

Diversity and Inclusion in Sport Leadership: A Longitudinal Review of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee.

Abstract

Purpose – This paper is to examine the progression of gender and racial inclusion made within the leadership of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee (USOPC) and determine what effect benchmarking has had on their inclusion efforts.

Methodology – Using USOPC’s Diversity and Inclusion Scorecard, the article will examine the gender and racial inclusivity thresholds and use the lens of critical mass to identify possible examples of homo-social reproduction disruption.

Findings– USOPC is broadly successful in achieving benchmark goals. However, closer analysis of their equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) scorecards reveals remaining structural barriers to be overcome. These relate specifically to racial and ethnic EDI. Longitudinally, females have achieved critical mass that has also translated to critical mass of women within Senior and Mid-Level management. Conversely, the USOPC has consistently failed to achieve Critical Mass within its Board of Directors (BOD), which is also replicated at the Senior and Mid-Level management levels. Overall, findings positively support the argument that critical mass positively contributes to the inclusion of marginalised populations.

Originality – There is no existing research that has examined the relationships between USOPC’s goals for inclusion and actual achievement of inclusion. There is limited research that uses critical mass as a lens to examine USOPC inclusion data longitudinally, or how critical mass may have affected homo-social reproduction within the USOPC.

Keywords Diversity, Inclusion, Critical Mass, Race, Gender

Introduction

Despite the wealth of documentation that supports the benefits of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) within management, white men still dominate the senior leadership roles within profit businesses (Deloitte, 2019;) and non-profit organisations (Gill and Orgad, 2018). A possible explanation for this phenomenon is homo-social reproduction, the proclivity, be it conscious or unconscious, to replace or select candidates who are similar to those who have the power of appointment. This can have significant impact both on the demographic configuration of an organisation, and in who receives advancement opportunity within it (Smith, 2013). One approach to disrupting homo-social reproduction is establishing a level of critical mass of marginalized populations to affect representational change. This article applies critical mass theory to longitudinal data provided by the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee (USOPC), revealing the USOPC's mixed results in disrupting homo-social reproduction within its leadership.

The overall goal of this study is to examine the progress of EDI within the USOPC leadership. The longitudinal data will show that the USOPC has created an environment that has allowed inclusive female participation at the Board of Director level and at the Senior and Mid-Level Management. However, the data additionally suggests that People of Colour have not achieved a level of inclusive participation at Board of Director level, nor at the Senior and Mid-Level Management of the USOPC. Further examination of the data reveals a significant difference between success experienced by females and racial and ethnic minorities in achieving a level of critical mass, both in terms of the desired and achieved levels of diversity set by the USOPC. It is the position of this paper that the current tools used by the USOPC to determine benchmarks are inadequate and potentially contribute to greater levels of exclusion.

The United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee

Created with the passage of the 1978 *Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act* (Woolley and Peters, 1999), the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) provides administrative oversight for the National Governing Bodies (NGBs) of the sports that compete in the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Youth Olympic Games, and the Pan and Parapan American Games for

the United States of America. Both the USOPC and the NGBs are registered as 501(c)(3) tax exempt organizations. To be a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt under section of the USA Internal Revenue Code, an organization must operate for the purpose for which the exemption was granted. None of organization's earnings may be used for the benefit of a private shareholder or individual. They must not engage in any attempts to influence legislation campaign activity for or against political candidates. It should be noted that in June 20, 2019 USOC changed their name to USOPC in order to include the Paralympic Games.

The federally chartered, non-profit organisation was given the mission to:

- Promote and protect athletes' rights, safety and wellness.
- Champion the integrity of sport.
- Respect the important role of member organisations and support their success.
- Set clear standards of organisational excellence and hold themselves and all member organisations accountable.
- Engage as a trusted and influential leader to advance the global Olympic and Paralympic movements.
- Honour and celebrate the legacy of Olympic and Paralympic athletes.

