University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

5-2004

Factors influencing the willingness to mentor female campus recreation professionals.

Glenna G. Bower
University of Louisville

Recommended Citation

Bower, Glenna G., "Factors influencing the willingness to mentor female campus recreation professionals." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 134.
https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/134

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE WILLINGNESS TO MENTOR FEMALE CAMPUS
RECREATION PROFESSIONALS

By

Glenna G. Bower
B.S., University of Southern Indiana, 1995
M.A., Indiana State University, 2000

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

College of Education and Human Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

May 2004

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE WILLINGNESS TO MENTOR FEMALE CAMPUS
RECREATION PROFESSIONALS

By

Glenna G. Bower
B.S., University of Southern Indiana, 1995
M.A., Indiana State University, 2000

A Dissertation Approved on

March 10, 2004

by the following Dissertation Committee:

_____

Mary A. Hums, Dissertation Co-Director

_____

John Keedy, Dissertation Co-Director

_____

T. Christopher Greenwell

_____

Daniel F. Mahony

_____

Anita M. Moorman

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to two special people in my life. First, I dedicate this to Abby Hess, the person I was able to share the majority of my academic endeavors with. She provided me with support and understanding through some of the most difficult times. She is truly someone I leaned on, and I know I could not have accomplished what I did without her.

Second, I dedicate this research study to my mentor, professor, and friend, Dr. Mary A. Hums. I could not have completed this research, or any of my doctoral studies, without the continuous understanding, and support she has provided to me throughout my years at the University of Louisville. She has truly made what could have been a torturous journey more enjoyable. She is a mentor that any student would be happy to have when completing a doctoral degree. She will always be the professor who made a difference in my life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE WILLINGNESS TO MENTOR FEMALE CAMPUS
RECREATION PROFESSIONALS

Glenna G. Bower

May 2004

The purpose of this study was to discover factors which influence a mentor's

decision to engage in a mentoring relationship within campus recreation administration.

The present study investigated four areas of inquiry within campus recreation: (a) what

are the individual reasons for mentoring women? (b) what organizational factors inhibit

or facilitate mentoring women? (c) what protégé characteristics attracted mentors? and

(d) what outcomes are associated with mentoring women?

A phenomenological research design was chosen to examine the mentoring

relationship from the perspective of the mentor. A group of campus recreation

professionals from the Midwest were contacted for the study (N = 5, 3 female and 2

male). The participants were four directors and one assistant director of university

campus recreation programs. This research study relied on three in-depth

phenomenological interviews with each participant as the primary means of collecting

data. The researcher used the constant comparative method of analysis throughout the

study. Analysis of the data produced personal life history portraits of each participant

and provided themes and categories for each research question.

The data produced some interesting findings. First, although the research study was focused on females within campus recreation, there were not a substantial amount of "gender related" responses. Second, the mentors, in most cases, referred to students as the protégés without mentioning other professional staff within the organization. Third, the mentors cited time commitment as a disadvantage to mentoring others. Fourth, the mentors described "discussing sensitive issues" as a negative outcome associated with mentoring others. Fifth, the mentors described how the mentors are vulnerable in a camps recreation setting. Finally, the mentors described professional development opportunities as organizational factors which facilitate the mentoring relationship.

Study findings provided valuable information for campus recreation directors wanting to know ways to successfully mentor not only females but also males entering the campus recreation profession.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The demographics of the United States workforce constantly change. One area

where changes are evident is the gender make-up of the managerial workforce. Of the

United States population, 18% or 51 million people are classified as managers (Bureau of

Labor Statistics, 2003). In terms of female representation, the percentage of women in

managerial positions was 31% in 2001 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2003). Women are

making strides across many different industries, including a number of traditionally male-

dominated industries.

Male-dominated professions are often called nontraditional occupations for

women. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2003, para. 1), "nontraditional

occupations are those that women comprise 25% or less of the total employed." For

example, women are making advances in areas such as surveyors, space scientists,

production helpers, architects, sheriffs, bailiffs, and other law enforcement officers (U.S.

Department of Labor Women's Bureau, 2003). However, some professions remain male-

dominated, such as marine life cultivation, construction trades, firefighter occupations,

airplane pilots and navigators, truck drivers, and pest control occupations (U.S.

Department of Labor Women's Bureau, 2003). In general, women have been historically

underrepresented in business and in higher education administration (Catalyst, 2002;

Warner & DeFluer, 1993). One particular area of business where women have been

underrepresented is the sport industry.

Business. Women began entering the corporate world as managers in substantial numbers during the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, very few businessmen ever expected women to pursue careers leading to senior management positions because no corporate policies included affirmative action programs to promote women to senior management positions (Morrison, 1987). Catalyst, a New York City-based nonprofit organization which seeks to advance women in business, reported the percentage of board seats held by women in the Fortune 500 in 2001 was 12.4%, while 87% of the companies had only one woman director (Catalyst, 2002). Women in the Fortune 501-1000 companies hold 8.9% of all board seats and 61% of the Fortune 501-1000 companies had only one woman director (Catalyst, 2002). Of all the Fortune 1000 companies, women held 10.9% of all board seats, and 74% of the companies had only one woman director (Catalyst, 2002).

Higher education administration. Although women occupied more leadership positions than they did a decade ago, studies in higher education generally revealed women were less likely than men to participate in upper levels of administration (Warner & DeFluer, 1993). For example, the American Council on Education reported women make up 19% of college presidencies (22% at two-year institutions; 13% at PhD granting institutions) (King, 2000) and employment data collected during the 1990's indicated women were still underrepresented in the highest positions of student affairs organizations (Blackhurst, 2000). Current estimates indicate women hold between 23% (Twale, 1995) and 33% (Drum, 1993) of the senior level positions. This proportion has

remained relatively constant during the last decade despite increasing numbers of women at the entry and middle management levels (Twale, 1995).

   Sport industry. The number of management positions in the sport industry is growing at a rapid rate around the world. Statistics on women in sport management are difficult to track because of the wide range of careers available in the various segments of the sport industry. The sport industry consists of a variety of segments including intercollegiate athletics, interscholastic athletics, international sport, professional sport, leisure service management, sport for people with disabilities, sporting goods, health and fitness, event management, facility management, and recreational sport (including campus recreation). Despite the rise in the number of sport management positions, women continue to be underrepresented in leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2002, 1988; Hart, Hasbrook, Hart, Mathes, & True, 1990; Lovett & Lowry, 1988; Pastore, 1991, 1992; Pastore & Meacci, 1990), interscholastic athletics (e.g., Fowlkes, Coons, Bonner, & Koppein, 1987; Hart, Hasbrook, & Mathes, 1986; Oglesby, Shelton, Demchenko, & Thumler, 1987; Pastore, 1994; Pastore & Whiddon, 1983), international sports (e.g., Hums, Barr, & Doll-Tepper, 1998; Hums, Moorman, & Nakazawa, 1998; McKay, 1997), professional sport (Hums & Sutton, 2000; 1999), leisure service management, (e.g, Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Frisby, 1992; Henderson & Bialeskchki, 1996), sporting goods industry (Feitelberg, 1996), health and fitness (e.g.,International Health, Racquet, and Sportsclub Association, 1995), and recreational sport (Yager, 1983; Varner, 1992).

Often the lack of progress for women has been attributed to the glass ceiling (Tavakolian, 1993; Ragins & Townsend, 1998). The U. S. Department of Labor (1991) defined the glass ceiling as "artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing within their organization and reaching their full potential" (p. 1). Dominguez (1991) further defined the glass ceiling as "the invisible barriers, real or perceived, which appear to stymie advancement opportunities for minorities and women" (p. 716). The literature on the glass ceiling suggests barriers fall under the two broad categories of corporate culture and corporate practices (Jackson, 2000). Schein (1985) defined organizational culture as "a pattern of basic assumptions developed as a group or organization learns to cope with its environment" (p. 2). When an organization has more men than women (or vice versa) in upper management positions, the culture tends to adopt attributes which favor the dominant gender, creating what is referred to as "gendered organizations" (Klenke, 1996). Thus, barriers for women in male-dominated professions are developed. Several researchers focused their attention on understanding these barriers women face in their advancement in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry.

Business. The barriers which prevent women from ascending to senior management positions in large corporations frequently occur in both overt and covert ways. First, perceptions and stereotypes are barriers to women. For example, despite gains made by women, negative attitudes and stereotypes of women as leaders prevail (Klenke, 1996). This is because men are viewed as the organizational leaders, while women are viewed as supportive followers. Heilman, Block, Martell, and Simon (1989)

reported male managers characterize female managers as less self-confident, less emotionally stable, less analytical, less consistent, and possessing poorer leadership abilities than male managers. Offermann (1992) reported successful corporate leaders, regardless of their gender, almost always choose to conform to traits associated with the male stereotype. Second, balancing work and family is still a problem for women in the corporate world (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1997). Maier (1997) reported it is imperative for those pursuing a career in a male-dominated culture to dedicate all life roles to their work. Third, the presence of an old boys network exists in these male-led organizations. These informal networks are important for upward mobility through increased visibility, information exchange, career planning and strategizing, professional support and encouragement (Jackson, 2000). However, studies show women have largely been excluded from these networks (Klenke, 1996).

Fourth, the concept of tokenism is a barrier to women within business. Kanter (1978) found that sex ratios (ratio of men to women or women to men) create an extraordinary amount of influence on group behavior in organizations. She found that women had to continually prove themselves and their credibility as managers, particularly when they were the "token" woman. Tokens are subject to more on-the-job pressure and scrutiny than dominants because they are visible to the rest of the group and the visibility increases performance pressures. Fifth, management style is another barrier to women. Klenke (1996) reported aggressiveness, dominance, competition, objective thinking, and decisiveness as leadership characteristics perceived by both men and women as desirable. However, when women display these traits, they are often seen negatively, while men are seen positively (Klenke, 1996). Ragins, Townsend, and Mattis

5

(1998) reported women perceive if they adopt a "feminine" managerial style, they run the risk of being viewed ineffective, and if they adopt a "masculine" style, they will be criticized for not being feminine. Finally, the lack of training and career development for women has been identified as a barrier. Women need experience in the areas of operations, manufacturing, or marketing, but find it difficult to receive this experience. This line of experience is deemed necessary for the CEO position and other senior management positions (Oakley, 2000). Although the barriers within this section were examples seen in business, the barriers are very similar to those experienced in higher education administration.

Higher education administration. In recent years a range of arguments have been proposed explaining why women continue to be underrepresented in higher education administration positions. Organizational and structural barriers have received considerable recognition in recent times. First, lack of access to networks is a common barrier to women in higher education administration (Ehrich, 1994). The lack of access to these networks decreases the chances of finding out about job openings and information which is shared within these networks.

Second, the concept of tokenism is a barrier to women within higher education administration (Shakeshaft, 1987). Women who enter gender-inappropriate occupations and skewed work groups experience negative consequences of tokenism (Yoder, 1991). The negative consequences of tokenism may include role conflict, social isolation, and/or performance pressure (Yoder, 1991). Third, differences in leadership styles have been found as one of the most common struggles for women in higher education administration (Oakes, 1999). Yeh and Creamer (1995) found women leaders struggled

6

with caring for the needs of others versus choosing the best situation for themselves. Fourth, multiple time commitments create a barrier to women in higher education administration because of the long hours and numerous workplace responsibilities (Oakes, 1999). The long, irregular hours usually required for administrators in higher education often lead to a lack of sufficient time for the family. This in turn could lead to feelings of guilt and a struggle between the importance of work or family (Oakes, 1999). Fifth, women lack the knowledge of, or the opportunity to enter the informal system of career advancement used for so long by men called the old boys' network (Scanlon, 1997). Finlay (1986) contends women simply do not understand the "academic game", making women unsuccessful players in an arena where the original rules were developed by men (McCook, 1994). Finally, a wall of tradition and stereotyping separates women from the inner sanctum of leadership positions within higher education administration (Sampson, 1987). The barriers within this section were examples seen in higher education administration, and the barriers are very similar to those experiences of a woman in the sport industry.

Sport industry. Although there are a variety of segments within the sport industry, the overall barriers women face are consistent from one segment to the next. First, the presence of an old boys network is a common barrier to women within the sport industry. For example, Acosta and Carpenter (1985b) reported female athletic administrators attributed the demise in the number of female coaches to the success of the old boys network, failure of the old girls network, and discrimination on the part of the male administrators doing the hiring. Second, sexual harassment is often a barrier to women wanting to enter the sport industry. Women in the sport industry experience the

same type of the sexual harassment a woman might experience in other male-dominated professions (Hall, 1984). Often women are stereotyped as lesbians (Hall, 1984). Third, balancing work and family can be challenging for women in the sport industry. Yager (1993) reported women in intramural recreational sports administration expressed concerns about disruptive time schedules, often involving nights and weekends. Fourth, tokenism occurs within the sport industry. Tokenism may occur in the form of status leveling. For example, if females in upper level management positions within organizations are rare then they might be mistaken as secretaries (Knoppers, 1987). Tokenism may occur in the form of "slotting." This means since every committee needs a female member, the few females end up overburdened with committee work. Tokenism may occur in regards to occupational stereotyping. Occupational stereotyping occurred when males are considered the norm in the profession and, therefore are preferred by subordinates (Knoppers, 1987). Fifth, gender differences in managerial styles was mentioned as a barrier. Frisby and Brown (1991) reported that women in leisure service management viewed the managerial style of men as being controlling and autocratic. The women indicated "men knew how to play the game" better than women when it came to negotiating, supporting the notion that women tend to operate according to formal rules and policies of organization and are sometimes naïve to informal policies.

Several studies discussed barriers related to women's underrepresentation in leadership positions in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry. These barriers for women still exist today and will continue to exist unless initiatives are taken to overcome them. The literature provides several initiatives used as coping strategies for female administrators. The most common have included mentoring

(Crawford, 1992), networking (Hill & Ragland, 1995), goal development (Boudreau, 1994), and career planning (Edson, 1988).

Mentoring has received a considerable amount of credit for helping women break the gender-related barriers in business (Burke and Mckeen, 1990; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1989; Ragins, Townsend & Mattis, 1998), higher education administration (Blackhurst, 2000; Twale & Jelinek, 1996) and the sport industry (Sisley, Weiss, Barber, & Ebbeck, 1990; Strawbridge, 2000; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Yager, 1983).

Mentoring

A mentor is an experienced, productive manager who relates well to a less-experienced employee and facilitates his or her personal development for the benefit of the individual as well as that of the organization (Kram, 1985). More importantly, mentors are frequently characterized as individuals who are committed to providing support to junior members in an effort to remove organizational barriers and to increase the upward mobility of their protégés (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1985)

Mentoring functions. Kram (1983) identified two primary functions a mentor serves: (a) career and (b) psychosocial. The career function usually facilitates and enhances the career advancement of the protégé. This is often seen when the mentor provides sponsorship, coaching, protection, exposure and visibility, and challenging assignments. The psychosocial function usually enhances the protégé's sense of identity, competence, and work-role effectiveness. This is seen as the mentor provides role modeling, counseling, acceptance and confirmation, and friendship (Kram, 1985). Scandura and Ragins (1993) indicate role modeling might be a separate function in itself. Ragins (1989) indicated mentoring may serve as a buffer between the organization and

9

the individual by creating interference for the protégé and providing special access to information, resources, and contacts. In summary, mentoring provides for the protégé's upward mobility in the organization by providing visibility, support, resources, and direction. In addition to the mentoring functions, Kram (1983, 1985) identified four phases to mentoring.

