenological focus on individual experiences, some critics have called for a more explicit feminist research perspective that accounts for the way structural and socio-cultural practices and processes exclude many women from leadership in sport (e.g., Fink, 2016; Knoppers, McLachlan et al., 2022). The institutionalization of the doing of gender

and diversity in sport organizations and the gendering of sport work is complex and, therefore, needs to go beyond a reliance on liberal feminist perspectives.

Many critical sport feminist researchers are drawn to explorations and explanations of how systematic relations of dominance are maintained in society not through force, but through mutual consent by dominant and marginalized groups (Markula, 2009). These relations are grounded on the idea that social organizations are based on common sense and the natural order of things and tend to be accepted as such, also by subordinate groups. The dominance or hegemony of certain groups and practices such as men and masculinities in sport organizations is sustained through ideological control: “a set of ideas that serve the interests of dominant groups but come to be understood and taken up as the societal common sense about the way things naturally are and thus should remain” (Theberge & Birrell, 1994, p. 327).

To account for the power relations that sustain the unequal structures that shape sport organizations, some feminist scholars consider how sport is ideologically constructed as a hegemony defined by forms of heroic masculinity (e.g., Burton et al., 2009; McKay et al., 2001; Shaw & Hoerber, 2003). Sport organizations operate according to this power structure as well. For example, although many of the chapters in this book detail the experiences of women, they indirectly suggest that forms of masculinity are the norm. Critical feminist research suggests that leadership in sport organizations is often synonymous with forms of heroic masculinity that exclude women from senior positions. For example, Vicki Schull et al. (2013) explored selection procedures for an athletic director of a Division I university. The researchers concluded that a man was selected for the position of an athletic director of this large university because a “if a woman came in ... she would have been eaten up alive” (p. 56). Women who are selected for positions of leadership in organizations where heroic masculinity and leadership are synonymous may (have to) engage in ways of thinking and doing that are aligned with these forms of masculinity (Acker, 1990; Knoppers, de Haan et al., 2022). Such gendered organizational “rules” are often seen as gender neutral, however, and internalized by those working in organizations. Diane Forbes (2002), for example, described how senior administrators in nonsport organizations internalized the ways their male colleagues and bosses worked as being gender neutral. Doing so was often not in these women’s best interest and/or served to silence them.

To summarize, feminists critical of the current organization of sport aim to reveal how an ideologically based dominance creates the exclusion and marginalization of many women and results in resistance to their presence in organizations, the sustaining of invisible emotional labor, harassment, and gender-based violence. Although this dominance may be part of the practices and culture in many nonsport organizations, the way it is practiced in sport may be unique.

Sport is a unique institution that is formally and visibly organized based on gender and (dis)ability binaries. Susan Birrell and Nancy Theberge (1994) add that “the artificial separation of the sport world into two separate spheres delineated by sex clearly marks gender difference as significant and worth maintaining. Consequently, sex difference is constructed as a logical and necessary part of our cultural world”

(p. 346). This creates a hierarchical binary so that women's sport is considered not only separate to men's sport, but also inferior to it. As Anna Posbergh (Chapter 18) and Ryan Storr and Sheree Bekker (Chapter 17) argue, this logic has been used to construct and police the boundaries of the category labeled "woman." This is an important indication of how the ideology of heroic heterosexual masculinity operates not just through sport participation/involvement but also within sport organizations and may help to explain why the sport sector lags behind other organizations in the percentage of women in positions of leadership (IOC, 2018).

Using the appointment of a Canadian woman as coach of the South Korean national ice hockey team in 2014, NaRi Shin and Doo Jae Park (Chapter 5) illustrate further how essentialist binary assumptions about gender operate in the neoliberal, global world. This neo-liberalism has another side that assumes the gains in women's access to sport produce an environment in which gender has become neutral. For example, Bettina Callary and Brian Gearity (Chapter 15) describe how the hiring of a woman coach for a men's team is constructed as gender neutral. This neutrality is situated in the argument by those doing the hiring that only knowledge and experience and not gender play a significant role in the hiring of coaches. This assumption that gender is no longer relevant in organizational positions in organizations and in leadership reflects what scholars have called a post-feminist sensibility (Banet-Weiser et al., 2020; Gill, 2016). Post-feminism is an approach that focuses on the need for individual women to choose to be empowered within the existing system, to lean in and to develop self-confidence in order to neutralize the gendering of positions of leadership. Similar to liberal feminism, post-feminism emphasizes an individual woman's choice to be empowered without change in organizational structure or to the organization's gendered culture (Riley et al., 2017).