To aid in its efforts to foster EDI, the USOCP created benchmarks, generated from data specific to each NGB (financial, staffing, and status) as well as information from the U.S. Census and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). These benchmarks allow for an appraisal of each NGB's EDI efforts. Data is collected in relation to the Board of Directors; Standing Committees; Staff; Membership; National Team Coaches and Athletes; and Developmental Team Coaches and Athletes (TeamUSA, 2020). Each NGB is given a scorecard identifying the benchmark for diversity for each NGB. In return, each NGB must then submit their actual EDI data to the USOPC's Diversity and Inclusion Department, thus allowing the USOPC to examine the EDI efforts of each NGB (TeamUSA, 2020). Whilst there is a recognition that benchmarks have their own limitations, they do provide a gauge for monitoring organisational progression/regression towards the attainment of inclusion (Sisjord, Fasting and Sand, 2017; Pielke, et al, 2020)).

Why Boards of Directors Need to be Examined

Existing literature has made a clear connection between the makeup of Boards of Directors (BOD) and the performance of the organisations they govern (Deloitte, 2019). BOD are principal stakeholders, with the ability to create, and guide both the strategic direction and culture of an organisation (Johnson *et al*, 1996). Indeed, Amiri et al (2022: p63) go so far as to say that ‘the board of directors is the most influential decision-making unit in any corporation’. BOD can play an active role in the operations of the organisation and at times work alongside employees to deliver organisational objectives (Hillman and Dalziel, 2003). Senior leaders are crucial to top-down approaches to the management of diversity in organisations. Identifying top leadership commitment as a success factor in the implementation of diversity management, Quach and Defray (2020: p28) make the case that senior ‘management should serve as a role model, and be involved in defining diversity goals and communicating diversity visions within the organization’. Due to the roles played by this panel of individuals in the governance of an organisation, a significant amount of academic exploration has gone into Board performance optimization. These explorations have examined operational issues, including the creation of ‘ideal’ job descriptions that best define the roles and responsibilities of Board members (Hermalin and Weisbach, 2003). In addition to defining roles, research has examined the optimum number of Board members needed to maximize Board performance (Paniauga *et al*, 2018). Other studies have examined the optimum Board meeting frequency likely to facilitate the best quality leadership and guidance from its members (Min and Chizema, 2018).

While this literature addresses aspects of Board structure and operations, analytical attention has also been focused on types of individuals who become Board members. This is particularly important given the fact that they are responsible for directing both the operational success and financial solvency of their organisations (Joecks, 2020). Notwithstanding debate on detailed efficacy, academic circles and the business community widely accept that EDI has been proven to positively influence innovation, communication and financial positioning in organisations (Lusiana *et al*, 2020; Rahman *et al*, 2020; Papadimitri, *et al*, 2020). Because of this general acceptance, both academics and industry practitioners continue to examine the

demographic makeup of this elite group of leaders (Papadimitri, *et al*, 2020; Lusiana *et al*, 2020; Rahman *et al*, 2020).

The traditional understandings of EDI are presented in terms of sex and race. Hambrick, Cho and Chen (1996) identified positive results from racially/ethnically diverse membership among the Board. Their argument suggests that such racial diversity widens knowledge, awareness and operations of an organisation through the increased variety of different cultural experiences among its directors. Because of the wider knowledge and experience that diversity is reported to provide, positive links have been established between an organisation's financial performance and the racial diversity of its leadership (Reguera-Alvarado and Bravo-Urquiza, 2020).