Mentoring phases. Kram (1983, 1985) identified four phases to mentoring which included initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. The initiation phase occurs when the mentoring relationship begins and usually lasts 6 to 12 months. Following the initiation phase a more intense relationship begins to develop during the cultivation phase. The cultivation phase lasts approximately 2 to 5 years. Following the cultivation phase, the mentor and protégé relationship might begin to break apart during the separation phase. During this phase, structural and psychological separation occurs. The separation phase may occur over 6 to 24 months. Finally, the mentor and protégé enter into a redefinition phase. This is where the relationship changes from mentorship to a collegial or peerlike relationship.

Benefits of mentoring for the protégé. The benefits to protégés are so valuable that protégés should consider identifying mentors early in their careers. Benefits in business include higher career and pay satisfaction and self-esteem (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992), reduced role stress and role conflict (Wilson & Elmann, 1990), faster promotion rates, higher compensation, and accelerated career mobility (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1989; Scandura, 1992; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991). Benefits in higher education administration include developing careers (Lee & Nolan, 1998), reduced role conflict and ambiguity, increased organizational commitment (Blackhurst,

2002), providing advice, guidance, and help dealing with office politics and procedures (Hubbard & Robinson, 1996). Benefits in the sport industry include improved professional advancement (Yager, 1983), higher salaries and more satisfaction with work (Weaver & Chelladurai (2002), and influenced perceived abilities, development of networks, and motivation (Sisley et. al, 1990). Mentors are also believed to experience benefits.

Benefits of mentoring for the mentor. While a great deal of research has been completed on the benefits of having a mentor in regards to the protégé, little is known about the benefits to the mentor. From what little research that has been conducted, there are several benefits to the mentor. Benefits include a link between mentor status and greater internal satisfaction (Ragins & Scandura, 1994), creativity and energy received from the protégé (Kram, 1985), a sense of rejuvenation (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978), the loyal support base from the protégé (Kram, 1985), and the organizational recognition given to the mentor for his or her capabilities as a teacher and advisor (Kram, 1985). Organizations have likewise been recognized as recipients of the benefits of mentorships (Noe, 1988).

Benefits of mentoring for the organization. Many organizations have attempted to formalize mentoring relationships to capitalize on the potential developmental aspects of such relationships. Benefits of the mentoring relationship to the organization have been linked to enhancing organizational commitment (Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996), lowering levels of turnover (Scandura & Viator, 1994), increasing employee productivity (Silverhart, 1994), developing managerial talent (Ragins & Scandura, 1994), and

educating new employees or socializing them regarding the organization's values (Wilson & Elman, 1990).

Mentoring relationships were found to be significant factors in career development (Dreher & Ash, 1990), career satisfaction (Levinson et. al, 1978), and organizational success (Ragins & Scandura, 1994). This line of research suggests that advancement to powerful positions in organizations may be partially based upon the successful development of mentoring relationships. If this is the case, then an examination of women and mentoring is warranted.

Women and Mentoring

The mentoring relationship, while important to men, may be critical to the advancement of women in organizations (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Morrison, White, Van Velsor, 1987; Ragins, 1989). Compared to their male counterparts, females face greater barriers to advancement within business (Jackson, 2000; Klenke, 1996; Ragins et. al., 1998), higher education administration (Hubbard & Robinson, 1996; Twale & Jelinek, 1996), and the sport industry (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Yager, 1993). Mentors may buffer the female manager from overt and covert discrimination, and may help their female protégés circumvent structural, social and cultural barriers to advancement in the organization (Ragins, 1989).

Mentoring functions and benefits for women. Specific mentoring functions are unique to females wanting to advance into upper level management positions. First, mentors may promote their female protégés' advancement by altering co-workers' stereotypical perceptions. Female managers frequently face "status leveling," resulting in being stereotyped and mis-identified as possessing lower status (Kanter, 1977). By

providing "reflected power" mentors signal to others in the organization that their female protégé has their powerful backing and resources (Kanter, 1977). Second, mentors may provide psychosocial functions of emotional support and building confidence (Burke & Mckeen, 1997). Research indicates women have lower self-confidence compared to their male counterparts (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). The lack of self-confidence leads female leaders to question their abilities and career goals.

Third, the mentors may train female protégés on the "ins and outs" of organizational politics. Since women have less experience in politics than their male counterparts, women may be disadvantaged in developing organizational political strategies and moving into power positions (Kanter, 1977). Fourth, mentoring relationships may provide female managers with "inside" information on job openings and changes in the organization's technology, structure, and strategy (Jackson, 2001). Women are often excluded from informal networks, such as the old boys network, and therefore do not have access to inside information. The mentor may offset this deficiency. Fifth, mentors may promote female mangers' advancement by providing feedback on management style and effectiveness (Oakley, 2000). This is important because female managers often face a "male managerial model" and a mentor may help them to develop an effective and accepted managerial style. Finally, the mentor may provide career development functions such as providing career advice and feedback to the protégé (Burke & McKeen, 1997). Studies investigating the functions of mentors for female protégés found mentors were perceived as being instrumental in helping women overcome gender-related obstacles to advancement in organizations.

However, the question remains: Why are women still not advancing? One reason could be women may be less likely than men to develop a mentoring relationship due to barriers associated with having either a female (Ragins, 1996; Vincent, 1995) or male (Ragins & Cotton, 1993; Ragins & Scandura, 1994) as a mentor.

Barriers to the Mentoring Relationship

It has been well documented that women face different barriers than men when it comes to initiating a mentoring relationship (Ragins, 1994; Ragins, 1996; Vincent, 1995). In order to get a clear understanding about the mentoring relationship, benefits and barriers associated with becoming a mentor are examined in regards to female and male mentors.

Barriers for female mentors. Research indicates women are generally encouraged to seek a female mentor or become one because of the detrimental sexual issues common to male mentor and female protégé relationships (Ragins & Cotton, 1993; Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Vincent, 1995). Selecting a female rather than a male mentor is seen as a way to develop women in their careers (Vincent, 1995). Aspiring female protégés may have more opportunities and may feel more comfortable in a female-female than a female-male mentoring relationship. However, there are some barriers with a female-female mentoring relationship.

First, there is a shortage of women in the upper levels of the organizations, creating a dearth of potential female mentors (Ragins, 1996). When there is a shortage of women at upper levels of management, women in these positions are overburdened with women needing mentors (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Second, women do not have enough time available to adequately mentor (Ragins & Cotton, 1993; Vincent, 1995).

14

Since women face greater barriers to advancement than men, women who do advance to upper levels of the organizations may need to spend their time advancing their own careers rather than helping others (Kanter, 1977). Third, women at high levels of the organization are unwilling to mentor others because of the "Queen Bee" syndrome (Gallese, 1993). Women in upper levels of the organization do not want to mentor others because they did not have help, so why help others? The "Queen Bee" syndrome also illustrates women's unwillingness to mentor other women out of fear the protégé may surpass them in the organization. Finally, the female mentor-protégé relationship evokes negative reactions because it is often seen as a "female power coalition" (Gallese, 1993; Ragins, 1989). Potential female mentors may avoid female protégés because they do not want to be labeled as a "feminist troublemaker" (Gallese, 1993; Ragins, 1989). With these barriers, women are often faced with having to approach someone of the opposite gender. This type of relationship is called cross-gendered mentoring and also poses barriers to a successful mentoring relationship.

Barriers of cross-gendered mentoring. Cross-gendered mentoring may be more beneficial to the female because male mentors hold a more crucial position within the organization (Noe, 1988). Men generally have more self-confidence in the mentoring process than females (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Confidence is a key factor in mentoring and women who lack self-confidence often feel less qualified to mentor (Vincent, 1995). Since many men have been protégés and mentors, they enter the process perceiving fewer barriers and with more confidence. Unfortunately, the development of cross-gender mentorships may be inhibited by a number of gender-related barriers.

First, a cross-gendered mentoring relationship may be misconstrued as a sexual advance (Ragins, 1996). Women often feel the mentoring relationship with a male will be misinterpreted as sexual in nature and lead to gossip, jealousy, and resentment (Ragins, 1989). Second, women may have problems initiating cross-gender mentoring relationships (Ragins, 1996). Since men are encouraged to take on the traditional aggressive sex role and women are encouraged to take on the passive sex role, women often are reluctant to initiate the mentoring relationship. Women do not want to be seen as too assertive which may threaten the mentor (Ragins, 1996). If women do initiate the mentoring relationship with a man they are often seen as "overly aggressive" by others within the organization (Ragins, 1996). Third, men might not initiate the mentoring relationship because they are not comfortable with a female protégé. If males see women as motherly figures and not as a protégés in the organization, then they are less receptive in developing mentoring relationships with them (Ragins 1996). Fourth, women lack access to formal and informal networks within the organization. Males may select protégés on the basis of involvement in these key networks (Ragins, 1996). Thus, since women occupy lower level staff positions, they are not as likely to get involved with networks which could lead to mentoring relationships. Fifth, male mentors may be reluctant to choose a female protégé because of the greater risks involved. Since women in higher management positions are rare, they are highly visible within the organization. If they are highly visible then their failures will receive more attention than that of a male protégé (Ragins, 1989).

Research has shown there are barriers to having a female mentor/female protégé or a cross-gendered mentoring relationship. If a woman selects a female rather than a

male mentor it is seen as a better way to develop her career and eliminates the possible sexual issues associated with the cross-gendered mentoring relationship. However, women seem more reluctant than men to become mentors. Is this the case within the sport industry? What are the individual reasons for mentoring others, what organizational factors influence mentoring others, what are the factors related to the mentor-protégé relationship, and what are the outcomes associated with mentoring from the perspective of a mentor within the sport industry? Specifically, how are these questions reflected in one particular segment of the sport industry, campus recreation?

Statement of the Problem

While the mentoring relationship is important in career development for both genders, it is particularly critical for women in organizations and especially critical for those in male-dominated professions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987; Ragins, 1989). Mentoring relationships are important to female protégés by helping them overcome barriers (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Mentoring relationships are important to female mentors because they provide career rejuvenation, organization recognition and improved job performance (Kram, 1985). One problem which exists for women is the lack of mentors due to barriers inhibiting the development of relationships. These barriers inhibit the willingness of a female to enter a mentoring relationship (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Although there is a considerable amount of research on the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the protégé, little has been done from the perspective of the mentor and even less on the willingness to mentor others. This study focuses on understanding mentoring from the perspective of the mentor to discover factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship.

Second, features in can organization an inhibit or facilitate the initiation of a mentoring relationship. Kram (1985) indicated those features could be performance management systems, culture, rewards systems, and design of work. This study identifies organizational factors which mentors believe might enhance or interfere with their opportunities to mentor others within campus recreation. Third, research indicates a mentor's perception of expected benefits and costs, and the decision to engage in the mentoring relationship are influenced by the protégé characteristics (Olian, Carroll, & Giannantonio, 1993). Little research has been conducted to attempt to collect information directly from mentors regarding protégé characteristics they find desirable. This study, in part, identifies protégé characteristics which positively influence a mentor's decision to develop a mentoring relationship within campus recreation.

Finally, research indicates a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship is influenced by the outcomes he or she realizes by mentoring others (Newby & Heide, 1992). By examining the outcomes mentors believe they obtain from mentoring others, one could get a better understanding of the choice to serve as a mentor. Thus, this study provides a list of outcomes associated with mentoring others in campus recreation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand the perspective of the mentor in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in mentoring relationships with women within campus recreation. The present study investigates four areas of inquiry: individual reasons for mentoring others, organizational factors which

18

inhibit or facilitate mentoring, protégé characteristics which attract mentors, and the outcomes associated with mentoring others.

Significance of the Study

There are many reasons why this study is important to the body of literature in the area of mentoring. First, research has shown the mentoring relationship to be highly effective for women by providing them with initiatives to overcome barriers. Research has also shown barriers to mentoring women which inhibit the willingness to enter into a mentoring relationship. Very little research, however has been conducted on the reasons why individuals enter the mentoring relationship. Even less is known from the perspective of the mentor, and no research has been conducted in this area within campus recreation. This research study will examine the reasons why an individual mentors another, from the perspective of the mentor within campus recreation. No study has yet taken this perspective.

Second, employees at all levels of the organization within campus recreation may encounter opportunities to serve as mentors. This study provides them with baseline information pertinent to their development as a mentor. Third, organizations are being called upon to provide lifelong employee learning. Mentoring provides the opportunity for individuals to grow, adapt, and develop within the competitive organizational environment. Finally, the results of the study provides further development of the mentoring process and enable organizations to better facilitate mentoring relationships among employees.

By gathering such data in campus recreation, the first step is taken to understand the perspective of the mentor in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision

to engage in a mentoring relationship with women within campus recreation. This may help decrease the underrepresentation of women in the campus recreation profession.

Research Questions

This study focuses on the following research questions:

1.   What are the individual reasons for mentoring women within campus recreation?

2.   What organizational factors inhibit or facilitate mentoring for women within campus recreation?

3.   What protégé characteristics attract mentors within campus recreation?

4.   What are the outcomes associated with mentoring women within campus recreation?

Delimitations

The study is delimited as follows:

1.   Only campus recreation directors in four-year higher education institutions are included in the population.

2.   The female and male campus recreation professionals interviewed are people who had experienced a mentoring relationship. The researcher selected these respondents from a previous study where the campus recreation professionals are identified as a mentor. A total of forty-three campus recreation professionals were named as mentors, but the researcher only chose participants located in the Midwest due to traveling constraints. The researcher also selected one participant by asking one of the participants to identify another individual within campus recreation who was a mentor.

Limitations

The study is limited as follows:

1. The study is limited to campus recreation professionals who were identified as mentors from a previous study by Bower and Hums (in press) or identified by one of the study participants as a mentor.

2. The researcher is a female working in campus recreation which could alter the objectivity of the results.

3. The results are not generalized to individuals outside the study because of the nature of the phenomenological genre.

Operational Definitions

Campus Recreation

A segment of the sport industry found on university campuses and colleges which encompass intramural sports, extramural sports, outdoor adventure activities, special events, fitness and wellness, informal sports, and club sports.

Glass Ceiling

"Artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing within their organization and reaching their full potential" (U.S. Department, 1991, p. 1.)

Hyper Research 2.0

A computer software used for qualitative data analysis.