Assumptions about women based on this binary may include the notion that women and men are not only physically different and, therefore, separate competitions need to be organized for men's and women's sport, but also that women and men possess distinct and complementary qualities or essences. Women and men are, therefore, assumed to have, or be able to draw on, different innate skills when engaging in sport leadership. Nicole LaVoi and Anna Goorevich (Chapter 13) problematize such essentialist narratives as they are commonly applied to women in coaching, in particular the existence and emergence of a "woman's way of coaching." This belief that women coach differently than men because they are women means they can be penalized for not coaching in ways that conform to heroic masculinity and for not excelling in being supportive of their athletes (see also Chapter 15).

This belief that women are by nature nurturing and communicative can also mean women are expected to engage in emotional labor within a department/sport organization and with women's teams. Specifically, they may be assigned supportive and caring (unpaid) work using their purportedly well-developed communication skills that are part of their nurturing "nature." They have responsibilities not only in the organizations but also outside of them. They may have responsibilities such as childcare, elder care, healthcare, cleaning, nurturing, shopping, and cooking. Organizational and management structures are, however, often based on the assump-

tion that such household-related caregiving is primarily a private matter. This assumption tends to penalize many women who have few resources to delegate these responsibilities to others. Sarah Zipp and Sasha Sutherland (Chapter 7) discuss the dynamics of what they call the motherhood penalty and fatherhood premium in sport organizations and how these dynamics contribute to the lack of diversity in organizations.

Capitalist economies have largely depended upon this unpaid and/or invisible work of social reproduction occurring within households and organizations. Alixandra Krahn and Parissa Safai (Chapter 12) explore the nexus of various constructions of gender, work, and sport that create conditions that constrain women sport coaches and require them to engage in emotional supportive labor. The authors reveal how the demands for women sport coaches to perform socially reproductive labor as the central component of their sport coaching work entrench gender and work inequities in the sport system. These inequities include facing harassment/gender-based violence.

Despite the post-feminist promise of empowerment within the existing sport system, women working in sport organizations continue to face and cope with harassment/gender violence. Julia Ferreira Gomes, Jessica Nachman, Lyndsay Hayhurst, and Mitchell McSweeney (Chapter 10) describe how this can manifest itself in Sport for Development (SfD) projects that, ironically, could challenge social inequalities but also strengthen binary forms of gender and contribute to gender-based violence. This gender-based violence and harassment is often a taken-for-granted aspect of working in sport organizations for many women. Rarely do women sport leaders receive bonuses or a promotion for their excellence in dealing with gender-based harassment. Sarah Barnes (Chapter 11) reviews the extant literature about harassment in coaching/management and other closely related fields and reflects on the possible lessons that might be learned from feminist theorizing about how to combat harassment in institutional contexts within sport. Bettina Callary and Brian Gearity (Chapter 15) draw on empirical data to reveal how women coaches navigate this harassment through compliance, creativity, and resistance. Although these chapters and the #MeToo movement draw attention to this harassment and its frequency, relatively little data are available that describe how it has decreased in institutional (sport) contexts.

In addition to their care work, women also engage in paid work in sport organizations in various capacities. In these positions, they are constrained by structures and cultures and must continually navigate and negotiate their positions and working conditions. In their chapter, Lauren Hindman and Nefertiti Walker (Chapter 8) examine the contribution of organizational structures and practices to the continued underrepresentation of women working in the administration of men's professional sports and how this division perpetuates gender inequities. Specifically, they draw on Joan Acker's (1990) theory about the gendering of organizations to explain the gendered divisions of labor in the administrative offices of two men's professional sports teams. In addition to highlighting the structural conditions constructed based on the ideals of heroic masculinity, they describe how women comply with and resist these

dynamics. The authors of the various chapters in this book argue that this gendered culture and structure require change and transformation.