The topic of gender or sex diversity dominates the diversity and inclusion literature, specifically when examining the leadership and management of elite level sport (Adair, *et al*, 2010). Like other forms of diversity and inclusion, gender diversity has been shown to increase productivity (Yang and Konrad 2011) and helps with better strategic decision-making (Herring 2009). Studies suggest that organisations with a mixed gender BOD outperform organisations that have a Board comprised of just one gender (Joecks *et al*, 2013). Terjesen *et al*, (2009) suggest that, because of the unique skills, knowledge and perspectives, which females bring to the decision-making process, their presence at this senior level, can help increase the overall performance of an organisation. Additionally, research suggests that organisations with higher levels of gender diversity display both higher levels of innovation (Yang and Konrad 2011) and greater attention to the concept of corporate and social responsibility (Joecks *et al*, 2013; Torchia *et al*, 2011; Terjesen *et al*, 2009; and Konrad *et al*, 2008). Amiri *et al* (2022: p77) conclude that 'gender diversity is positively and significantly related to the four dimensions of social sustainability' (workforce, human rights, community, product responsibility). Moreover, research by Konrad *et al* (2008) identified that females bring a collaborative leadership style that benefits Boardroom dynamics by increased listening, social support and win-win problem solving. Research also indicates that Boards with higher female representation have better financial management and engage in less risky financial and management decisions (Ward and Forker, 2017;). Furthermore, Terjesen *et al* (2009) found that females were significantly more active in promoting non-financial performance measures, such as customer and employee satisfaction.

Yet white men continue to numerically dominate senior leadership roles. This tendency to select members based on racial and gender similarity can have a considerable impact on the future makeup of an organisation. Because white men proportionally dominate senior leadership roles (Deloitte, 2019; Gill and Orgad, 2018), marginalized groups will encounter greater hurdles in their attempts at professional advancement due to homo-social reproduction (Elliott and Smith, 2004). In order to address this risk of homo-social reproduction, interventions have been made, e.g., structural alteration to Board make-up and requirements for specific diversity percentages within Boards. International approaches, such as instituting quotas to regulate the makeup of BODs, are particularly evident in attempts to increase the number of women at Board level in Europe (Terjesen *et al*, 2015). For example, Norway's requirement that 40% of the Boards of publicly traded companies should be women (Sweigart, 2012). Recently, global fast-food franchise giant McDonalds announced their goal to increase the representation of marginalized groups in senior management roles from 29% to 35%, over the subsequent four years (Ziady, 2021).

However, notwithstanding such attempts to create opportunity, people of colour and women continue to find it difficult to advance to the highest levels of leadership (Gloor *et al*, 2018). The difficulties experienced by females within sports management have been specifically identified and documented (Adriaanse, 2017). In fact, the reality of action taken to improve EDI in sport management is not match the abundance of rhetoric on the subject (Storr, et al, 2022). Indeed, there are numerous factors which continue to either passively support a non-inclusive status quo or worse, to actively mitigate against change (Denison, et al, 2020). These range from systemic barriers such as the dynamics of organizational culture (Knoppers, et al, 2020) to the discursive practices utilized by individuals, especially those in management or leadership positions (Spaajj, et al, 2020).

Inclusion vs Diversity

The term diversity has been used to designate the demographic variances among collective group association, e.g., in social organisations and in companies (both profit and not for profit) (McGrath, Berdahl, and Arrow, 1995). Diversity can take many forms that are easily recognisable, for example gender, race, and age (Milliken and Martins, 1996). However, it can also encompass less obvious categories, such as: educational background; technical knowledge; and socio-economic status (Kochan *et al*, 2003). Hence, the idea of diversity is

perhaps better summed up as “the varied perspectives and approaches to work that members of different identity groups bring” (Thomas and Ely, 1996, p. 80).

However, while much of the literature seems to address diversity in the form of representation, there is a separate and distinctly different conversation to be had, around diversity in the form of inclusion. Mor Barak and Cherin (1998) express inclusion as the amount to which an individual has the ability to participate fully within an organisation, and to possess the ability to influence the decision-making processes. Unlike diversity, which is about representation and being seen, inclusion is about being heard and participating. Thus, inclusion denotes an individual’s ability to contribute fully and effectively to an organisation without the need to compromise oneself (Behnke *et al*, 2021). Establishing a level of critical mass is one way to create such inclusion.