Mentor

"An experienced, productive manager who relates well to a less-experienced employee and facilitates his or her personal development for the benefit of the individual as well as that of the organization" (Kram, 1985, p. 1).

Mentoring

Mentoring is the process which occurs when a more experienced individual, the mentor, becomes personally committed to another individual, the protégé, and contributes to the personal and professional development of the individual, and a relationship is established (Kram, 1985; Levinson, 1978).

National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)

The National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) is the governing body founded in 1952 to oversee the recreational sports profession. The mission of NIRSA is to provide for the education and development of professional and student members and to foster quality recreational programs, facilities, and services for diverse populations (NIRSA, 2003).

Protégé

A protégé is a less experienced individual who becomes involved in a relationship with a mentor and receives numerous types of assistance from the mentor with respect to one's personal and professional development and achievement of goals (Kram, 1985; Levinson, 1978).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review focuses on four areas. First, the literature review focuses on women in the workforce. The researcher felt women in the workforce was an important topic because it provided facts, dates, places and faces for women who played an integral part in women's history in the workforce. By examining the history of women in leadership positions, one can begin to realize that the underrepresentation of women in the workforce today is not much different than what it was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This introduction of women in the workforce led right into the second section of the literature review which focused on underrepresentation of women in the workforce today. The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions is evident in business (i.e., Catalyst, 2002), higher education administration (i.e., Kowalaski & Stouder, 1999; Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1992) and the sport industry (i.e., Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Bower & Hums, in press).

This underrepresentation is due to a variety of barriers, leading right into the third section of the literature review which focused on barriers to women's advancement. Research indicated many barriers which hinder the advancement of women in leadership positions with business (i.e., Jackson, 2000; Oakley, 2000), higher education administration (i.e., Mark, 1986; Tedrow, 1999), and the sport industry (i.e., Hums & Sutton, 2000; Pastore, Danylchuk & Inglis, 1996). These barriers for women still exist

today and will continue to exist unless initiatives are taken to overcome the barriers. Several initiatives are used to help women advance within into leadership positions. One of those initiatives is mentoring. This leads right into the next section of the literature review which is on mentoring. Mentoring has been shown to help women advance in business (Allen, Poteet & Burroughs, 1997; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, Amendola, 1997), higher education administration (Hubbard & Robinson, 1996; Twale & Jelinek, 1996) and the sport industry (Inglis, Danylchuk & Pastore, 2000; Strawbridge, 2000).

By researching the following areas, (a) women in the workforce, (b) underrepresentation of women in management, (c) barriers to women's advancement, and (d) mentoring, the research study began to evolve.

<center>Women in the Workforce</center>

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries most American women worked at home. In this pre-industrial society, most men farmed and fished while women manufactured a variety of goods (cloth, hats, food products) for both use and trade. The "undeserving" (those not married) women, were institutionalized and forced to work for less pay than men for doing the same job (Abramovitz, 1988).

In the period following the Revolutionary War, the United States was taking the first tentative steps toward industrialization. Many women were asked to work away from the home, which was counter to the traditional patriarchal family during the colonial times. By 1820, women worked in 75 different manufacturing occupations. Patriarchal families and "True Womanhood" (mothers/homemakers) repressed opportunities for women within the labor force by the end of the depression years of the 1830's (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). In 1840 only about 10% of all women had jobs

outside their homes and by 1860 at most 15% of all women were in the labor force (Kessler-Harris, 1982). Most of these women were young, single, poor, widows, blacks, migrants, and/or emigrants from foreign countries (Kessler-Harris, 1982).

During the Civil War, American society realized women were needed in the labor force. The government opened clerical jobs to women, schools hired teachers, and the wounds and illnesses from the war created a need for the nursing profession (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). By 1870, nearly a quarter of the wage earners in nonagricultural occupations were female, as were 70% of domestic servants. Thirty percent of women within the workforce were industrial workers and over four-fifths were employed making clothes, while the other fifth were either teachers, store clerks, paper box makers, cigar makers, or printers (Turbin, 1992). This concerned men as they returned from war. Men blamed their low wages on women and wanted the women to return home.

In 1870 women began to be college-educated. Women constituted almost a fifth of all college students and by 1880, almost a third (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). Besides teaching and nursing, women were beginning to enter the fields of medicine, the ministry, and law. In 1890, college-educated women led to the beginning of the ideal "New Woman" who was American, determined, competent, and independent (McGovern, 1968).

The next era in workforce evolution was the Progressive Era (1900-1920), explained by Dr. Anna Howard in her speech during the National War Labor Board in December 1919. Dr. Howard said,

"The time has come when we women have a right to ask that we shall be free to labor where our labor is needed, that we shall be free to serve in the capacity for

which we are fitted. No human being can tell what another human being can do until that human being has had the opportunity to test himself. And so it has been with women"(Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 86).

Three important employment trends benefited women during the Progressive Era between 1900-1920. First, women redistributed themselves out of domestic service and factory work into jobs with more status, though not necessarily more pay. For example, women entered into jobs such as physicians, electricians, and lawyers. Second, professional women transformed "volunteer" work into "paid tasks." For example, women started private-duty nursing. Third, women started their own businesses. Women actually ran two-thirds of the employment offices in big cities (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). For example, women such as African American Sarah Breedlove McWilliams Walker made a million dollars from her beauty products business (Uglow, 1985).

During the late 19th century and early 20th century it was the general consensus "women ought not take jobs which 'rightfully' belong to men" (Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 49). However, the wide range and variety of work, as described in the 1900 census, has astounded those who looked at women a century ago as homebodies. In 1900, the census reported 18.8% (5,829,807) of American women, one in five of the female population over 10 years of age, were workers. Women were found in 295 of the 303 occupations listed in the census. These women had occupations including lawyers (1,010), journalists (2,193), clergy (3,405), dentists (787), physicians and surgeons (7,399), stevedores (18), engineers and surveyors (84), theatrical managers (95), architects (100), electricians (409), miners and quarries (1,365), and hunters, trappers, guides and scouts (8,246) and farmers, planters and overseers (307,788). By 1920 the

numbers of women as workers increased to 24% or 8,202,901 with one in four females over 10 (Schneider & Schneider, 1993).

Women working during the "professional woman" era often faced difficulties but found themselves in a land of opportunity. In the professions women entered (e.g., industrial medicine, journalism, dentistry), they battled the usual societal disapproval, inequitable status, sexual harassment, low pay, and gender discrimination. However, as women's presence and influence increased, they began to create their own conditions, even their own professions and professional associations (Schneider & Schneider, 1993).

Of all the women working in the Progressive Era (1900-1920), those who ran their own businesses were the hardest to track. Women undertook all types of entrepreneurial adventures from private duty nurses, part-time sewing, serving as party hosts, professional photographers, dressmaking, and hat making. Although all these entrepreneurial adventures were considered "business" for women, only those women whose successes earned them fame or wealth were considered "entrepreneurs." For example, Texan Jessie Daniel Ames and her mother operated a local phone company, Gene Stratton-Porter was a writer and a novelist, Fannie Farmer opened the School of Cookery in Boston, Elsie DeWolfe flourished as the first actress and independent interior decorator, Amy Marbury was a theatrical and author's agent, Maggie Lena Walker was the first female bank president, Madame C. J. Walker was the first black businesswoman (Schneider & Schneider, 1993).

By 1920, society decided it was best for women to function as wives and mothers. Whereas about a quarter of wage-earning women were married, others chose to leave the labor force when their husbands were making more for doing the same job (Harris, 1978).

Throughout the 1920s women developed professionally through education. For example, during the 1920's, women earned 12 out of every 100 science and engineering doctorates (Hass & Perrucci, 1984). The economy needed female workers who found jobs in clerical work, sales, marketing, publishing, accounting, credit, and life insurance (Schnieder & Schneider, 1983). By 1930, a third of the wage-earning women were married and immigrants and blacks constituted 57% of all employed women (Harris, 1978). However, unions kept shunting most women into dead end jobs, denying them sufficient economic independence. During the Great Depression (1929-1939) women constituted 24.3% of all workers in 1930 and 25.1% of all workers in 1940 (Ware, 1982).

The outbreak of the war in 1939 ended the Great Depression, providing more opportunities for women in the labor force as men went off to war. The minimum age for employment went from 18 to 16 and the government and employers recruited close to 3.5 million women to work (Kessler-Harris, 1986). Five years after the war, 16% of women worked in the labor force and the number continued to grow to 32% by 1950. During the 1950s, the Women's Bureau of Department of Labor (founded in World War I by Progressive Era women) started to ask for equal Social Security benefits, paid maternity leaves, and day care.

The 1960s and 1970s marked turning points for women who demanded more respect and higher wages. The female labor force doubled from 22 million in the 1960s to 44 million in the 1970s (Householder, 1988). Society started recognizing women's changing roles by the powerful, yet feminine, ads depicting women of that era. As career opportunities increased women left the more traditionally accepted forms of employment, such as teachers and nurses, for more lucrative ones, such as lawyers and doctors.

Women started to voice their opinions and widen their support groups through

networking. Betty Friedan gave women a voice when she published *The Feminine*

Mystique in 1963, which focused on concerns of women in secondary labor force,

inequality of women's pay, sexual harassment, and the concerns of professional

opportunities for females (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). The progress of women in the

U.S. Workforce during the 1960s was bolstered by the implementation of several pieces

of federal legislation including the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the Civil Rights

Act in 1964, and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) of 1978. The Equal Pay Act of

1963 "provides only that employers must pay men and women equally when both

perform jobs under the same working conditions and requiring equal skill, effort, and

responsibility" (Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 84). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act in

1964, "prohibited discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion,

national origin, or sex by employers engaged in interstate commerce with 15 or more

employees, labor unions, apprenticeship training program sponsors, educational

institutions, employment agencies, and all federal, state, or municipal governments in

reference to their civilian" (Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 49). The Pregnancy

Discrimination Act (PDA) of 1978 amended Title VII and expanded the definition of sex

discrimination. The Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) "prohibited discrimination

against women employees because of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical

conditions" (Schneider & Schneider, 1993, p. 213).

During the 1970s and 1980s women started to move into traditionally male-

dominated professions particularly in medicine and law (Woody, 1992). Women were

also making a presence in the area of equal opportunity. Women won their first

significant victory in equal pay in 1982 with the case *The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) v. Washington* (Mezey, 1992). The AFSCME sued the State of Washington, some of its officials, and all state agencies, boards, and institutions of higher education on behalf of everyone who had worked for the state in positions which held at least 70% female incumbents. The allegations revolved around discrimination on the grounds of paying women less because the jobs were considered "women's jobs". The judge ruled for the plaintiff based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Mezey, 1992).

Women's organizations continued to lobby for new legislation, such as the Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 (overturned in 1992), and the Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Assistance Act of 1990. The Women's Business Ownership Act of 1988 was established by the Office of Women's Business Ownership (OWBO). The OWBO was founded in 1979 as a Women's Network for Entrepreneurial Training to match successful women entrepreneurs (mentors) with women business owners whose companies were ready to grow (protégées). Mentors served for one year. It also offered a national database, access to capital conferences, training and counseling, and technical and financial information (Amott & Mattaei, 1991). The Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Assistance Act established the first federal training program specifically designed to meet the needs to displaced homemakers. Ironically this legislation was never funded (Foundation for Women, 1992).

During the 1980's and 1990's the economy started to divide the work force into two widely shaped segments: (a) highly skilled and (b) repetitive and routine work (Schneider & Schneider, 1993). Highly skilled workers were always learning, being

30

creative, maintaining high personal satisfaction, high control over their own work, and high pay. Repetitive and routine work was closely supervised and often boring. Although 45% of the workforce was female, women's jobs often fell into the second category of repetitive and routine, and women earned on the average $26,000 versus $39,000 for men (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991). The 1980s and 1990s were also a time women prepared themselves for the work world. More women started going back to school to earn their degrees. For example, the number of women receiving B.A. degrees rose from 455,806 to 534,570 during the 1980's (Schwartz, 1992).

Underrepresentation of Women in Management

Today, the problem of underrepresenation of women in managerial positions of power, decision making, and influence in the U.S. continues in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry.

The U.S. Department of Labor (2001) reported women comprised almost 50% of the U.S. workforce, yet only occupied about 30% of all salaried manager positions, 20% middle manager positions, and about 5% of executive level positions in 2001. Even with these numbers the movement of women into predominately male-dominated professions has not been evenly distributed across different sectors. Women fare better in traditionally female-dominated professions, or so called "women's jobs," of health services, banking and finance, communications, support and other services (U.S. Department of Labor, 2001). Women are less likely to break into the ranks of predominately male-dominated management positions in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry. This section of the literature review examined

statistical information regarding the underrepresentation of women with business, higher

education administration, and the sport industry.

Business

Women began entering the corporate world as managers in substantial numbers

during the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, very few businessmen ever expected

women to pursue careers leading to senior management positions because no corporate

policies included affirmative action programs to promote women to senior management

positions (Morrison, 1987). Catalyst, a New York City-based nonprofit organization

which seeks to advance women in business, reported the percentage of board seats held

by women in the Fortune 500 in 2001 was 12.4%, while 87% of the companies had only

one woman director (Catalyst, 2002). Women in the Fortune 501-1000 companies hold

8.9% of all board seats and 61% of the Fortune 501-1000 companies had only one

woman director (Catalyst, 2002). Of all the Fortune 1000 companies, women held 10.9%

of all board seats, and 74% of the companies had only one woman director (Catalyst,

2002).

Business is one sector where women are underrepresented in senior level

management positions. Women are also underrepresented in leadership positions within

higher education administration.

Higher Education Administration

The number of females attending higher education institutions has increased

dramatically since the 1960s (Scanlon, 1997). Many women with advanced degrees have

acquired positions as the faculties of colleges and universities, but few are selected into

leadership positions (Maack & Passet, 1994). Demographic studies indicate women in

higher education administration are working in predictable departments of nursing and social work or mid-level to lower level positions of librarian, registrar, or director of financial aid (Wilson, 1990). In summary, the best way to describe women in the field of higher education administration is less representation, less power, and less prestige (Scanlon, 1997).

Moore (1984) examined the overall status of women in administration in the Leaders in Transition project. The research project specifically on the absence of women in leadership positions. The project was initiated in 1981, and constructed a national profile of college administrators. The participants for the study included a stratified random sample of administrators representing 55 positions at 1,600 four-year accredited institutions ($N = 4000$). The sample was stratified by position type as described in the 1979-1980 Educational Directory (President, Provost, Vice President, Registrar, and Dean). Results indicated 20% of the total sample were women. Of the participants, three administrative positions employed the largest number of women: Librarian, Registrar, and Director of Financial Aid. The same three positions contained the largest number of minority administrators. For male respondents, the three top positions were President or Chancellor, Chief Business Officer, and Registrar. This shows women were not evenly distributed across all categories of institutions or positions. Rather, they were clustered at the bottom of many career ladders just as in business and the sport industry.

Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992) examined organizational configurations of administrative positions and determined the influence of personnel policies and decisions making practices on the rates of promotion for different groups of administrative and professional staff within a large, public research university. The study focused on three

questions: (a) What was the organizational configuration of administrative positions? (b) What was the representation of white men, white women, and minorities by administrative level? and (c) How has the university's policies and practices regarding promotion, sponsorship, and position creation influenced the rate of promotion of white men, white women, and minority administrators? The university used for the study was The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. This university was chosen because in 1985 it was one of the largest higher education employers in the United States and its career system was similar to many of the 100 research universities, which employed approximately one-third of the higher education workforce. All the advertised administrative vacancies for regular, full-time positions within designated two academic years (1983-85) were analyzed ($N = 820$). A total of 132 positions were eliminated because the personnel office was not notified whether the position was filled and closed the file as incomplete. Of the remaining 688 vacancies, internal candidates filled 376 positions. The university personnel data bank yielded complete information on 350 of the individuals, which became the sample for the study ($N = 350$). Results of the study indicated white women and minorities were clearly disadvantaged in their placement within the organization, and white men were advantaged in hiring and promotion practices. Further, white men were overrepresented at high administrative levels, and white women and minorities were overrepresented at low administrative levels.

Twale (1995) conducted a longitudinal, descriptive study on men and women who were members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The participants for the study were males and females from the NASPA Member Handbook from 1985-1986 and 1991-1992 ($N = 2686$). Results of the study

indicated women began receiving senior level positions but not in proportion to the increase of women entering the field. This supports the contention that even though the numbers of women in higher education administration were increasing, women still remained underrepresented at the senior administrative levels of their institutions.

Higher education administration is another industry where women are underrepresented in leadership positions. Women are also underrepresented in leadership positions within the sport industry.

The Sport Industry

The sport industry is made up of a variety of segments. This section of the literature review focused on research which examined barriers to women's advancement within the segments of intercollegiate athletics, interscholastic athletics, leisure service management, professional sport, and campus recreation.

Intercollegiate athletics. During the past three decades the representation of women as administrators (head athletic directors), head coaches, sports information directors, and head athletic trainers within intercollegiate athletics has rapidly declined (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). For example, Acosta and Carpenter (2002) reported the following statistical information on women within administrative positions within intercollegiate athletics: (a) when Title IX was enacted in 1972 more than 90% of women's programs were directed by female head administrators, in 2002 the number decreased to 17.9% and (b) 18.8% of women's athletics programs do not have a female within their athletic structure.

Holmen and Parkhouse (1981) collected data to assess trends in selecting coaches for female athletes between 1974 and 1979. The study addressed the extent of the

changes in the numbers of coaches for female athletes during the 1974-1979 time period, the magnitude of change between the assistant and the head coach during the 1974-1979 time period, the extent of the changes in the gender of coaches were during the 1974-1979 time period, and the changes in numbers and gender of head and assistant coaches for specific individuals and team sports during the 1974-1979 time period. The participants in the study were a randomly selected group of intercollegiate female athletic directors at member institutions for the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) ($N = 335$). One questionnaire was sent to all participants to solicit gender trends for the 1974 and 1976 academic years and another questionnaire was sent one year later to solicit gender trends for the 1979 academic year.

The result of the Holmen and Parkhouse (1981) study indicated the most significant trend was a major reduction in the percentage of female coaches and an increase in the male coaches during the five-year period. One of the most consistent findings was the hiring of male head coaches. There was a significant trend toward the hiring of male coaches for female individual and team sports at both the assistant and head coach levels.

Acosta and Carpenter (2002) reported statistical information on the status of women coaching within intercollegiate athletics including: (a) in 1972, the number of head female coaches were more than 90% and in 2002 the number decreased to 44.0%, (b) women were hired for only 35 (10%) of the 361 new head coaching positions offered in the last two years,(c) since 2000, 90.3% of new head coaching jobs were filled by men, and (d) only 2% of men's college teams had a female coach. This is the lowest

representation of females as head coaches of women's teams since Acosta and Carpenter began tracking data in 1976 (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002).

Acosta and Carpenter (2002) reported the following statistical information on women as sports information directors and head athletic training positions within intercollegiate athletics: (a) even though 87.7% of all universities (Division I, II, III) have a full-time sports information director only 12.3% of the positions are held by females, and (b) even though 72.2% of all universities (Division I, II, III) have full time head athletic trainers only 27.8% of the positions are held by females. What caused this decline in the number of women in leadership positions?

Interscholastic athletic. Although specific figures in interscholastic sport at the national level are not available, similar trends regarding the underrepesentation of women within administrative and coaching positions have been reported for certain states. For example, from 1971-1972 nine states indicated 82% of coaches in girls' interscholastic sports were female (Hasbrook, 1988). In 1984-1985, this figure declined to 38% (Hasbrook, 1988). In 1988, 33% of all head interscholastic coaches in the state of Ohio were female (Stangl & Kane, 1991). In 1991, it was reported that only 25% of the individuals coaching in the state of Illinois were female (Wilkinson & Schneider, 1991). Other states which have shown the steady decline in administration and coaching within interscholastic athletics in the past three decades, include Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin (Hart et al., 1986; Hasbrook, et. al., 1990; Heishman, Bunker,& Tutwiler, 1990; Sisley & Capel, 1986; True, 1986).

Sisley and Capel (1986) provided background information about all head and assistant coaches in Oregon high schools. The categories examined included, gender of coach, teacher certification status, preparation for coaching, and training for athletic injury management. Participants, coaches from 252 high schools in the state of Oregon ($N = 4,238$), were mailed a survey. Results included a dominance of males in interscholastic coaching positions, a higher percentage of male coaches teaching and coaching in the same school, a greater percentage of females held physical education degrees in comparison to males, and males dominated coaching positions in all sports. Results of the study indicated a need for females to be actively recruited to fill vacant coaching positions.

Stangle and Kane (1991) examined how homologous reproduction influenced the proportion of female to male head coaches within the historical context of Title IX. Participants for the study included schools from the annual school directory of the Ohio High School Athletic Association for the school years 1974-75, 1981-82, and 1988-89 ($N = 937$). These years were chosen because they represented the initial 10 year implementation of Title IX. Results of the study reflected previously discussed national trends. Significantly more women were hired by female versus male athletic directors. However, there was also a significantly smaller proportion of female coaches in 1981-82 and 1988-89 compared to 1974-75. This occurred under both female and male athletic directors.

Lovett and Lowry (1994) identified by size and gender the different administrative structures overseeing athletic programs in public schools, and determined if significant differences existed between the types of administrative structure and the

number of head coaches by gender. The participants for the study were principals and athletic directors from 1,106 public secondary schools in Texas. The sample was developed by surveying the 1992-93 issue of *Sports Guide of High School and Colleges – Coaches Directory* (Coynor & Town, 1992) in Texas. The frequencies of male and female coaches were analyzed using chi-square statistics. Study findings indicated 88% of all Texas secondary schools had a two-person administrative structure and 90% of those schools had an all-male model. Of the 13% of schools with a three-person administrative structure, 38% of the schools had an all–male model. Results of the study illustrate the opportunity for homologous reproduction in terms of the male population. Homologous reproduction has the power to determine who is employed, cultivating into a disproportionate ratio between male and female coaches.

Leisure service management. Leisure services management is analogous to parks and recreation in the local community. Research in leisure service management indicates women are underrepresented in leadership positions. For example, Arnold and Shinew (1996) examined female representation among middle and senior management positions in Illinois public recreation agencies and found women held 54% of the middle management positions, and only 11% of the upper management positions (Arnold & Shinew, 1996).

Professional sport. Women have traditionally been involved in leadership positions within professional sport but with limited representation. For example, Effa Manley was the first woman to co-own a professional men's baseball team, the Newark Eagles in the 1930's and 1940's (Berlage, 1994). Several women have been involved in the ownership level of professional baseball including Joan Payson, Jean Yawkey, and

Joan Krok (Byrne, 1998; Beaton, 1998; Hastings-Ardell, 1998). In 1944, the Women's Professional Golf Association (WPGA) was organized by Hope Seignious, Betty Hicks, and Ellen Griffin to organize professional golf for women (Ladies Professional Golf Association, 1997). Later, a group of pioneering women founded (1950) and chartered (1951) the Ladies Professional Golf Association (WPGA) (Ladies Professional Golf Association, 2002).

In 1973, Billie Jean King and a group of pioneering women founded the Women's Tennis Association (WTA) after Margaret Smith Court had earned barely one third the amount collected by men's singles champion for winning the women's singles title at the United States Open (Women's Tennis Association, 2003). In 1997, the Women's National Basketball Association was founded by Valerie Ackerman who is also the president (Women's National Basketball Association, 2003). In 1999, the Women's Professional Football League (WPFL) was founded by Lisa Vessey (Women's Professional Football League, 2003). The WPFL leadership positions are all represented by women (Women's Professional Football League, 2003). In 2000, the National Women's Football Association (NWFA) was founded by Catherine Masters (National Women's Football Association, 2003). These women were pioneers in the leadership of professional sports, but how are the women represented today? The 2003 Racial and Gender Report Card (covers 2001-2002) indicated the percentage of women in professional positions has declined in the National Basketball Association (NBA), Major League Baseball (MLB), and Major League Soccer (MLS), and in the Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA) (Lapchick, 2003). In fact, women in senior administrative positions decreased in all the men's leagues. The percent of women in the

NFL was 15%, MLB had 13%, the NHL had 19%, and MLS had 22% (Lapchick, 2003). In five men's professional sports leagues there are only 2 female CEO's (Lapchick, 2003).

Campus recreation. The National Intramural Recreation Sports Association (NIRSA) was the first nationally known organization supporting campus recreation. Throughout NIRSA's history, women have played a limited role in leadership and administrative positions. Women's involvement in NIRSA began in 1950 when the organization held its first meeting at Dillard University in New Orleans. Twenty individuals were present, including three women. During the election process, one woman was voted vice-president and another recording secretary (Yager, 1983). However, in 1959, women were barred from NIRSA membership, a ban which lasted until 1971 (Varner, 1992). In the last 30 years, women gradually began playing an integral part in the overall development of the organization. For example, between 1981-1992, eleven elections were won by women including the first woman elected to a national office serving as Vice President (Patti Homes) in 1981 and the first woman President of NIRSA (Mary Daniels) in 1986 (Varner, 1992). Although women have made some progress within NIRSA, their presence in leadership positions is still less than that of men.

Why are women underrepresented in management positions within business, higher education administration, and the sport industry? What barriers do women face when trying to advance to senior-level management positions with in business, higher education, and the sport industry?

41

Barriers to Women's Advancement

The number of women seeking management positions has increased as a function of their greater participation in the labor force, expanded access to educational and employment opportunities, and affirmative action programs (Noe, 1988). However, women seeking employment in predominately male-dominated professions face many barriers which decrease the chances of obtaining leadership positions. A tremendous amount of research exists investigating the organizational and structural barriers women encountered in advancing to upper level management positions in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry.

Business

Most of the literature on barriers to advancement for women within business is embedded in the glass ceiling research. The U S. Department of Labor (1991) defined the glass ceiling as "artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing within their organization and reaching their full potential" (p. 1). Those barriers include perceptions and stereotypes, balancing work and family, presence of an old boys network, the concept of tokenism, management style, and lack of training and career development for women wanting to make it to the top (Jackson, 2000; Klenke, 1996; Oakley, 2000; Ragins, Townsend & Mattis, 1998).

Burke and McKeen (1995) compared the work experiences of managerial and professional women as a function of the number of women in their organizations. The hypothesis of the research was that managerial and professional women in male dominated settings would report a less satisfying and supportive work environment. The participants for the study were female business graduates from a major Canadian

42

university ($N = 1444$). A total of 792 questionnaires were completed for a return rate of 55%. Results of the study indicated managerial and professional women working in male dominated organizations were less satisfied than women working in organizations with fewer men at levels of corporate management. Several factors were involved with these results: a) women may be excluded from the old boys network in male-dominated organizations, b) women felt like outsiders or foreigners in a male world, c) women had difficulty adapting to corporate masculinity, and d) the entry of women into middle management positions was accompanied by male backlash.

Wentling (1995) focused on career goals and aspirations, perceived obstacles to career development, perceived obstacles or hindrances to obtaining desired jobs, and actions believed necessary to obtain desired jobs. Participants for the study included women in mid-level management positions ($N = 30$). Each participant was interviewed. Women managers revealed the following obstacles to women's advancement: (a) bosses who do not guide or encourage progression, (b) sex discrimination, (c) lack of political savvy, and (d) lack of career strategy. Suggested actions which should be taken to ensure maximum use of women's business capabilities included, providing feedback on job performance, accepting women, ensuring equal opportunities, providing career counseling, identifying potential, encouraging assertiveness, accelerating development, offering mentoring opportunities, encouraging networking, and increasing women's participation.

Davies-Netzley (1998) examined the extent to which men and women in elite corporations offered similar perspectives on corporate success and mobility. The study examined how women presidents and CEOs responded to a work situation associated

with masculinity. The participants for the study included presidents and chief officers, both men and women, who occupied elite corporate positions in Southern California corporations (N =16). Nine of the participants were women and seven were men. The researchers used qualitative measures in interviewing participants face-to-face for one hour. The interview questions focused on the respondents' social origins, education, career path, business and social affiliations, characterization of social networks, and factors assisting them in their rise to the top and their ability to successfully function in their position. Results indicated women emphasized social networks as most significant for success at elite levels and argued the existence of an old boys' network has continued to make it more difficult for women to succeed. The women also asserted their success depended largely on how entrenched male networks were and how willing elite men were to accept the women in the networks.

Jackson (2000) investigated perceptions of women in middle managerial positions on their own career barriers in their organization. The researcher examined perceptions regarding the implementation of any initiatives taken by their organizations to reduce or remove career-impeding barriers, and developed a survey questionnaire that would quantify and measure perceptions of the glass ceiling. Participants for the study included women who worked in a mid-to-large size organization of over 400 employees (N = 470). Each participant was mailed a survey. Results of the study were arranged under three categories: (a) perceptions of career barriers, (b) perceptions of workplace initiatives, and (c) perceptions of their chances for success in career advancement in their organization. Women middle managers perceived their organizational barriers included, stereotypes, work-family conflict, old boys network, valuing women and tokenism,

management style, and career development. They perceived their organization to have undertaken initiatives including, challenging assignments, career development and feedback, commitment and accountability, retention and recruitment, diversity, and mentoring. The women in middle management positions perceived their chances for success in career advancement were enhanced by tuition reimbursement, flexible hours, cafeteria-style benefits, telecommuting for managers, professional part-time employment, spouse relocation assistance, elderly care benefits, job sharing for managers, on-site day care center, company-supported child care, and parenting classes.