ASSESSING THE POINTS OF RESISTANCE IN SPORT MANAGEMENT

When feminist scholars demonstrate how ideologically supported power relations operate in sport, they also record several points of resistance by individual women who actively use their agency to instill change. For example, Annelies Knoppers et al. (2021) found that although the management and organization literature reveals constraints to women in positions of management/leadership, the level of resistance and lack of change seem to be greatest in the sport sector. Coaches, administrators, boards of directors, and trainers do, indeed, shape the context in which sport takes place. Their presence, experiences, and ways of doing gender both reinforce and challenge notions about gender and leadership/management and may help further explain how such work is gendered and fosters exclusion, and how and why women are underrepresented in sport work and positions of leadership in sport organizations.

Although they are underrepresented, women *do* work in sport organizations in various capacities such as coach, manager, board member, and director. They may criticize the sexism, heteronormativity, and racism embedded in their organization, but they do negotiate and navigate their jobs, whether they are paid or volunteers. Debra Meyerson (2008) calls this negotiation and navigation by critical women “tempered radicalism.” Examples of how critical women temper their radicalism appear in Ruth Jeanes, Aishwarya Ravi, and Laura Alfrey’s intersectional analysis of the experiences of women soccer coaches (Chapter 14), in Dawn Trussell and Shannon Kerwin’s work on women coaches in community sport (Chapter 19), in Bettina Callary and Brian Gearity’s analysis of women coaching elite sport (Chapter 15), and in Emily Ankers and Beccy Watson’s exploration of self-identification by women leaders in outdoor education (Chapter 16).

Although the picture painted in many chapters in this book is one of women having to engage in tempered radicalism while negotiating an often-hostile environment in sport organizations, they also engage in resistance. For example, Dunja Antunovic and Annika Olson (Chapter 4) reflect on how sportswomen themselves use digital media for self-presentation and how sport organizations, sponsors, and advertising agencies have added to the sexualization of sportswomen, the selling of empowerment, gender equity, and in some cases social justice causes. Antunovic and Olson argue that “new” media in this context serve both as a tool toward attaining functional goals and as a space for contemporary articulations of feminism.

The authors further illustrate that transformation pertaining to gender and sport leadership can consist of changes in practices and in thinking/doing. Although women in management must navigate and negotiate this dominant form of masculinity as it is embedded in the gender “rules” of an organization, women do not form a generic category. Certain identities tend to be routinely privileged based on

definitions of “woman,” and of constellations of relations of power such as ethnicity, race, and sexuality that intersect, as many chapters in this book illustrate. Eva Soares Moura (Chapter 21) reveals how those working on a SfD project attempted to queer it by encouraging nonheterosexual, nonbinary individuals and transgenders to participate as athletes and as leaders. Similarly, Ferreira Gomes et al. (Chapter 10) argue that the dominance of heteronormativity in SfD contributes to gender violence and thus needs to be queered, that is, the heteronormative assumptions that underlie sport practice need to be disrupted. Storr and Bekker (Chapter 17) add that the inclusion of trans, gender diverse, and athletes with sex variations could help to interrupt and reconfigure the gendered hierarchies, practices, and ideologies of masculinity and sex differences that undermine gender equity in sport organizations. Talia Ritondo, Sarah Leberman, and Dawn Trussell (Chapter 20) contend that women can redefine invisible labor by conceptualizing motherhood in unique ways. They challenge dominant conceptualizations of positional leadership and re-imagine leadership through an exercising leadership framework that situates leadership in everyday acts and recognizes the intersectionality of individual and group identities and lived meanings and experiences of volunteers, together with systems of oppression at the meso-level of organizational practices and policies (see also Trussell and Kerwin, Chapter 19). This argument about the need to recognize the intersectionality of practices and identities was made by various authors.

ASSESSING THE INTERSECTIONALITY OF INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP IDENTITIES IN SPORT MANAGEMENT

While some critical feminist perspectives retain a primary focus on gender, there is an increased realization that gender relations are also structured by other social forces and that “women” no longer constitute a generic or universal, singular identity category. Lines of power marginalize some women more than others and in different ways. The study of women as gendered subjects has often assumed women are white, able-bodied, and cisgender and has paid relatively little attention to those seen as the Other. Exploring the lived experiences of women in sport management from only a gendered perspective fails to acknowledge how diverse identities operate simultaneously. This has begun to change as women who are marginalized, such as those labeled as nonheterosexual or nonwhite, have become the focus of some research projects (Carter-Francique & Olushola, 2016; Norman, 2012; Trussell, 2020). Research focusing on women as a generic category, although sorely needed, has often ignored how women live and are constituted by several identities simultaneously. An understanding of the category “women” now requires recognition that it is enmeshed in power relations such as those based on race, gender, sexuality, class, and disability. The approach that considers the simultaneous workings of power through multiple identities is often called intersectionality.