Critical Mass Theory

The thesis behind Critical Mass Theory is that marginalized groups are more likely to attain influence in an organisation once a certain threshold within the organisation is achieved (Joecks *et al*, 2013). Kanter (1977) provided a significant contribution to the application and popularity of Critical Mass Theory, by applying threshold model analysis when examining the politics of gender and collective political action within corporate leadership structures. Kanter (1977) contends that, when a marginalized group achieves critical mass among the leadership of an organisation, that group can then affect policy and generate transformation as wholly involved contributors, and not just as token agents of diversity.

Since Kanter’s (1977) work, ‘critical mass’ has gained greater traction among academics and policy developers to justify the appointment of more women to leadership positions (Joecks, *et al*, 2013; Torchia *et al*, 2011). The work of Gaston *et al*, (2020), and Adriaanese (2016), have used Critical Mass Theory to examine the inclusion of women in leadership and management roles within elite levels of sports organisations.

A significant contribution made by Kanter (1977) was the development of taxonomies to help identify and distinguish different levels of critical mass. Gaston *et al*, (2021, p 6) provided an overview of Kanter’s (1977) taxonomies:

- *Uniformed Groups* are groups in which all members share the same (visible) characteristics. Uniformed groups are comprised of 100 percent of the same sex or race.
- *Skewed Groups* are groups in which one dominant type (e.g., males) controls a few (e.g., females), and therefore controls the group and its culture. The few are called “tokens” and are not treated as individuals but as representatives of their category (Kanter 1977 p 208). Kanter (1977) and Joecks (2012) suggest that, *skewed* groups comprise of a 90/20 split, whereas *tilted* Groups are groups with less extreme distribution. Unlike the *skewed* groups, minority members can ally and influence the culture of the groups. They do not stand for all of their kind but instead represent a subgroup whose members are to be differentiated from each other, in their skills and abilities (Kanter, 1977 p. 208). Kanter (1977) and Joecks (2012) suggest that male dominated *tilted* groups are comprised of up to a 20-40 split.
- *Balanced Groups* are groups in which the majority and minority turn into potential subgroups, where differences becomes less and less important. The focus thus turns to their different abilities and skills (Kanter, 1977 p. 208). Kanter (1977) and Joecks (2012) suggest that *balanced* groups are comprised of up to a 40-60 split.

The works of Joecks *et al* (2012) and Torchia *et al* (2011) all recognise that the achievement of a tilted classification is needed in order for marginalized groups to gain power, and thus to affect the administrative and mission course of an organisation.

Methodology

Source Material:

The source materials for this research comes from USOPC’s Diversity and Inclusion Scorecard (DIS). First published in 2013, the DIS provided data on two areas of diversity: ‘Women’ and ‘People of Colour’. In the following year the report added ‘Military Veteran’ status, and in 2015 ‘Persons with Disabilities’ were included, to make up the four areas that are currently included in the scorecard. This article has focused only on the ‘Women’ and ‘People of Colour’ data, as these they provide the greatest amount of longitudinal information.

The scorecard's presentation of the data has changed since its inception. From 2013 to 2015, percentages were presented with the decimal value to the tenth, while from 2016 to 2017 the decimal value was stretched to the hundredths. The data will be presented as shown in the relevant individual year report. More significantly, from 2018 the BOD Data was no longer presented as a stand-alone line item. From 2018 – 2020 the USOPC changed the reporting structure of the report, merging the BOD line item with Senior Level Management, to what is now referred to as "Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers", while Mid-Level managers are now referred to as "First/Mid-Level Officials and Managers". To help ensure consistency, this research has elected to focus on the 2013 -2017 data, as it would be difficult to confirm the accuracy of Board of Director data after 2018.

Additionally, the data does not identify intersectionality, for example whether a Board member is both Asian-American and female. As seen in the literature review, much of the research uses the term 'Gender Diversity' when speaking about the EDI of the female sex. As this research subscribes to the idea that gender is a social construct, the article will be using the terms 'sex/female' rather than 'gender/woman/women' in the discussion sections.