Lemons and Parzinger (2001) examined why women encounter obstacles to managerial positions within, and ultimately exit from the Information Technology field. Participants included members of Systers, an informal on-line organization for women working in the field of information technology. Systers was developed in 1987 as a small mailing list for women in "systems." The number of systers has grown to 2,500. Of the 2,500 systems, 60 returned a questionnaire. The researchers used the qualitative method of content analysis to categorize the responses into three categories: (a) educational aspects and family characteristics, (b) corporate culture, and (c) sociological factors. Results included suggestions for increasing promotion opportunities, more networking for women, coordinating career and family planning, and being confident and aggressive in assignments.

Higher Education Administration

Early research on female higher education administrators focused on quantifying gender representation, identifying characteristics of women who aspired to be administrators, identifying employment procedures and their effects on females, and the

verification of career barriers (Mark, 1986; Tedrow, 1999). Perhaps the most relevant of these today is the study of career barriers. This section of the literature review focused on examining research which examined barriers to women's advancement within higher education administration.

Mark (1986) cited the following internal factors limiting women's activity in administrative positions including deliberate curtailment of professional achievement due to family demands, unwillingness to accept increased responsibilities due to family commitments, and reduced leadership aspirations.

LeBlance (1993) identified eleven barriers to advancement for women in higher education administration. The barriers included self esteem, need for self-improvement, limited external interactions, motherhood/family/academe, issues of loneliness, limited political/business encounters, leadership traits of women, women who do not plan their careers, need for mentoring, need for internal/external support systems, and the lack of ability to see the "big picture" within the organization.

Tedrow (1999) conducted a study to gain a thorough understanding of women's leadership issues within higher education administration. Participants for the study were senior women administrators working at community colleges within a specific geographical region or section of the Midwest ($N = 30$). Results of the findings indicated removing barriers to advance the development of women's leadership within community colleges will not occur unless key members of the institutions are willing to examine the college's culture. Another finding indicated institutions need to move away from a "one size fits all" leadership culture within higher education administration. Finally,

employees need to be challenged about the assumptions they hold about women and women's abilities within higher education administration.

The Sport Industry

The sport industry is made up of a variety of segments. This section of the literature review focused on examining research examined barriers to women's advancement within the segments of intercollegiate athletics, interscholastic athletics, leisure service management, professional sport, and campus recreation.

Intercollegiate Athletics. Acosta and Carpenter (1985a) conducted a study to attempt to explain the diminishing role of women in intercollegiate athletics. The participants surveyed for the study included males and females involved in intercollegiate athletic administration at colleges and universities across the United States ($N = 307$). Results indicated females ranked the four most important reasons for the diminishing role of women in intercollegiate athletics as (a) success of the old boys' network, (b) weakness of the old girls' network, (c) unconscious discrimination, and (d) lack of qualified women coaches and administrators. Males perceived the four most important causes for the diminishing role of women in intercollegiate athletics as (a) the lack of qualified women, (b) unwillingness of women to recruit and travel, (c) failure of women to apply for job openings, and (d) time constraints due to family duties. Results indicated women saw networking as particularly important while the males did not.

Knoppers (1987) attempted to explain male domination in the coaching profession by using Kanter's (1977) individual model based on the assumption that the structure of the workplace shapes the worker. Kanter (1977) identified three structural determinants in the workplace which shape gender differentiated work behavior (opportunity, power,

47

and proportion in the coaching profession). The first individual model indicated the type

of obstacles encountered in the coaching occupation that affect the degree of opportunity

also vary by gender. One of the common obstacles females found in a male-dominated

profession was sex discrimination. This supported the research by Acosta and Carpenter

(1985) in which female administrators attributed the demise in the number of female

coaches to the success of the "old boys" network, failure of the "old girl" network, and

discrimination on the part of the male administrators doing the hiring.

The second structural determinant of the individual based model was "power."

This referred to one's capacity to mobilize resources. Mathes (1982) reported women

lacked the "power" within athletic departments due to their inability to control resources.

This lack of "power" to control resources eventually led to the reasons behind why many

women left athletic administration and coaching.

Finally, the third structural determinant of an employee's behavior included the

number or proportion of men to women within the athletic organization. This supported

Kanter's (1977) theory of gender skewing. A ratio of .15 or less was considered

"skewed" and one of .16 to .35 as tilted within an organization. According to Kanter

such treatment took on three forms: (a) when status leveling occurred, female coaches

were being mistaken for secretaries, (b) tokenism occurred in the form of slotting, or (c)

stereotyping occurred where males were considered the norm in the profession and

therefore preferred by subordinates.

Knoppers (1989) addressed the following research questions: (a) Why should

women coach? (b) What factors exclude women? (c) Why might the number of women

coaches continue to decline? The first research question addressed was why women

should coach. The literature revealed four reasons why women should coach: (a) all jobs in the labor force should be open to all people regardless of their gender, age, and race; (b) there are differences in the way males and females coach and their leadership styles (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger & Tarule, 1986); (c) women may help alter gender relations (Bray, 1988; Hartmann, 1976); and (d) women may serve as role models (Overall, 1987). The literature revealed the factors which excluded women from coaching were both structural and institutional. Those structural and institutional factors included lack of opportunity, lack of power, and gender proportion (Kanter, 1977). Finally, the literature revealed the reasons why the number of women coaches continue to decline: (a) the control of sport by males, and (b) men might resist hiring women coaches based on the capitalistic revenue motive which drives sport at many educational institutions.

Pastore and Meacci (1990) conducted a study examining the viewpoints of women's teams coaches concerning strategies for recruiting and retaining female college coaches. Questionnaires were mailed to each participant, who were male and female NCAA Division I coaches from the Big East, Big Ten, Pacific Ten, and Southeastern Conferences ($N = 255$)(148 males and 107 females). The strategies evaluated included: administrators actively recruiting females for coaching positions, college and university physical education departments increasing coaching minors, increasing the number of assistant coaches, the number of coaching workshops and clinics, implementation of a national coaching certification, recruiting current female athletes into the coaching profession, increasing opportunities for physical education majors and female athletes to get more practical experience in coaching, the most important strategy for recruitment

and retention, and providing strategy recommendations not mentioned on the questionnaire.

Results of the Patore and Meacci (1990) study indicated both male and female participants said the most important strategies were administrators actively recruiting females for coaching positions, recruiting females athletes, increasing assistant coaching positions, and increasing opportunities for attaining experience. Females had a higher agreement than males for administrators actively recruiting females for coaching positions and college and university physical education departments implementing coaching minors.

Pastore (1991a) examined the differences between male and female NCAA Division I coaches' reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Two research questions were asked: (a) What influenced NCAA Division I coaches of women's athletic teams to enter the profession? and (b) What may influence NCAA Division I coaches of women's athletic teams to leave the profession?. The participants for the study consisted of NCAA Division I coaches of women's athletic teams (basketball, golf, gymnastics, softball, swimming, tennis, track, and volleyball) from the Big East, Big Ten, Pac Ten, and Southeastern conferences ($N = 255$), of which 148 were men and 107 were women. Division I coaches were selected because this segment of the NCAA coaching population represented the smallest percentage of female coaches. The survey, distributed to all Division I coaches ($N = 255$) in the previously mentioned sports, consisted of three parts: (a) demographic information, (b) reasons for entering the coaching profession, and (c) reasons for leaving the coaching profession. The return rate was 76%.

Pastore's (1991b) study findings indicated female coaches entered the profession to remain in competitive athletics, work with advanced athletes, serve as role models, and help females reach their athletic potential. Female coaches indicated a stronger agreement than males in three areas: (a) working with advanced and motivated athletes, (b) helping female athletes reach their athletic potential, and (c) becoming a role model. Both genders were consistent with reasons for leaving the profession. The findings indicated female coaches left the profession to spend more time with family and friends.

Pastore (1991) examined gender trends for two-year college coaches of men's and women's athletic teams and the possible relationship between the gender of the athletic administrator and gender of coaching staffs. Participants for the study included two-year college athletic administrators randomly selected from the 1989-1990 *National Directory of College Athletics (Women's Edition)* ($N = 250$). Participants were sent a questionnaire requesting them to indicate their gender. The participants were also asked to indicate the gender for the intercollegiate athletic teams they coached at their institution during the 1983-1990 time span. Of the 250 surveys mailed, 136 administrators (115 males, 21 females) responded for a 54.4% return rate. The female teams included were basketball, golf, gymnastics, soccer, softball, swimming, tennis, track, and volleyball. The men's teams included on the survey were basketball, baseball, football, golf, gymnastics, soccer, swimming, tennis, and track. Results indicated little changes in the percentages of males and females coaching men's athletic teams from 1983-1990. However, there was a noticeable change in gender trends for coaches of women's sports. The percentage of males coaching women's teams increased from 51% to 57% while the percentage of female coaches declined from 49% to 43%. Acosta and Carpenter (1992) conducted a

study to discover the reasons women coaches were not applying for jobs representing career advancement. The most frequently cited responses to the "worst things about your career" in coaching were long hours, dealing with the "old boy network", and sex discrimination. The most frequently cited responses to the "best things about your careers" in coaching were interesting variety of duties, involvement with young people, and the rewards of success.

Pastore (1992) conducted a study requesting two year college athletic administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of employment strategies regarding gender and to provide recommendations based on the evaluation. The participants of the study included two year college athletic administrators (N = 19 females; N = 117 males). The administrators were randomly selected from the 1989-1990 National Directory of College Athletics (Women's Edition). All participants were mailed a questionnaire with 138 returned for a 55.2% return rate. The two-part questionnaire included (a) demographic information, and (b) seven recruitment and retention strategies. Results from all administrative responses indicated five of the seven strategies were considered effective in the recruitment and retention of female coaches. These strategies were (a) active recruitment of females for coaching positions by administrators, (b) increasing opportunities for females to get practical experience in coaching, (c) female athletes being recruited into the coaching profession, (d) implementing coaching minors into college and university curriculums, and (e) increased coaching workshops/clinics. The male administrators selected "administers actively recruit females" as their first choice whereas, females chose "increased opportunities for females to get practical experience in coaching."

Fitzgerald, Sagaria, and Nelson (1994) conducted a study to determine whether the common experiences of current athletic directors were similar to the career pattern associated with the literature on athletic director positions. The study used Spilerman's (1977) "career trajectory" model from occupational sociology as the basis for understanding the careers of the athletic directors. The study focused on the following: (a) To what extent do athletic directors' career experiences correspond to the five-step normative career pattern proposed? (b) Do variations in athletic directors' career patterns conform to identifiable patterns within NCAA Divisions I, II, or III? and (c) Do variations in career patterns differ by athletic director's gender? The sample consisted of athletic directors drawn from a population of 802 NCAA Division I ($n = 95$), II ($n = 94$), and III ($n = 96$) listed in the *1989-90 NCAA Directory* ($N = 285$). All women were surveyed to make sure enough women were represented in the sample ($n = 66$). The remainder of the sample were men ($n = 219$).

Results from the Fitzgerald, Sagaria, and Nelson (1994) study indicated collegiate coaching as the most common antecedent professional position for athletic directors. The potential importance of collegiate coaching coupled with the decreased representation of women coaches further excluded women from advancing to athletic director positions. Unless athletic departments began to value new and different people (i.e. coaches) (Kanter, 1977) and increased the representation of female coaches, women were in essence excluded from future athletic director position vacancies.

Inglis, Danylchuk, and Pastore (1996) developed a scale of retention factors considered important in staying in one's coaching or management position. The instrument was sent to a population of athletic administrators ($n = 77$) and coaches ($n = $

760) of intercollegiate athletic programs representing three athletic conferences in Canada and the United States ($N = 837$): (a) the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA), (b) the Ontario University Athletic Association (OUAA)($n = 44$ for administrators; $n = 282$ for coaches), and (c) the Big Ten Athletic Conference ($n = 33$ for administrators; $n = 478$ for coaches). Results indicated work balance and conditions, recognition and collegial support, and inclusivity, provided foundations for a model which started to explore why intercollegiate coaches and administrators were motivated to stay in their positions, thus adding to the understanding of the retention function in the workplace.

Danylchuk, Pastore, and Inglis (1996) examined the ratings of female and male athletic administrators and coaches on the importance of a number of job attainment factors. In addition, the researchers examined the three most critical factors in subjects attaining their present job. The participants for the study included athletic administrators ($n = 77$) and coaches ($n = 760$) from men's and women's intercollegiate athletic programs in Canada and the United States ($N = 837$). The most critical factor in job attainment of athletic management and coaching positions was previous work experience. Second, there was low importance when it came to lack of other applicants for the position, affirmative action initiative and contacts with administrators/coaches within and outside one's present institution. Third, females rated gender, affirmative action initiative, and contact with a female from within one's institution as significantly more important than did males. Males rated contact with a male coach/colleague as significantly more important than females. Results of the study suggested an informal contact with someone of the same gender was important and supported same sex role model theory.

Pastore, Inglis, and Danylchuk (1996) examined the importance and fulfillment of the retention factors identified by Inglis et al. (1996): (a) work balance and condition, (b) recognition and collegial support, and (c) inclusivity. Specifically, the study identified reasons coaches and athletic administrators stay in their positions. The participants for the study included male and female administrators ($n = 77$) and coaches ($n = 760$) of three intercollegiate athletic conference programs in Canada and the United States ($N = 837$): (a) the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA), and the Ontario University Athletic Association (OUAA)($n = 44$ for administrators; $n = 282$ for coaches), (b) the Big Ten Athletic Conference ($n = 33$ for administrators; $n = 478$ for coaches). Of the 837 instruments mailed to athletic administrators and coaches, 359 (43%) were returned. Results indicated items provided by the organization (i.e. program support, support staff, reasonable time demands) and items administrators provided for their employees (e.g., sensitivity to family and time demands, good communication and supervision skills) were important aspects for coaches and athletic administrators. Females rated inclusivity as more important than fulfilling, whereas the males indicated inclusivity was more fulfilling than importance to them. Finally, females perceived inclusivity to be of greater importance than the other factors.

Pastore, Danylchuk, and Inglis (1999) conducted a study to determine whether work balance and conditions, recognition and collegial support, and inclusively were considered necessary retention factors. The researchers used confirmatory factor analysis. The original model by Inglis et al. (1996) was developed through the use of principle component analysis with varimax rotation. This study used two models: (a) one examined the importance of the three retention factors, and (b) the other investigated

fulfillment of these factors. The participants for the study were of athletic administrators and coaches from CIAU institutions and NCAA Division I schools of three conferences, (a) the Big Ten Athletic Conference (USA), (b) Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (Canada), and (c) Ontario Universities Athletic Association (Canada) ($N = 216$). This sample was representative of the sample utilized in Inglis et al. (1996) retention model, however, the current study excluded athletic administrators and coaches from the conferences who previously participated in the Inglis et al. (1996) study. A random sample of 500 athletic administrators and coaches ($N = 500$) was selected ($n = 165$ athletic administrators and coaches from CIAU institutions and $n = 335$ from NCAA Division I schools). A total of 216 participants responded to the instrument for a response rate of 43.4%.