Intersectionality, in various forms, is an important stance in more than half of the chapters in this book. This stance may reflect a move in sport management from a

“post-positivist” lens and “interpretive” interview type of studies to more critical approaches to understanding gender within ideologically supported power relations. Various authors draw on the notion of intersectionality to explore how sport workers with marginalized identities, such as those based on disability, LGBTQ+, and/or race/ethnicity, are simultaneously constituted by gender. These authors use the concept of intersectionality in different ways. Ankers and Watson (Chapter 16) engage with the concept of intersectionality at the identity level. They asked participants in their project to define and name their identities. In contrast, Piggott and Matthews (Chapter 2) use the notion of intersectionality of gender and (dis)ability to construct categories and base their quantitative analysis on them. They assigned identity labels to represent intersections between gender and disability in (inter) national sport governance.

Several authors in this book draw on Kimberlé Crenshaw’s (1991) original conceptualization of intersectionality. Crenshaw was one of the first to use the notion of intersectionality to place African American women as subjects within research (Crenshaw, 1991). She argued that intersectionality is more than an additive component that adds race to gender, but instead is a dynamic enmeshed in individual lives and institutions and their practices and constitutes marginalized individuals simultaneously. Specifically, gender and race are so entangled in the lives of black women that attributing their experiences to one or the other is impossible. Trussell and Kerwin (Chapter 19) expand the notion of intersectionality to point to the ways gender/race/ethnicity and sexuality constitute each other in sporting individuals, sport institutions, and practices, including in sport research.

Crenshaw’s perspective has been developed further, for example, by Patricia Hill Collins, who locates the intersectional identity construction within a concept of a matrix of dominance. Collins (2000, 2019; Collins & Bilge, 2000) uses the term intersectionality to refer to “particular forms of oppressions, for example, the intersections of race and gender, or of sexuality and nations” (Collins, 2000, p. 18). The social position each individual and group occupies is located within a system of “interlocking oppressions” or the matrix of domination that constitutes “the macro-level connections that link systems of oppression such as race, class, and gender” (Dhamoon, 2011, p. 231). We expand on this in the concluding chapter.

Intersectionality has also been used to add to understandings about the ways these relations of power intersect in the experiences of women in positions of leadership in sport. Jeanes, Ravi, and Alfrey (Chapter 14) draw on an intersectional feminist framework to consider how gender intersects with other social identities, such as those pertaining to race and sexuality, to shape the experiences of women coaches in community sport. Barnes (Chapter 11) reveals how women coaches face multiple and interconnected sources of harassment due to intersections of race, sex, gender, and class. Trussell and Kerwin (Chapter 19) extend this scholarship to community sport where many leaders are volunteers. They argue that community sport often has an exclusive volunteer culture. They center inequities and identities within multiple levels of analysis – the intersectionality of individual and group identities and lived meanings and experiences of volunteers – together with systems of oppression at

the meso-level of organizational practices and policies. Laura Burton and Ajhanai Keaton (Chapter 6) present an operational framework for studying and implementing intersectional equality in both research and organizations. This framework requires a focus on practices and a recognition of intersecting social identities. The authors contend that the use of a framework of intersectional equality requires sport organizations to intentionally examine their structures, processes, and practices, while also being attuned to how social identities are entangled in more than one system. Intersectional accounts of women's experiences embedded in organizational structures, interpersonal interactions, and processes add to explanations of why, despite the deployment of tempered radicalism, women may disengage from positions in organizations that claim to value diversity (Knoppers et al., 2021).