Critical Mass Application and Analysis:

The research examined the data through the lens of Kantar's (1977) Critical Mass Theory, to establish if the USOPC was creating an environment allowing inclusion to occur. The research plotted the data from the 2013-2017 USOPC's DIS to determine if, and or when, critical mass was achieved within the BOD. This process was repeated using Senior Level and Mid-Level Management data to determine the levels of critical mass within those groupings.

Findings and Discussion:

When the data is examined through the lens of Kanter's (1977) Critical Mass Theory, Table 1 and Table 2 (drawing on data from the USOPC diversity and inclusion scorecards) provide both the actual percentage of females and people of colour on the BOD, as well as the desired goals stated in each scorecard from 2013 – 2017.

As shown in Table 1, from 2013 to 2017 the USOCP sought to have a 'Tilted' level of female representation on its Board, as shown in the 'Goal' column. This desired level of 30% or more

coincides with the work of Kanter (1977), Joecks *et al* (2012), Torchia (2001) and Torchia *et al* (2011), allowing greater opportunity for Female inclusion. The Board exceeded its goal target in 2013 and 2014, thus attaining a 'balanced' classification. Between 2015-2017 the difference between actual and goal was marginal, thus falling just short of this classification. These results indicate that females are able to fully participate and affect the operation of the USOPC.

Insert Table 1: Female Board of Director Critical Mass Table

When attention is focused on the membership of people of colour on the BOD (Table 2), the actual makeup of the Board is well below the 30% required to achieve inclusion. In 2013, 2014, 2016 and 2017 the People of Colour goal occupies what Kanter (1977) would classify as 'Skewed Groups', rendering people of colour on the Board as 'token'. 2015 is the only year in which the goal would be considered 'Tilted'. This is because this was the only year in which a goal was set which would result in a 'tilted' status. However, even if the USOPC is 100 percent successful in achieving their desired goal for people of colour, this is not set at a level that would allow for inclusive participation.

Insert Table 2: People of Colour Board of Director Critical Mass

While the above findings are interesting, what might they mean in the larger context of the management the USOPC? As previously identified in the literature, there is well-established support amongst both industry practitioners and academics that diversity within the structures of leadership benefits the performance and management of an organisation. However, a significant barrier to diversity at the highest levels of management is the idea of homo-social reproduction. The evidence illustrates that, although people of colour have not established a level of critical mass at Board level (30% or more), females have. So, this raises the question of how this might disrupt the act of homo-social reproduction, for both groups, within Senior Level Management and Mid-Level Management at the USOPC?

When the lens of critical mass is applied to examine female inclusion at Senior and Mid-level management, the data shows that between 2013 and 2017, the goal for females at the Senior

Level Management was set above 30%. For the most part, that 30% goal was achieved or fell just short, as shown in Table 3. When looking at female Mid-Level Managers during the same time frame, females experienced significant success achieving a 'Balanced' classification, with half of USOPC Mid-Level Managers being female. It should be noted that the highest rate of actual female representation coincides with the loftiest goals for female inclusion. That could be seen as a possible indicator that the higher the bar of achievement, the greater the level of achievement that occurs. Regardless of the possible implications, the fact remains that female EDI goals have been set at a level that actually allows inclusion to occur if achieved (as it was), thus establishing an environment that allows females to fully participate.

The data from Table 3 provides an interesting story about the historical rates of inclusion of females within the Senior and Mid-Level Management of the USOPC, when considered alongside the data presented about the BOD. There is a developing argument, from a numerical perspective, which supports the view that the USOPC is disrupting the classic homo-social reproduction of only advancing males into positions of leadership and management. It could be suggested that the makeup of the USOPC BOD has fostered a culture of female inclusivity through the setting and achieving levels of diversity to the point that it has created levels of critical mass, thus manifesting the 'Tilted' and 'Balanced' environments for females in other areas of management and leadership within the organisation.