Pastore et al. (1999) developed two models with three factors deemed necessary for retention of coaches and athletic managers. The study findings indicated the uncorrelated importance model (model 1) provided the best fit of the data. In particular, items related to time were considered most important when it came to work balance and conditions. Factors such as support, acknowledge, respect, and discrimination free work environments were most important when it came to recognition, collegial support, and inclusivity.

Interscholastic Athletics. Hart, Hasbrook, & Mathes (1986) conducted a study to (a) identify and apply a theoretical framework which could determine the reasons why females leave coaching and (b) collect and examine data regarding why females have dropped out or would drop out of coaching roles. The theoretical framework used for the study was Prus' (1982) career contingency model. Prus' (1982) study consists of four

processes: (a) initial involvement, (b) continuity, (c) disinvolvement, and (d) reinvolvement. The model also indicates the reasons for leaving coaching and/or athletic administration are linked to reasons for entering a career. Hart et al (1986) focused on the initial involvement (reasons for entering) and disinvolvement (reasons for leaving). Two copies of a questionnaire were mailed to each participant of the study. The participants for the study included a systematic random sample of current female coaches of every female athletic team at every other high school listed in the *Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association 1982-83 Directory of Member Schools* ($N = 271$). Each participant was asked to give a copy of the questionnaire to a former coach ($N = 105$).

The results of the Hart et. al. (1986) study indicated 42.1 % of the current female coaches entered the coaching profession because of the competitiveness of the game and the challenge of producing a winning team. About 40% of the former coaches entered the coaching profession to continue their athletic involvement, competitive situations, and the challenge of producing a winning team. About 43% of the current coaches said they would leave because there was a concern for their coaching performance (i.e., lack of success, tired of losing). In addition 13.7% of the current coaches indicated dealing with inadequate facilities, inadequate equipment, and inadequate administrative support. About 38% of former coaches said they left coaching because of perceived time and role conflicts with their personal lives. In addition, 17.6% of the former coaches indicated there were inadequate facilities, inadequate equipment, inadequate administrative support, and inadequate support for girls.

Fowlkes, Bonner, Coons, and Koppein (1987) reported on a meeting which lead to the establishment of a statewide program for interscholastic coaches Wisconsin. The meeting led to a new task force of women coaches and administrators from Wisconsin high schools and universities as well as several concerned citizens. The task force had several purposes including to: (a) form a network promoting the value of women coaching women; (b) increase placement, retention, and advancement of women in administration, coaching, and officiating positions; (c) improve the quality of coaching; (d) provide a voice for non-teacher coach of women's sports; (e) promote equitable and fair hiring practices of women coaches; (f) educate significant groups whose decisions impact on girls' sports programs; (g) provide female role models in coaching; and (h) promote media and public support of women's athletics.

The design of the task force included the following action plans: (a) develop and implement membership categories; (b) develop support networks; (c) educate school boards, teachers' unions, and school administrations on the factors encouraging more women to participate in interscholastic leadership positions; (d) develop political action plans with boards and unions; (e) design a reference manual for hiring women in athletics. The implementation of the Task Force activities included: (a) the design and distribution of brochures; (b) the division of the State of Wisconsin into five regions with five representatives to facilitate the distribution if necessary; (c) the staffing of a membership booth at at the annual Wisconsin Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance state convention; (d) the serving as a liaison with the Wisconsin Women's Network Task Force; (e) the delivery of presentations at the State Teacher's convention and at WAHPERD; (f) the writing of articles about the Task Force; (g) the

representation of the Task Force on the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association (WIAA) Sex Equity Task Force; and (h) the publishing of the reference manual, "Quality Programs, Quality Coaches". The results of the program have developed a solid foundation for networking, collegial affiliations, and information sharing among people within interscholastic athletics in Wisconsin.

Schafer (1987) examined the purpose, design, implementation and results of the "Sports Need You" program. The "Sports Need You" program was designed to reverse the decline of women in interscholastic coaching, officiating, and athletic administration in Colorado. The specific goals of the program included to: (a) increase the percentage of women as coaches in Colorado high schools; (b) sensitize and encourage employees to seek women and minority men for athletic positions; (c) gather statewide data to delineate equity programs; (d) monitor programs and direct actions; (e) improve communication between school districts, colleges, governing bodies, and professional associations regarding the need for gender-balanced and race balanced athletic staffs; and (f) publicize the benefits of athletics. Leaders from Colorado girls interscholastic sports examined ways to stop the decline of women as coaches, officials, and athletic directors of Colorado high school sports.

The "Sports Need You" program had four components: (a) steering committee, (b) documenting the problem, (c) publicizing the problem, and (e) support for women in athletic roles. Steps for implementing the program included: (a) selecting positive opinion leaders and role models for the steering committee (10-15 people), (b) documenting disparities between male and female representatives in athletic areas, (c) determined the rationale for the project (to provide female role models, to enlarge the

talent pool of competent coaches, to ensure women fill their fair share of staffing roles in athletic programs, and to achieve diverse representation in athletic and education administration),(d) set objectives (i.e., speaking at conferences), (e) securing the endorsement of influential groups, (f) obtain funding for objectives, (g) evaluate the objective, and (h) report progress. There are necessary resources for the program: (a) positive, committed leaders, (b) a familiarity with academic research, (c) funding, and (d) recognition for work. The results of the program indicated leaders persevered with their plans and noted an increase in the number and percentage of women in interscholastic coaches in Colorado. Results of the study indicated the need for continuing efforts regarding self-help, policies and practices promoting gender balance, and the need for a coordinated national women's sport network to bring women back to their historical and rightful place of coaching and administering female sport programs.

Pastore (1994) conducted a study to understand the strategies used to retain females in high school head coaching positions. The participants were high school athletic administrators and head coaches from basketball, softball, tennis, and volleyball teams ($N = 354$). Participants were chosen through a random national sample of athletic directors provided by the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators Association (NIAAA), and a random sample of 500 coaches selected from the 1992-1993 state high athletic directories of California, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Out of the 1000 participants mailed a survey, 354 (35.4%) were returned and 346 were usable.

Pastore (1994) used a questionnaire consisting of two parts: (a) demographic information, and (b) the use of retention strategies for female coaches. The results

indicated males tended to perceive use of developmental opportunities, financial incentives, job definition, and communication as retention strategies for female coaches. Women rated these retention factors lower because there was a strong networking tradition among male coaches which affected how women viewed the likelihood of success for this strategy.

Caiozzi, Seidler, and Verner (2003) examined Illinois interscholastic athletics administrators' networking practices. The participants were athletic directors randomly and purposively chosen from the Illinois High School Association (IHSA) membership ($N = 219$). Each participant filled out a modified version of the Mentor Relationship and the Use of Networking survey developed by Young (1985). Results of the study indicated men (48%) were more actively involved than women (42%) in networking. The top three benefits of networking included strategy, information/idea exchange, advice/expertise, and reassurance/support. The majority of men and women administrators agreed networking strengthened their professional developments. Yet, findings reveal slightly more availability of networking for men in comparison to women.

Leisure Service Management. Frisby and Brown (1991) studied career histories and career experiences within the context of the lives of women who currently occupy positions in middle or senior management in the leisure service sector. Participants for the study were women listed as members in the *1989 Directory of the Society of Directors of Municipal Recreation of Ontario (SDMRO)* ($N = 30$). Participants holding a position in upper management (e.g., Recreation Directors, Program Supervisors, Community Development Coordinators) were randomly selected from the SDMRO by the job title.

Frisby and Brown (1991) used a semi-focused interview schedule and asked participants a series of preset open-ended questions in seven areas: (a) the nature of their current position, (b) the background factors which lead to their current positions, (c) their workplace experiences, (d) experiences in professional organizations, (e) the perceived effects of pay equity legislation, (f) their family situations, and (g) their personal aspirations. Content analysis of the data involved a search for common themes and identification of unique individual experiences illustrating diversity of women's career development. Results indicated several reasons why women face barriers within leisure service management: (a) career interruptions, (b) lack of mentors and role models, (c) organizational factors including discrimination, (d) exclusion from the "old boys network", female/male relationships, (e) gender stereotypes, (f) sexual harassment, (g) differences in managerial styles, (h) time commitments, and (i) pay equity.

Frisby (1992) discussed how traditional models of career development indicated glass ceilings for women in leisure service management. Participants for the study were women who occupied middle and upper management positions in municipal leisure services ($N = 30$). Participants were interviewed and asked about their career history, their current positions, their aspirations and definitions of career success, examples of factors which hindered or advanced their career, and their family situation. The results generated eight categories of factors which influence the career development process of women: (a) legislative factors, (b) socio-economic factors, (c) organizational factors, (d) professional organizations, (e) background factors, (f) individual factors, (g) current positions, and (h) family factors. The one of interest for this literature review revolved

around organizational factors. Results indicated women felt it was difficult being excluded from the informal networks which developed between men in the work place.

Arnold and Shinew (1996) examined issues regarding career advancement among male and female middle managers in public leisure service agencies. Specifically, the study focused on perceptions of success, obstacles toward promotion, aspirations and preparedness for senior management positions, and the desire for promotion during one's career. Participants included male and female middle managers from public recreation agencies in a Midwestern state ($N = 215$). This sample included 113 females and 102 males. The sample was obtained through a listing of employees and their addresses in the state directory. Each participant was mailed a six-page questionnaire. In terms of actual and perceived barriers toward promotion, women were more likely than men to report gender-related issues (gender discrimination, gender differences in management styles, and lack of role model–mentor) as obstacles toward their career advancement.

Arnold and Shinew (1996) examined perceptions of success, the obstacles one faces during career advancement, and the aspirations and preparedness for promotion during one's career in the recreation and park profession among both male and female middle managers. The participants of the study were male ($n = 102$) and female ($n = 113$) state park and recreation middle managers ($N = 215$). Each participant was mailed a questionnaire. The six most cited responses among all middle managers include: (a) lack of promotion opportunities, (b) lack of family and leisure balance, (c) low salary, (d) lack of education and maintaining current with issues, (e) job satisfaction and burnout, and (f) gender-related issues (e.g, being female in a predominantly male system). In addition, there were four suggestions made by the participants: (a) design a mentoring program, (b)

communicate the commitment of top leadership and the organization or promoting women through education, (c) benchmark the actions of other organizations who have recognized the worth and the promotions of women to executive status, and (d) encourage female professionals to establish or join a women's network.

Professional Sport. Hums and Sutton (1999) conducted a descriptive study on women working within management positions in professional baseball. The purposes of the descriptive study were to determine: (a) demographics of women working in the management of professional baseball; (b) career paths of women working in the management of professional baseball; (c) the most and least enjoyable aspects, and (d) the greatest challenges of being a woman working in the management of professional baseball; (d) career advice of women working in management of professional baseball; and (e) short-term and long-term career aspirations of women working in the management of professional baseball. Participants for the study included women listed in the *1997 Baseball America Directory* as working in Major League or minor league baseball ($N = 441$).

Hums and Sutton (1999) utilized a survey in conducting the research. Results indicated three general themes for most and least enjoyable aspects and greatest challenges of working in the management of professional baseball. The most enjoyable aspects included community involvement, feelings of self-actualization, and being respected. The least enjoyable aspects include, always having to prove themselves, being stereotyped, and not being part of the network. The greatest challenges included proving themselves, overcoming stereotypes, and the challenge of not fitting into the "old boys network." The career advice women suggested included gendered and non-gendered

responses: (a) learning to network, (b) utilizing an internship, (c) getting experience, (d) not trying to become "one of the boys," and (e) do not date the players.

Hums and Sutton (2000) conducted a study to establish and examine career information of women working in professional basketball. The study addressed the following concerning women working in professional basketball: (a) demographics of women working in the management of professional basketball; (b) career paths of women working in the management of professional basketball; (c) the most and least enjoyable aspects, and (d) the greatest challenges of being a woman working in the management of professional basketball; (d) career advice of women working in management of professional basketball; and (e) short-term and long-term career aspirations of women working in the management of professional basketball. The participants for the study included women listed in the *Sporting News Official NBA Guide for 1998-1999* and the *1998 Official WNBA Guide and Register* who worked with NBA or WNBA franchises or in the National Basketball Association ($N = 660$). Each participant was asked to answer demographic and open-ended questions through a modified version of the *Female Sport Managers Career* survey. The results of the Hums and Sutton (2000) study indicated the best aspects of being a woman working in professional basketball included excitement of the game, a variety of responsibilities, and love of the sport industry. The worst aspects of being a woman working in professional basketball included the old boys network, not being taken seriously, lack of respect, and the glass ceiling. The biggest challenges for a woman working in professional basketball included old boys network, lack of respect, glass ceiling, and not being taken seriously. The career advice offered by women to those entering the field included gendered and non-gendered responses. The non-

gendered responses included get experience, network, and work hard. The gendered responses included do not be intimidated by men, mentor other women, and do not date players. This study established interesting baseline information about the career paths of women working in professional basketball. In addition, it shed light on the workplace environment for women working in this traditionally male dominated segment of the sport industry. Another segment which has received attention in regards to the underrepresentation of women within leadership positions is campus recreation.

Campus Recreation. Bower and Hums (In Press) conducted a study to establish and examine career information on women working in the administration of campus recreation programs. The study addressed the following concerning women working in campus recreation administration: (a) career paths; (b) most/least enjoyable aspects of their jobs; (c) greatest challenges; (d) career advice for women wanting to enter this profession; (e) short-term and long-term career aspirations; (f) the role of mentors on their careers; (g) how they obtained their first/current job in campus recreation administration, and (h) demographics.

The population for the study was all women working in campus recreation administrative positions as listed in the *2001 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory* ($N = 768$). The research participants were selected based upon purposeful sampling. Each participant was asked to answer demographic and open-ended questions through a modified version of the *Female Sport Managers Career* survey. Since this was a qualitative study, validity and reliability of the instrument was established through trustworthiness of the data. The initial instrument was examined by a panel of experts and pilot tested, and was previously used in studies involving women working in the

management of professional baseball (Hums & Sutton, 1999), professional basketball (Hums & Sutton, 2000), and sport for people with disabilities (Hums & Moorman, 1999).

Using content analysis the qualitative data were examined for themes from the participants' answers to the open-ended questions. The responses of the Bower and Hums (In press) study revealed several general themes. The most enjoyable aspects revealed four general themes: (a) interacting with people, (b) the work environment, (c) feelings of self-actualization, and (d) managerial activities. The least enjoyable aspects of the job revealed gendered responses, which developed into five themes: (a) lack of respect, (b) women did not feel a part of the network, (c) conflict management, (d) time spent at the workplace, and (e) non-woman friendly environment for women. The five greatest challenges generated five general themes: (a) the women felt like they were not taken seriously enough; (b) the women felt like they were not a part of the network; (c) the women felt a lack of female representations, "glass ceilings", and exclusion from the "old boys network"; (d) non-female friendly environment; (e) managerial activities; and (f) time spent at the workplace. Finally, gendered and non gendered career advice was provided including: (a) obtain further education, (b) work hard and be persistent, (c) learn from "good" people, (d) do not try to be "one of the boys", (e) demand respect of male and female participants and colleagues, (f) expect to work in a male-dominated environment, and (g) do to conform to the male culture. This study established interesting baseline information about the career paths of women working in campus recreation administration. In addition, it shed light on the workplace environment for women working in this traditionally male dominated segment of the sport industry.