Diversity is a highly valued organizational principle, as suggested in the public statements of organizations (Ahmed, 2006a; Jonsen et al., 2021; Knoppers et al., 2021; Simpkins, 2019; Spaaij et al., 2020). Its promotion is often a form of nonperformative discourse or "happy talk," that is, talk that does not accomplish anything except linking an organization to a societal value (Bell & Hartmann, 2007). Inge Claringbould and Pepijn Geldof (Chapter 9) describe how leaders of sport clubs institutionalize heteronormativity even though they and the clubs' policies emphasize inclusiveness. These leaders explicitly talk about supporting a diversity of identities in their clubs or sport while at the same time implicitly reinforcing institutional heteronormativity in practice. Posbergh (Chapter 18) calls these nonperformative speech acts that do not accomplish anything, "codified language." She argues that sport organizations use such language in their policies to navigate "progressive" standards of inclusion and non-discrimination while simultaneously reinforcing normative cultural meanings relating to gender, sex, and sexuality. These strategies or nonperformative speech acts enable sport organizations to publicly commit to policies that seemingly do not discriminate and instead support inclusion while subtly reinforcing normative and essentialized ideas of (transgender) bodies and athletes.

The chapters in this handbook highlight how dominant forms of gender relations may be strengthened, disrupted, and challenged by those working in management and organizations in sport. Specifically, together they reveal how women negotiate and navigate gender in sport organizations. Some of the authors address conditions shaping the experiences of women in general, while others are more specific and recognize that intersectionality means that how women experience being "women" leaders in sport organizations varies by relations of power such as race, sexuality, and (dis)ability and that these relations intersect.

ASSESSING THEORIZING GENDER IN SPORT ORGANIZATIONS

The aim of this book has been to provide more openly feminist approaches to gender and diversity in sport management than have appeared in books about sport organizations thus far, to add to what is known about gender and its intersections

with other relations of power and provide pathways for uncovering more insights. When Annelies Knoppers, Lucy Piggott and Jorid Hovden (2023) recently looked at the content of five major sociology of sport journals, they found relatively little variation in the theoretical framings for this research. This lack of theoretical framing meant that we as editors of this handbook asked all the contributors to situate their arguments and empirical findings within a specific theory of their choice. Most of the authors in this handbook draw on critical, intersectional perspectives. This expands Knoppers and McLachlan's (2018) earlier finding of liberal feminist dominated research in sport management. The chapters in this book add to theoretical diversity of understanding gender in sport organizations, leadership, and coaching. However, we as editors wanted to go beyond these major perspectives to offer a section (Part IV) that details further feminist theoretical perspectives that could be used in researching gender and diversity in sport management. Louise Mansfield and Philippa Velija (Chapter 22) discuss insights that can be gained with the use of process-figurational sociology, as initially developed by Norbert Elias. With few exceptions (e.g., Velija, 2019; Velija et al., 2014), scholars investigating the gendering of and in sport management have rarely drawn on this perspective. Its use of historical processes may, however, give needed insight into how women leaders have been pushed to the margins after historically having led organizations that focused solely on women's sport.

Several scholars in the area of sport management and gender have drawn on the work of Pierre Bourdieu, although he himself did not specifically write about gender and sport (Laberge, 1995; Piggott & Matthews, 2020; Piggott & Pike, 2020). Bourdieu is a social theorist well known for his conceptualizations of field, habitus, and capital. Allison Jeffrey and Holly Thorpe (Chapter 23) explore how his ideas can provide insight into the ways power is gendered in sport organizations. For example, Bourdieu's concepts of field, habitus, and capital could be useful in explaining why practices of masculinity dominate in sport organizations.

While process-figurational sociology and Bourdieusian perspectives have been used to explain the gendering of sport organizations, critical feminism, as we have established, begins with examining gendered power relations and how they shape the experiences of women as a social group. Sally Shaw (Chapter 24) expands on critical feminism to argue for the need to incorporate a variety of feminisms in analyses of gendering in sport organizations. She argues that these must include intersectional analyses of power and thus avoid the assumption of the generic woman. Larena Hoerber (Chapter 25) also focuses on power in sport organizations, situating it in discourse, specifically in language, texts, and symbols. She reveals how critical discourse analysis is a tool that can be used to analyze gendered assumptions that shape sport organizations. The critical perspectives discussed thus far locate power in hierarchical positions, such as being chair of a sport organization or being head coach. A goal for creating change is, therefore, to look for ways to have more women occupy such positions, and in this manner their presence can contribute to organizational equality. Other perspectives look at power differently.

Zoë Avner (Chapter 26) points to the usefulness of analyzing discourse and power from a poststructuralist perspective. Those who draw on poststructuralist perspectives oppose the use of binaries and positional use of power to assume power is not located in a person or position but is relational and bound to the production of knowledge in different forms of knowledge (see also Markula & Pringle, 2006; Markula, 2018). Poststructuralist perspectives can, therefore, be used to uncover how power relations are embedded in the ways sport management is researched and how these findings become the dominant, “good” management and leadership principles in different contexts and different times and how individual managers, coaches, or leaders negotiate their ethics of management practice.