Insert Table 3: Female Senior and Mid-Level Critical Mass

However, as Table 4 illustrates, people of colour are not experiencing the same level of inclusion as their female peers. Within Senior Management, the goal was never greater than 15.9 %. Even if the USOPC achieved this goal, it is still half of what is needed to establish a level of critical mass. The same story occurs when examining the Mid-Level Managers: the goal is well below the required level of 30%.

Insert Table 4: People of Colour Senior and Mid-Level Management Critical Mass

Again, there appears to be numerical support for a developing argument that the USOPC has failed to overcome homo-social reproduction in terms of race at Board level. It could be further suggested that the lack of critical mass of people of colour is also being reproduced at the Senior and Mid-Level management positions at the USOPC.

While this research focused on 2013-2017, due to reasons stated in the methodology, the 2020 data nonetheless provides a similar story in terms of diversity goals and diversity achievement. Tables 5 and 6 show that the critical mass trends that occurred between 2013 and 2017 are a mirror reflection of the most recently available data published by the USOPC.

Insert Table 5: 2020 USOPC People of Colour Diversity

Insert Table 6: 2020 USOPC Female Diversity

Conclusion:

Critical Mass provides a theoretical path for encouraging inclusion, regardless of financial/staffing capabilities, and counters the self-fulfilling prophecy of marginalization by basing EDI policy of representation on a population size rather than on amassing a population that can effect change. However, if the USOPC Diversity Inclusion Scorecard is designed to create inclusion and not just diversity, the organisation needs to re-evaluate how it addresses inclusion, both for itself and for the NGBs under its umbrella. At the moment, the USOPC is advancing the role of females within the organisation as it appears the organisation has a greater appetite to include females at all levels of management (BOD, Senior Level and Mid-Management Level), as seen by the goals they have set. The more females are represented and gain full participation, the more they have power to influence the makeup of the organisation. From the data provided, it could be argued that the USOPC has been successful in their efforts to create an inclusive management and leadership team in terms of sex.

However, this is not the case in terms of race and ethnicity, nor where people exist at the intersection of multiple identities. For that reason our main recommendation is the need for some refinement to the way in which the USOPC collects data.

The USOPC needs to celebrate the success it has achieved in female inclusion and learn from that success. By applying Critical Mass Theory to the data collated from its underpinning research, this paper challenges the USOPC to increase the benchmarks for people of colour to match those of its female Board members. This would allow the USOPC to test their strong correlation data and possibly determine if the goal is a causal factor for the actual. If the higher benchmark results in greater racial inclusion, the USOPC could potentially reproduce the success achieved in female inclusion. By itself, this data is insufficient to provide evidence of causation, which is a limitation of this study. However, when combined with the critical mass data referred to above, a trend does emerge that could be tested by further research. For example, through a replication of this study to utilise newer data when they are released, to further extend the longitudinal study. This could then lead into research which seeks to investigate causal links between organisational success and female inclusion, and consider if this might also be inferred in relation to greater inclusivity for people of colour.

Completion and analysis of these organisational and research recommendations could yield insights and practical steps for both the USOPC, and any organisation seeking the benefits of better social inclusivity within its senior and mid-level management.

References

- Adair, D., Taylor, T., and Darcy, S. (2010). Managing ethnocultural and 'racial' diversity in sport: Obstacles and opportunities, *Sport Management Review*, 13:4, 307-312, DOI: 10.1016/j.smr.2010.06.002
- Adriaanse, J. A. (2017) [online] Women are missing in sport leadership, and it's time that changed. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/women-are-missing-in-sport-leadership-and-its-time-that-changed-69979> [accessed: 27th December 2017]
- Haji Amiri, Misagh, Nour Kifo, and Sumeyye Kusakci. (2022). Diversity in the Board of Directors and the Social Sustainability Pillar of the Firm: Evidence from Countries with High Environmental, Social, and Governance Scores. *The International Journal of Organizational Diversity* 22 (1): 63-83. doi:10.18848/2328-6261/CGP/v22i01/63-83.
- Behnke, J., Rispens, S., and Demerouti, E. (2021). Creating Inclusion to Leverage Workforce Diversity from a Work Characteristics Perspective. In *Aligning Perspectives in: Gender Mainstreaming (pp. 19-35)*. Springer, Cham
- Deloitte, L. L. P. (2019). *Missing pieces report: The 2018 Board diversity census of women and minorities on Fortune 500 Boards*.
- Denison, E., Bevan, N., and Jeanes, R. (2021) Reviewing evidence of LGBTQ+ discrimination and exclusion in sport, *Sport Management Review*, 24:3, 389-409, DOI: 10.1016/j.smr.2020.09.003
- Gaston, L., Blundell, M., & Fletcher, T. (2020). Gender diversity in sport leadership: An investigation of United States of America national governing bodies of sport. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 25(6), 402-417.
- Gloor, J. L., Morf, M., Paustian-Underdahl, S., and Backes-Gellner, U. (2020). Fix the game, not the dame: Restoring equity in leadership evaluations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 161(3), 497-511.
- Hambrick, D. C., Cho, T. S., and Chen, M. J. (1996). *The influence of top management team heterogeneity on firms' competitive moves*. *Administrative science quarterly*, 659-684.
- Hermalin, B. E., and Weisbach, M. S. (2003). *Boards of directors as an endogenously determined institution*.
- Herring, C. (2009). Does diversity pay?: Race, gender, and the business case for diversity. *American sociological review*, 74(2), 208-224.
- Hillman, A. J., and Dalziel, T. (2003). Boards of directors and firm performance: Integrating agency and resource dependence perspectives. *Academy of Management review*, 28(3), 383-396.
- Joecks, J., 2020. How to Get Women on Board (s)? The Role of a Company's Female Friendly Culture. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 32(3), 237+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A637926282/AONE?u=anon~da86c432&sid=googleScholar&xid=4c78a11a>

- Joecks, J., Pull, K., and Vetter, K. (2013). Gender diversity in the Boardroom and firm performance: What exactly constitutes a “critical mass”? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118, 61–72.
- Johnson, J. L., Daily, C. M., & Ellstrand, A. E. (1996). Boards of Directors: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 22(3), 409-438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200303>
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Knoppers, A., McLachlan, F., Spaaij, R. and Smits, F. (2021). Subtexts of Research on Diversity in Sport Organizations: Queering Intersectional Perspectives. [*Journal of Sport Management Volume 36: Issue 6*](#), 613–622.
- Kochan, T., Bezrukova, K., Ely, R., Jackson, S., Joshi, A., Jehn, K., and Thomas, D. (2003). The effects of diversity on business performance: *Report of the diversity research network. Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 42(1), 3-21.
- Konrad, A. M., Kramer, V., and Erkut, S. (2008). The impact of three or more women on corporate Boards. *Organisational dynamics*, 37(2), 145-164.
- Lusiana, L., Pratiwi, N., Zefriyenni, Z., Putra, R. A., and Vironica, W. F. (2020, June). The Effects of Multiple Directorship, Tenure, and Age of Board of Directors on Corporate Value. In *8th International Conference of Entrepreneurship and Business Management Untar (ICEBM 2019)* (pp. 85-88). Atlantis Press.
- McGrath, J. E., Berdahl, J. L., and Arrow, H. (1995). *Traits, expectations, culture, and clout: The dynamics of diversity in work groups*.
- Min, B. S., & Chizema, A. (2018). Board Meeting Attendance by Outside Directors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 147(4), 901–917. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45022417>
- Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., and Berkman, S. (1998). Organisational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 34(1), 82-104.
- Paniagua, J., Rivelles, R., and Sapena, J. (2018). Corporate governance and financial performance: The role of ownership and Board structure. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 229-234.
- Papadimitri, P., Pasiouras, F., Tasiou, M., and Ventouri, A. (2020). The effects of Board of Directors’ education on firms’ credit ratings. *Journal of Business Research*, 116, 294-313
- Pielke Jr, R., Harris, S., Adler, J., Sutherland, S., Houser R., and McCabe J, (2020). An evaluation of good governance in US Olympic sport National Governing Bodies. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 20:4, 480-499, DOI: 10.1080/16184742.2019.1632913
- Quach, S., and Frey, D. (2020). Diversity Management in Multinational Companies in Germany: A Benchmark Study about Implementing Diversity Management. *The International Journal of Organizational Diversity*, 20(2), 11-33