Gunn Helene Engelsrud (Chapter 27) introduces various phenomenological perspectives and gives an overview of their development and how this lens could be used to explore how leaders experience being a leader. Her emphasis on the body and lived experience is one that has been lacking in much research on the gendering of sport management, as has also been pointed out in the current chapter. Simone Fullagar and Adele Pavlidis (Chapter 28) use an approach called new materialism to also focus on what bodies experience and feel while they engage in “doing” gendered sport management. The authors also consider the relationship between these experiences and material objects. This means the environment/context in which interactions take place becomes very important in analyses of the workings of gender. Fullagar and Pavlidis are two of the few scholars who have used this perspective to focus on the topic of gender and sport management. We hope that these two chapters that assign importance to bodily experiences may provide a starting point for others to explore the experiences of women working in sport organizations, as volunteers and as paid workers.

These feminist approaches can be used to advance critical research in sport management and, if used, may assist scholars in expanding their knowledge about gender and how the resulting knowledge can be made visible. In the concluding chapter we present additional topics that can add to understandings of the gendering of and in sport organizations and sport management.

To conclude, this handbook brings together original work by international scholars to explicitly address gender and diversity and detail a variety of feminist perspectives to study sport management. The authors highlight how gendered ways continue to be maintained but also may be disrupted and challenged when managing and organizing sport. We hope that the wide range of current issues on gender diversity in sport management addressed in this book serves as an invaluable reference source for both students and faculty as well as for policy makers keen to engage with academic discussions on gender.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139–158.

- Adriaanse, J. (2019). Europe in world perspective: The Sydney Scoreboard Global Index for women in sport leadership. In A. Elling, J. Hovden, & A. Knoppers (Eds.), *Gender diversity in European sport governance* (pp. 11–20). Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2006a). Doing diversity work in higher education in Australia. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(6), 745–768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00228.x>.
- Ahmed, S. (2006b). Orientations: Toward a queer phenomenology. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 12(4), 543–574. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/202832>.
- Ahmed, S. (2007). A phenomenology of whiteness. *Feminist Theory*, 8, 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700107078139>.
- Banet-Weiser, S., Gill, R., & Rottenberg, C. (2020). Postfeminism, popular feminism and neoliberal feminism? Sarah Banet-Weiser, Rosalind Gill and Catherine Rottenberg in conversation. *Feminist Theory*, 21(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700119842555>.
- Banu-Lawrence, M., Frawley, S., & Hoerber, L. (2020). Women and leadership development in Australian sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34, 568–578. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2020-0039>.
- Bell, J. M., & Hartmann, D. (2007). Diversity in everyday discourse: The cultural ambiguities and consequences of “happy talk.” *American Sociological Review*, 72(6), 895–914.
- Berggren, K. (2014). Sticky masculinity: Post-structuralism, phenomenology and subjectivity in critical studies on men. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(3), 231–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X14539510>.
- Birrell, S. (2000). Feminist theories for sport. In J. Coakley & E. Dunning (Eds.), *Handbook of sports studies* (pp. 61–76). SAGE.
- Birrell, S., & Theberge, N. (1994). Ideological control of women in sport. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 341–359). Human Kinetics.
- Burton, L. J. (2015). Underrepresentation of women in sport leadership: A review of research. *Sport Management Review*, 18(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.02.004>.
- Burton, L. J., Barr, C. A., Fink, J. S., & Bruening, J. E. (2009). “Think athletic director, think masculine?”: Examination of the gender typing of managerial subroles within athletic administration positions. *Sex Roles*, 61(5), 416–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9632-6>.
- Burton, L., & Leberman, S. (2017). *Women in sport leadership: Research and practice for change*. Routledge.
- Carter-Francique, A. R., & Olushola, J. (2016). Women coaches of color: Examining the effects of intersectionality. In N. Lavoie (Ed.), *Women in sports coaching* (pp. 81–94). Routledge.
- Chisholm, D. (2008). Climbing like a girl: An exemplary adventure in feminist phenomenology. *Hypatia*, 23(1), 9–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2008.tb01164.x>.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.
- Collins, P. H. (2019). *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press.
- Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Crenshaw, K. W. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2019). *Diversity and inclusion in sport organizations: A multilevel approach* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Cunningham, G. B., Fink, J. S., & Doherty, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Routledge handbook of theory in sport management*. Routledge.
- Cunningham, G. B., Fink, J. S., & Zhang, J. J. (2021). The distinctiveness of sport management theory and research. *Kinesiology Review*, 10(3), 339–349.
- Dahlerup, D. (2013). *Women, quotas and politics*. Routledge.

- de Beauvoir, S. (1974). *The second sex* (H. M. Parshley, Trans.). Vintage.
- Denison, E., Bevan, N., & Jeanes, R. (2021). Reviewing evidence of LGBTQ+ discrimination and exclusion in sport. *Sport Management Review*, 24(3), 389–409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2020.09.003>.
- Dhmoon, R. K. (2011). Considerations on mainstreaming intersectionality. *Political Research Quarterly*, 64(1), 230–243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912910379227>.
- Elling, A., Hovden, J., & Knoppers, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Gender diversity in European sport governance*. Routledge.
- Fink, J. S. (2016). Hiding in plain sight: The embedded nature of sexism in sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 30(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2015-0278>.
- Forbes, D. (2002). Internalized masculinity and women's discourse: A critical analysis of the (re)production of masculinity in organizations. *Communication Quarterly*, 50(3–4), 269–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370209385664>.
- Gardiner, R. (2018). Hannah and her sisters: Theorizing gender and leadership through the lens of feminist phenomenology. *Leadership*, 14, 291–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715017729940>.
- Gill, R. (2016). Postfeminism and the new cultural life of feminism. *Diffractions*, 6, 1–8. www.diffractions.net.
- Hindman, L. C., & Walker, N. A. (2020). Sexism in professional sports: How women managers experience and survive sport organizational culture. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34(1), 64–76. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2018-0331>.
- Hovden, J., Knoppers, A., & Elling, A. (2019). Meta-analysis: Policies and strategies. In A. Elling, J. Hovden, & A. Knoppers (Eds.), *Gender diversity in European sport governance* (pp. 192–204). Routledge.
- International Olympic Committee (IOC). (2018). *Gender equality report*. International Olympic Committee, Lausanne.
- Jonsen, K., Point, S., Kelan, E., & Griebler, A. (2021). Diversity and inclusion branding: A five-country comparison of corporate websites. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32, 616–649. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1496125>.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books.
- Knoppers, A., de Haan, D., Norman, L., & LaVoi, N. (2022). Elite women coaches negotiating and resisting power in football. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 29(3), 880–896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12790>.
- Knoppers, A., & McLachlan, F. (2018). Reflecting on the use of feminist theories in sport management research. In L. Mansfield, J. Caudwell, B. Wheaton, & B. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of feminism and sport, leisure and physical education* (pp. 163–179). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knoppers, A., McLachlan, F., Spaaij, R., & Smits, F. (2022). Subtexts of research on diversity in sport organizations: Queering intersectional perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management*, 36(6), 613–622. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2021-0266>.
- Knoppers, A., Piggott, L., & Hovden, J. (2023). The skewed gender ratio in positions of leadership in sport organizations. Paper presented at the bi-annual conference of the International Sociology of Sport Association, Ottawa, Canada, August 14–17.
- Knoppers, A., Spaaij, R., & Claringbould, I. (2021). Discursive resistance to gender diversity in sport governance: Sport as a unique field? *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 13(3), 517–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2021.1915848>.
- Laberge, S. (1995). Toward an integration of gender into Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12(2), 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.12.2.132>.
- Markula, P. (2009). Introduction. In P. Markula (Ed.), *Olympic women and the media: International perspectives* (pp. 1–29). Palgrave Macmillan.