- Rahman, H. U., Zahid, M., and Jehangir, M. (2020). Different is Better: Does Difference in Age and Ethnicity of the Directors Matter for Corporate Performance in Malaysia? *Journal of Applied Economics and Business Studies*, 4(2), 205-220
- Reguera-Alvarado, N., and Bravo-Urquiza, F. (2020). The impact of Board diversity and voluntary risk disclosure on financial outcomes. A case for the manufacturing industry. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, (35(5), 445-462.
- Sisjord, M. K., Fasting, K., and Sand, T. S. (2017). The impact of gender quotas in leadership in Norwegian organised sport. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 9(3), 505-519.
- Smith, V. (Ed.). (2013). *Sociology of work: An encyclopedia*. Sage Publications.
- Spaaij, R., Knoppers, A., and Jeanes, R. (2020) "We want more diversity but...": Resisting diversity in recreational sports clubs, *Sport Management Review*, 23:3, 363-373, DOI: 10.1016/j.smr.2019.05.007
- Storr, R., Jeanes, R., Rossi, T., and Hunter, L. (2022). Are we there yet? (Illusions of) Inclusion in sport for LGBT+ communities in Australia. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 57(1) 92–111
- Sweigart, A. (2012). Women on Board for change: The Norway model of Boardroom quotas as a tool for progress in the United States and Canada. *Northwestern Journal of International Law and Business*, 32, 81A-105A.
- TeamUSA. 2020. USOPC Diversity and Inclusion Scorecard Compilation. [online] Available at: <<https://www.teamusa.org/About-the-USOPC/Diversity-Equity-Inclusion/D-and-I-Scorecards/Diversity-And-Inclusion-Scorecard-Compilation>> [Accessed 5 November 2020].
- Terjesen, S., Couto, E.B. & Francisco, P.M. (2015) Does the presence of independent and female directors impact firm performance? A multi-country study of board diversity. *Journal of Management Governance* 20, 447–483 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-014-9307-8>
- Terjesen, S., Sealy, R., and Singh, V. (2009). Women directors on corporate Boards: A review and research agenda. *Corporate governance: an international review*, 17(3), 320-337.
- Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. (1996). Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(5). [https://MakingDifferencesMatter:A>NewParadigmforManagingDiversity\(hbr.org\)](https://MakingDifferencesMatter:A>NewParadigmforManagingDiversity(hbr.org))
- Torchia, M., Calabro, A., and Huse, M. (2011). Women directors on corporate Boards: From tokenism to critical mass. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 299–317.
- Ward, A. M., and Forker, J. (2017). Financial management effectiveness and Board gender diversity in member-governed, community financial institutions. *Journal of business ethics*, 141(2), 351-366.
- Woolley, J. T., and Peters, G. (1999). The American presidency project. Santa Barbara, CA. Available from World Wide Web: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws>.
- Yang, Y., and Konrad, A. M. (2011). Understanding diversity management practices: Implications of institutional theory and resource-based theory. *Group & Organisation Management*, 36(1), 6-38.

Ziady, Hanna., C. 2021. All-male Boardrooms are a thing of the past at Britain's top companies. [online] CNN. Available at: <<https://edition.cnn.com/2021/02/24/business/women-ftse-350-hampton-alexander-review/index.html>> [Accessed 1 March 2021].