- Markula, P. (2018). Poststructuralist feminism in sport and leisure studies. In L. Mansfield, J. Caudwell, B. Wheaton, & B. Watson (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of feminism and sport, leisure and physical education* (pp. 393–408). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Markula, P., & Pringle, R. (2006). *Foucault, sport and exercise: Power, knowledge and transforming the self*. Routledge.
- McKay, J., Lawrence, G., Miller, T., & Rowe, D. (2001). *Gender equity, hegemonic masculinity and the governmentalisation of Australian amateur sport*. Cambridge University Press.
- Meyerson, D. E. (2008). *Rocking the boat: How tempered radicals effect change without making trouble*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Miller, M., Franken, N. & Kiefer, K. (2007). Exploring touch communication between coaches and athletes. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 7(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2007.11433953>.
- Norman, L. (2012). Gendered homophobia in sport and coaching: Understanding the everyday experiences of lesbian coaches. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 47(6), 705–723. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690211420487>.
- Norman, L. (2021). *Improving gender equity in sports coaching*. Routledge.
- Piggott, L., Hovden, J., & Knoppers, A. (in press). Sociological perspectives on gender inclusion in sport organizations. In S. Clegg, M. Grothe-Hammer, & K. Serrano Velarde (Eds.), *Sociological thinking in contemporary organizational scholarship*. Emerald.
- Piggott, L. V., & Matthews, J. (2020). Gender, leadership, and governance in English national governing bodies of sport: Formal structures, rules, and processes. *Journal of Sport Management*, 35(4), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2020-0173>.
- Piggott, L. V., & Pike, E. C. (2020). “CEO equals man”: Gender and informal organisational practices in English sport governance. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 55(7), 1009–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690219865980>.
- Pitts, B., Danylchuk, K., & Quarterman, J. (2014). Analysis of sport management literature: European Sport Management Quarterly. *CHOREGIA Sport Management Scientific Forum in International Journal Sport Management SMIJ*, 10(2), 45–72. <http://www.choregia.org/.../1025.pdf>.
- Pullen, A., & Vachhani, S. (2013). The materiality of leadership. *Leadership*, 9(3), 315–319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715013486038>.
- Riley, S., Evans, A., Elliott, S., Rice, C., & Marecek, J. (2017). A critical review of postfeminist sensibility. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(12). <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12367>.
- Schull, V., Shaw, S., & Kihl, L. (2013). “If a woman came in ... she would have been eaten up alive”: Analyzing gendered political processes in the search for an athletic director. *Gender & Society*, 27(1), 56–81. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243212466289>.
- Seawright, G. (2018). Questioning the white body: On applying a phenomenological mode of inquiry to whiteness studies in education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 31(10), 911–934. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1522007>.
- Shaw, S., & Cunningham, G. B. (2021). The rainbow connection: A scoping review and introduction of a scholarly exchange on LGBTQ+ experiences in sport management. *Sport Management Review*, 24(3), 365–388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14413523.2021.1880746>.
- Shaw, S., & Hoerber, L. (2003). “A strong man is direct and a direct woman is a bitch”: Gendered discourses and their influence on employment roles in sports organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(4), 347–375. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.17.4.347>.
- Simpkins, E. (2019). *Black women in sport leadership: An exploration of the sport intersectional model of power (SIMP)* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan].
- Spaaij, R., Knoppers, A., & Jeanes, R. (2020). “We want more diversity but ...”: Resisting diversity in recreational sports clubs. *Sport Management Review*, 23(3), 363–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.007>.

- Theberge, N., & Birrell, S. (1994). The sociological study of women and sport. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 323–330). Human Kinetics.
- Trussell, D. E. (2020). Building inclusive communities in youth sport for lesbian-parented families. *Journal of Sport Management*, 34(4), 367–377. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2019-0395>.
- van Amsterdam, N., Claringbould, I., & Knoppers, A. (2017). Bodies matter: Professional bodies and embodiment in institutional sport contexts. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 41(4), 335–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723517708904>.
- Velija, P. (2019). Cricket: The Women's Cricket Association and the England and Wales Cricket Board. In A. Elling, J. Hovden, & A. Knoppers (Eds.), *Gender diversity in European sport governance* (pp. 155–164). Routledge.
- Velija, P., Ratna, A., & Flintoff, A. (2014). Exclusionary power in sports organisations: The merger between the Women's Cricket Association and the England and Wales Cricket Board. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 49(2), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690212455962>.
- Weiss, G. (2015). The normal, the natural, and the normative: A Merleau-Pontian legacy to feminist theory, critical race theory, and disability studies. *Continental Philosophy Review*, 48, 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11007-014-9316-y>.
- Young, I. M. (1980). Throwing like a girl: A phenomenology of feminine body comportment motility and spatiality. *Human Studies*, 3(2), 137–156. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20008753>.