Several researchers discussed barriers relating to the underrepresented of women within leadership positions, higher education administration, and the sport industry. Unfortunately these barriers for women still exist today and will continue to exist unless initiatives are taken to overcome the barriers. Mentoring is one initiative which has received a considerable amount of attention for helping women break the gender-related barriers in business (Burke & McKeen, 1990; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1989; Ragins, Townsend & Mattis, 1998), higher education administration (Scanlon, 1997; Blackhurst, 2000), and the sport industry (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 1996; Pastore, 1994; Strawbridge, 2000; Yager, 1983).

Mentoring

This section of the literature review focused on mentoring research in the area of business, higher education administration, and the sport industry. This section was divided into the following subsections: (a) mentoring definition, (b) business mentoring, (c) higher education administration, and (d) segments of the sport industry. In the latter three subsections, the discussion will focus on mentoring functions and phases, benefits of mentoring, and gender and mentoring.

Mentoring Definition

While various definitions of mentoring exist in the literature, the most enduring image of a mentor was predicated in the classical vision of Odysseus. The term "mentor" actually derived from the character named Mentor, who was a faithful friend of the Greek hero Odysseus in Homer's epic story *The Odyssey*. Odysseus left for war, leaving Mentor behind to serve as a tutor to his son Telemachus. Mentor served in this role, earning a reputation of being wise, sober, and loyal. The classic understanding of the

term "mentorship" evolved from the relationship of these two characters. This myth embodied many of the positive attributes associated with the mentoring relationship (Wilson & Elman, 1990).

Several researchers redefined mentoring by focusing on understanding the "traditional" mentor role. The "traditional" mentoring role focuses on transmitting values and skills to the next generation of organizational managers. This focus insured future managers meshed within the existing organizational structure (Feldman, 1988; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978). For example, mentors were defined as those who helped shape professional identity (Ragins, 1989), taught intricacies of the work environment (Kram and Isabella 1985), rendered guidance and support (Burke, 1984), provided political sponsorship (Kanter, 1977), and facilitated entry into organizational and professional networks (Ibarra, 1993).

While some researchers clung to the "traditional" definitions of mentoring, other researchers were interested in "contemporary" definitions which provided a more comprehensive view of the mentor role. The "contemporary" definitions suggested mentoring may offer, in addition to career development functions, psychosocial support in the form of counseling and friendship (e.g., Burke & McKeen, 1989; Haynor, 1994; Kram, 1983; Olian, Giannantionio, & Ferern, 1988; Scanlon, 1997). For example, Burke and McKeen (1989) believed psychosocial functions, career development functions, and role model functions were interrelated components of the mentoring role. Haynor (1994) suggested mentors provided the protégé the valuable psychological functions of affirmation, acceptance, and encouragement. Kram (1983) believed psychosocial functions contributed to the protégé's professional identity and were essential

components in the socialization process of most professionals. Olian et al. (1988) believed protégés placed greater value on the mentor's ability to provide social support than on career development functions. Scanlon (1997) believed mentoring involved a relationship between a mentor (sponsor) and a protégé.

Finally, other researchers suggested the role of the mentor needed to be expanded and redefined and suggested mentoring relationships significantly influenced career mobility (e.g., Dreher & Ash, 1990; Dreher & Cox, 1996; Fagenson, 1989; Kanter, 1977; Klenke, 1996; Kram, 1985; Newby & Heide, 1992; Ragins, Townsend, & Mattis, 1996; Roche, 1979; Scandura, 1992; Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991), and offered more instrumental resources for promotional opportunities (Ragins & Cotton, 1991), as well as systems for preparing future leaders within the organization.

Although many mentoring definitions were mentioned, Kram's (1985) definition was used for this study because it included all the other meanings. Kram (1985) defined a mentor as "an experienced, productive manager who relates well to a less-experienced employee and facilitates his or her personal development for the benefit of the individual as well as that of the organization" (p. 1).

Business

A considerable amount of literature has been written in business related journals and textbooks on the value of having a mentor for career development in the business world (Chao & Walz, 1992; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Levinson, et. al, 1978; Reich, 1985). This section of the literature review focused on mentoring functions and phase, benefits of mentoring, and gender differences and mentoring in business environments.

Mentoring functions and phases in business. Kram (1983) developed a

conceptual model derived from an intensive biographical interview study of relationships

in one corporate setting. The participants for the study were randomly sampled from a

group of (a) young (25-35 years old) managers who had three or more years of tenure in

the organization and who were in their first, second, or third levels of management, and

(b) senior management between the ages of 39-63 who worked at the organization for an

average of 23 years ($N = 30$).

Kram (1983) interviewed the young participants twice. The first interview was to

discover the young managers' career histories and explore relationships with more senior

managers who were important during their lives in the organization. During the second

interview, the primary task was to explore one or two relationships with senior managers

which were important in the young managers' career. The second set of parallel

interviews were conducted with the senior mangers. An emergent design was used in

establishing hypotheses throughout the study. Themes and categories became the basis

for the conceptual model of the phases of mentor relationships. A phase model

illustrating how a mentor relationship moved through the phases of initiation, cultivation,

separation, and redefinition was derived from the study results.

Kram and Isabella (1985) examined the nature of peer relationships among

managers and other professionals at early, middle, and late career stages in one

organizational setting. The research design was guided by three primary questions: (a)

For what purposes do individuals form and maintain peer relationships? (b) Can

distinctive kinds of peer relationships be identified? and (c) What are the functions of

peer relationships at different career stages? The participants for the study included

71

human resource staff from a large, northeastern manufacturing company ($N = 15$). The

four criteria for the selection of the participants were (a) age, (b) gender, (c) tenure in the

organization, and (d) willingness to participate. From the original list, the research team

randomly selected five people from each category. The final sample consisted of six

people in the early-career (25-35), five in middle-career (36-45), and four from late-

career (46-65) stages.

Kram and Isabella (1985) conducted two 1 ½ to 2 hour interviews with each

participant. The first interview established rapport and the second interview explored the

significant relationships. A grounded theory approach was utilized for the data analysis.

Throughout the data collection process, researchers developed their own emergent

hypotheses and used constant comparison in establishing categories following the

interview process. The results of the study suggested peer relationships offered an

important alternative to conventional mentoring relationships by providing a range of

developmental supports for personal and professional growth at each career stage.

Burke and McKeen (1997) examined antecedents and consequences of mentor

functions among managerial and professional women. The general research questions

addressed during the study included: (a) whether the protégé and mentor characteristics

predicted the level of mentor functions reported by the protégé; (b) whether the process

characteristics of the mentor relationship predicted the level of mentor functions reported

by protégés; and (c) whether the level of mentor functions reported by protégés predicted

a variety of individual and organizational outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, intent to quit).

Participants for the study included female business graduates from a central alumni

records office of a major Canadian university ($N = 481$). A questionnaire was mailed to

each participant. Results of the study indicated the existence of mentor relationships. Most of the mentors were in a direct supervisory position. The mentoring experience started early in the protégés life. Mentors were older and higher in the organizational administrative chain. Mentors also provided benefits of role modeling, career development and psychosocial functions (building confidence, emotional support). Overall, woman receiving more career development functions, received more psychosocial functions from their mentors.

Benefits of mentoring in business. Reich (1985) conducted a study to find out more about how mentor relationships work. Participants for the study included corporate executives in the Columbia University Executive Program ($N = 520$). Each participant was mailed a questionnaire asking about his/her protégé. Results indicated executives gained from their relationship with the person who played a key role in their career development. According to 75-90% of respondents, concrete assistance given by mentors produced these highly valued outcomes: more chances to develop abilities, be creative, make difficult decisions, and become self-confident. Overall, the executives saw these relationships as a means to use and expand their natural talents while developing skills.

Fagenson (1989) examined the job/career experiences perceived to be associated with being/not being a protégé and to determine whether men or women in higher versus lower level positions perceive equal benefits in their careers/jobs from being mentored. Participants for the study included high and low level managerial men and women working in a large company (over 70,000 individuals) in the health care industry ($N = 518$). Questionnaires were distributed to the employees by the company's management

development office. Results of the study revealed mentored individuals reported having more satisfaction, career mobility/opportunity, recognition, and a higher promotion rate than non-mentored individuals. However, protégés' perceptions of their job/career situations were not affected by their sex or employment level.

Dreher and Ash (1990) examined the linkages between a global measure of mentoring experiences, employee gender, and four outcome variables related to monetary or economic success. The participants for the study included business-school graduates from two large state universities in the United States ($n = 1000$). A stratified random sampling procedure, which included equal numbers of male and female graduates from both degree programs for the classes of 1978 and 1983, was used at each university for the study. Each participant was mailed a survey and 45% of 978 questionnaires were returned. Only those participants who worked at least 35 hours per week and who included complete data on all analysis variables were used for the study ($N = 440$). Study findings revealed no gender differences with regard to the frequency of mentoring activities, and gender did not moderate mentoring-outcome relationships.

Whitely, Dougherty, and Dreher (1991) examined the relationship of career mentoring to the promotions and compensation received by early career managers and professionals working in a variety of organizations. Specifically, the following two hypotheses were tested with a group of managers and professionals in the early parts of their career: (a) with other variables controlled, mentoring was related to measures of the early career progress of managers and professionals, and (b) with other variables controlled, socioeconomic status moderated the relationship between mentoring and career progress was different for those from upper and lower level socioeconomic

backgrounds. Participants for the study included all graduates of the M.B.A. programs from the classes of 1980, 1981, and 1982 from the Universities of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. In addition, individuals graduating from undergraduate business programs at those same universities were randomly sampled so the number of M.B.A. and B.S.B.A. degree holders were equivalent ($N = 1269$). A survey was sent to all participants with a return rate of 52%. Results of the study supported the conclusion that having a career-oriented mentor has greater correlations with promotion rate for people from the higher-level socioeconomic backgrounds than for those from lower-level backgrounds.

Chao and Waltz (1992) conducted a theoretical and empirical exploration of the following issues: (a) relationships between functions served by mentors and individual job, and (b) comparisons of the outcomes among nonmentored, formally mentored, and informally mentored individuals. The two mentoring functions examined for the study were career-related and psychosocial, as identified by Kram (1983). One hypothesis guided the study (relationship between functions served by mentors and individual job): Protégés in informal mentorships perceived their mentors provided more psychosocial and career-related functions than protégés in formal mentorships.

A four part hypotheses related to the second exploration of the study (comparisons of the outcomes among nonmentored, formally mentored, and informally mentored individuals) included: (a) informal protégés reported higher levels of organizational socialization than formal protégés who reported higher organizational socialization than non-mentored individuals; (b) informal protégés reported higher levels of intrinsic job satisfaction than formal protégés who, in turn reported higher intrinsic job satisfaction than non-mentored individuals; (c) informal protégés had higher salaries than

formal protégés who, in turn, had higher salaries than non-mentored individuals; and (d) there was a positive relationship between mentorship functions and job outcomes for both formal and informal protégés. The data used for the study was collected as part of a longitudinal study examining the career development of alumni from a large Midwestern public university and a small private institution. Alumni were randomly selected from a cross-section of nine graduating classes from each institution between the years 1956 and 1986 ($N = 764$). A total of 576 subjects responded to a survey for a response rate of 75.9%. Results indicated the career related mentoring function had a principal effect on intrinsic satisfaction and socialization goals, politics, and history, but a smaller impact on salary, extrinsic satisfaction, and performance proficiency.

Catalyst (1993) conducted a national study to address women's advancement from the perspective of women who actually advanced to senior levels of leadership in the nation's largest companies. The participants for the study were female executives and CEO's of *Fortune* 1000 companies ($N = 1251$). Surveys were returned from 461 female executives and 325 CEO's. Follow-up in-depth interviews were also conducted with 20 female executives and 20 CEO's. The women were asked to identify the key strategies they used in their rise to the top, and the barriers to advancement they faced in their firms. Results of the study indicated 91% of the female executives surveyed reported having a mentor sometime in the course of their careers and 81% saw their mentor as being either critical or fairly important in their career advancement. When asked what was holding women back, 49% of the female executives and 15% of the CEO's reported exclusion from informal networks.

Gaskill (1993) provided a conceptual framework for mentor program development, implementation, and evaluation based on the collective profiles and operational activities of successful, existing formal mentoring programs in retailing. Participants for the study included Executive Development Directors from retail businesses located in the southwestern region of the United States (N=90). The retail companies were selected from the *1990 Directory of Department Stores, the 1990 Directory of Mens' and Boys' Wear Specialty Stores, the 1990 Directory of Women's and Children's Wear Specialty Stores*, or *the 1990 Directory of Discount Stores*. Those companies selected employed 10 or more company executives indicating potential for career advancement.

Gaskill's (1993) used two data collection instruments for the study: (a) a mailed questionnaire and (b) a structured telephone interview schedule. The questionnaire was used to distinguish between retailers presently operating a formal mentoring program and those not engaged in executive development through formal mentoring. A telephone interview schedule was used to obtain information from respondents offering a formal mentoring program. The interview schedule was composed of three content areas: (a) Mentoring Program Director Background, (b) Program Emergence and Involvement, and (c) Mentoring Program Operational Activities.

Gaskill (1993) results indicated a determination of program success involved both the individuals who administered and participated in the programs. Senior management needed to be committed to the concept and to exerting the time and effort necessary to ensure effective leadership. Mentor candidates also needed to be carefully reviewed for their qualifications, willingness, and desire to participate. Finally, formalized mentoring

programs provided organizational exposure, developed executive talent, built confidence and competence, provided emotional support, and developed productive, fast-tracking executives with improved levels of career commitment.

Chao (1997) conducted a longitudinal research examination on mentoring functions and outcomes via a literature review. Based on the literature review, three hypotheses were proposed: (a) protégés in different phases of mentorships perceived different levels of psychosocial and career-related support from their mentors; (b) protégés in different phases of mentorship were perceived at different levels of career planning, career involvement, organizational socialization, job satisfaction, and income; (c) there were no significant differences between protégés in current mentorships, defined by the Cultivation and Separation phases, and nonprotégés on a variety of job and career outcomes over a five year period; and (d) there were significant differences between protégés in past or former mentorships, defined by the Redefinition phase, and nonprotégés on a variety of job and career outcomes over a five year period. The participants for the study included alumni from a large midwestern university and a small private institution (N = 428). Current protégés (n = 82) and former protégés (n = 69) were compared with individuals who reported never having a mentor (n = 93). Results showed no differences between mentored and non-mentored individuals in regards to mentoring functions, job, and career outcomes.

Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs (1997) examined mentoring from the perspective of the mentor. The study investigated four areas of inquiry related to the mentor's choice to engage in a mentoring relationship: (a) individual reasons for mentoring others, (b) organizational factors which inhibited or facilitated mentoring, (c) protégé characteristics

78

which attracted mentors, and (d) the outcomes associated with mentoring others. The participants for the study included employees from five different organizations who mentored others ($N = 27$).

Allen et al. (1997) conducted 60-minute interviews with each participant. Interview questions were generated based on a comprehensive review of the mentoring literature. Results of the study included five general categories. The first category was "individual reasons for mentoring others". Under the first category there were two general sub-categories, "other focused" and "self-focused". The "other focused" category included the desire to help others, the desire to pass along information to others, and the desire built a competent workforce. The "self-focused" reasons included the desire to increase personal learning and the desire to feel gratification. The second category was "organizational factors related to mentoring others". Under the second category there were two sub-categories, "inhibited themes" and "facilitated themes". The "inhibited themes" subcategory included factors such as time demands and organizational structure. Mentors noted downsizing and restructuring were factors inhibiting their ability to mentor others. The "facilitated themes" subcategory included factors such as support for employee learning and development and company training programs.

The third category was "protégé attractiveness" which included subcategories of "reflections of self", "personality indicators", "motivational factors", "competency indicators", and "help arousal, learning orientation". Under the subcategories, mentors were more attracted to junior employees perceived to have more talent/ability than junior employees perceived to have less talent/ability. Protégés who were perceived by mentors to have a higher degree of motivation and willingness to learn were involved longer, and

were said to have a more successful mentoring relationship than protégés perceived by mentors to be less motivated and less interested in learning. Mentors were perceived to achieve greater costs in not providing mentoring to junior employees who appeared in need of help and are under their direct supervision than junior employees who appeared in need of help and are not under their direct supervision. Finally, mentors were perceived to have greater rewards in providing mentoring to protégés who were perceived to be similar to themselves than protégés perceived to be dissimilar. The fourth category was "outcomes of mentoring others" which included sub-categories "positive benefits of mentoring" and "negative consequences of mentoring." The positive benefits of mentoring included building support networks and self-satisfaction. The negative consequences of mentoring include time requirements, favoritism to protégé, protégé abused relationship, and feelings of failure.

Fagenson-Eland, Marks, and Amendola (1997) examined the influence of mentor-protégé relationship structure and experience factors on perceptions of mentoring. The participants for this survey study included mentors from two intermediate sized technology organizations owned by the same parent company ($N = 28$). The response rate was 68%. The results of the study indicated the perceptions of mentoring were affected by both mentor-protégé relationship structure and experience factors. The study revealed the experience with mentor-protégé relationships (number of mentors/protégés and relationship length) and the relationship structure (formally arranged vs informally developed and subordinate vs non-subordinate protégé) significantly affected reports of the amount of psychosocial support, career guidance, role modeling, and communication which occurred in the mentoring relationship in which the protégé and mentors engaged.

Catalyst (1999) surveyed women ($n = 482$) and men ($n = 356$) at seven leading securities firms ($N = 838$). Catalyst also interviewed nine focus groups of men and women in Chicago, New York, and San Francisco. The results of this study indicated lack of mentoring opportunities as the leading barrier to women's advancement. Seventy-two percent of the female executives in Scandura's (1991) study who had advanced to an executive level reported they had a mentor. The mentoring relationship was related to expectations of promotion and salary.

Gender differences and mentoring in business. Ragins and Cotton (1991) examined gender differences as perceived barriers to mentoring. The four hypotheses examined during the study were (a) women perceived greater barriers to gaining mentors than men; (b) age, rank, and length of employment were negatively related to perceived barriers of mentoring relationships; (c) experience in mentoring relationships was negatively related to perceived barriers to mentoring relationships; and (d) protégé experience included reduced perceptions of barriers to mentoring of men but had little or no impact for women. Participants for the study included employees from three research and development organizations in the southeastern United States ($N = 880$). A total of 510 surveys were returned for a response rate of 58%. Results indicated women experienced more barriers to obtaining mentors than men, and individuals lacking previous experience reported greater barriers to obtaining a mentor than experienced protégés. The study also indicated there was a lack of a significant interaction between gender and protégé experience for men and women. This finding suggested a shortage of female mentors which required women to develop cross-gender mentoring relationships, thus leading to more barriers.

Scandura and Ragins (1993) examined the impact of sex and gender role orientation on the development and functions of mentoring relationships in Certified Public Accounting (male-dominated organization). The researchers expected having a mentor would be significantly associated with gender role orientation, as specified by the following hypotheses: (a) those who reported having a mentor were more masculine or androgynous than those who reported not having a mentor, (b) those who reported lacking a mentor were more feminine than those who reported having a mentor, (c) gender roles accounted for more variance in mentorship functions than biological sex, and (d) individuals with feminine gender role orientations reported fewer mentorship functions than individuals with masculine or androgynous gender role orientation.

Participants for the Scandura and Ragins (1993) study included a random sample of accounting professionals from the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) ($N = 800$). Each participant was sent a survey. One hundred and ninety-two respondents indicated they did not have a mentor ($n = 120$ men and $n = 72$ women). The remaining 608 ($n = 404$ men and $n = 204$ women) respondents reported characteristics of mentors and mentor functions. Results of the study indicated that biological sex was not related to mentoring, but gender role orientation was significantly related to having a mentor and mentor functions. Those individuals with an androgynous sex role orientation reported more mentorship functions than individuals with feminine or masculine orientations.

Scandura and Ragins (1994) investigated the differences in the costs and benefits associated with being a mentor. The participants for the study were 160 executives ($N = 160$). There were 80 female ($n = 80$) and 80 male ($n = 80$). Results of the study

indicated gender role orientation was significantly associated with the presence of a mentor. The results included the following: (a) gender role orientation was found to be a stronger predictor of mentorship functions than biological sex; (b) women and men who described themselves in androgynous terms reported more career development and psychosocial support than individuals with feminine (i.e., dependent, passive, nuturant, helpful) or masculine (i.e., independent, aggressive, competitive, self-confident) behavioral attributes; (c) gender role orientation was related to the career development and psychosocial mentorship functions, it was unrelated to the role modeling function; and (d) individuals with masculine or androgynous orientations were more likely to report having a mentor than individuals with other orientations.

Ragins and Cotton (1993) investigated differences in willingness to mentor among men and women. There were five hypotheses in the study: (a) women will report less willingness to mentor than men, (b) willingness to mentor will be curvilinearly related to age, (c) organizational rank will be positively related to willingness to mentor, (d) length of employment will be positively related to willingness to mentor, and (e) experience in mentoring relationships will influence willingness to mentor such that more mentor and/or protégé experience will be related to greater willingness to mentor. Participants for the study included employees of three research and development organizations in the Southeastern United States ($n = 880$). The sample ($N = 510$), with a 58% return rate consisted of 229 women and 281 men. The study's findings indicated (a) gender influenced the two willingness to mentor measures differently; (b) there was no curvilinear relationship between age and willingness to mentor which supported (hypothesis two); (c) rank was positively associated with both of the willingness to

mentor measures (hypothesis three); (d) while significant relationships were found between length of employment and both of the willingness to mentor measures, the relationships were the opposite direction than expected (hypothesis four); and (e) mentorship experience accounted for a significant amount of the variance in both the willingness to mentor measures.

Ragins and Scandura (1994) developed and tested current mentorship and career theories by exploring gender differences in the anticipated costs and benefits associated with becoming a mentor. This study explored the mentoring relationship from the protégé perspective. There were four hypotheses for the study: (a) the costs of mentoring women were greater than the cost of mentoring men; (b) the benefits of mentoring women were greater than the benefits of mentoring men; (c) women were more likely to be mentors than men; and (d) women expressed equivalent intentions to mentor as men. The study used a matched pairs research design since the study called for a comparison between male and female executives. Male and female executives were randomly selected to participate in the study ($N = 160$). Analysis of the results revealed gender was not significantly related to costs, benefits, or intentions to mentor; thus it supported hypothesis four but not one or two. Results also indicated women were more likely as men to actually be mentors, which supported hypothesis three. The core implication of the study supported the need for more women to become mentors when they break through the glass ceiling within organizations.

Vincent and Seymour (1995) studied differences between men and women and their willingness to mentor. The study specifically focused on the following: (a) a comparison of mentors/non-mentors on selected demographic characteristics: age,

education, salary, race, and work experience; (b) the status of mentoring among female executives and their protégés in the following areas (gender of protégé, differences in gender, ages of protégés compared to mentors, selection of mentor/protégé, preparation for role of mentor, benefits of mentoring, and career advancement of protégé); and (c) a profile of a typical mentor from data gathered and analyzed in the study. Participants for the study included a random sample of female executives from the National Association of Female Executives ($N = 649$). Results indicated women were as willing to mentor as men, and previous mentors or protégés were more willing to enter subsequent mentoring relationships. The benefits of mentoring included: (a) personal and career development, (b) career rejuvenation, (c) advancement, (d) peer recognition, and (e) a loyal base of support. For protégés, female mentors provided a role model and helped to eliminate possible sexual issues as well as other organizational barriers. Barriers also existed for mentors. Barriers were overcome through formal training programs and open discussion in the workplace regarding mentoring between females and males which encouraged positive relationships.

Ragins (1996) explored gender-related barriers to mentoring, relayed the results of an empirical study on this issue, and presented recommendations for organizations and human resources practitioners. Ragins (1996) indicated at least three factors blocked women from obtaining male mentors: (a) sexual issues; (b) sex-role expectations (men take aggressive roles and women take passive roles); and (c) blocked opportunities (women may have fewer formal and informal opportunities for developing mentoring relationships). The participants for the study were employees of three research and development organizations in the southeastern United States (N=880). A total of 510

surveys were returned, including women (n=229) and men (n=281). The results indicated: (a) women face greater barriers than men; (b) women were more likely than men to report a lack of access to potential mentors; (c) male mentors were unwilling to mentor women; (d) supervisors and co-workers disapproved of the relationship; and (e) the initiation of the relationship might be misconstrued as sexual in nature. Other findings included: (a) women were more likely than men to have a mentor; (b) experienced protégés reported fewer barriers to having mentors than individuals lacking mentoring experience; (c) the more experienced individuals were at developing mentoring relationships, the more confident they were for developing relationships in the future; and d) barriers to mentoring relationships suggested that women may face a "Catch 22" situation. A "Catch 22" situation referred to the following, although women need mentors, their lack of experience made it difficult for them to gain mentors. Several implications to organizations were suggested: (a) training programs needed to be developed for potential female protégés and their mentors; (b) human resource professionals and organizations increased both the formal and informal opportunities for women to meet potential mentors on an informal basis; (c) organizations developed formal mentoring programs; and (d) an organization circumvented many of the barriers women face in developing cross-gender relationships by increasing the number of potential female mentors.

As evident by this review, numerous studies exist in the business literature regarding mentoring. The next body of literature reviewed dealt with another male dominated profession, higher education administration.

Although the literature written on mentoring in higher education administration is not as in-depth as that of business, it has supported the value of having a mentor for career development in higher education administration (Kelly, 1984; Noe, 1988; Hubbard and Robinson, 1996). This section of the literature review focused on mentoring functions and phases, benefits of mentoring, and gender differences and mentoring.

Mentoring functions and phases in higher education administration. McNeer (1983) examined the influence of mentors and the mentoring system on the career development of women in public and private coeducational colleges and universities. The participants of the study included women in chief administrative and chief academic administrative positions in four-year coeducational colleges and universities in the six-state Great Lakes region including Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin ($N = 9$). Results of the study indicated women in senior faculty and administrative positions appear to be serving as both role models and mentors for other women to a greater extent than their numbers would predict.

Benefits of mentoring in higher education administration. Noe (1988) examined the influence of protégé characteristics, gender composition of the mentoring relationship, the quality of the relationship, and the amount of time the protégé spent with the mentor on career and psychosocial benefits gained by the protégé. Development programs were designed to promote personal and career development of educators who aspired to attain administrative positions (e.g., principal, superintendent of schools). One part of the program was designed to improve administrative and interpersonal skills. Mentors were assigned to protégés during this program. Each mentor was assigned from

one to five educators as protégés. The researcher administered development programs to nine different sites across the United States and involved 139 educators and 43 mentors ($N = 182$). Of the protégés, 74 were female and 65 were male. Of the mentors 22 were male and 21 were female.

Noe's (1988) findings included the following: (a) participants reported high levels of job involvement and career planning activity; (b) participants tended to have an internal locus of control and valued relationships with supervisors and peers at work; (c) on average, mentors reported spending approximately four hours with the protégés in the six-month period; and (d) effective utilization of the mentor was partially related to protégés attainment of psychosocial functions. This study emphasized the continued need to use formal assigned mentoring programs for employee development but suggested further study of mentoring relationships be undertaken in order to better understand the implications of these relationships for the individual and the organization.

Twale and Jelinek (1996) traced key aspects of primary mentoring experiences of senior level student affairs professionals throughout their careers, beginning with graduate school, entry level professional positions, and finally senior administrative positions where they mentored others. The study also summarized the benefits derived from these mentoring experiences at all three career levels. The participants for the study were female deans and vice presidents of student affairs ($N = 40$). Each participant was given a questionnaire to complete. The results of the study indicated women who had mentors were more likely to act as mentors themselves. The data also suggested a need to identify women protégés early in their professional career.

Scanlon (1997) synthesized the major findings from the body of literature dealing with mentoring and applied the work to the career development of women in academic administration. The major findings from the literature in the last two decades indicated women who were qualified to assume advanced leadership positions in academe had a mentor or several mentors at different stages of their career. The mentors were extremely important in attaining ultimate goals, and fostering career development by exposing women to growth experiences which increased knowledge and self-reliance. In addition, mentors and organization can also benefit from the mentoring relationship. Mentors reported further career advancement and peer respect.

Blackhurst (2000) examined the effects of mentoring on select work-related variables identified in the literature as critical to women's success and satisfaction. The study specifically focused on the differences between the following variables for women with and without mentors: (a) role conflict and role ambiguity; (b) organizational commitment; (c) career satisfaction; and (d) perceived sex discrimination. Participants for the study included a random sample of women student affairs administrators from the *NASPE Member Handbook* ($N = 500$). The data were collected using a questionnaire mailed to all participants. Results of the study indicated mentoring might have important benefits for women student affairs professionals. The benefits included reduced role conflict and ambiguity and increased organizational commitment. In addition, the study found women of color did not benefit from their mentoring relationships in the same way as white women. White women with mentors were more committed to their organizations and reported significantly less role ambiguity than white women without mentors. Women of color without mentors reported higher levels of role ambiguity and

sex discrimination and lower levels of organizational commitment than white women with mentors. Women of color without mentors perceived significantly more sex discrimination (unequal pay, restricted advancement, inequities in hours worked) than white women with mentors. Finally, results did not support the assumption of mentoring enhancing the career satisfaction of women student affairs professionals.

Gender difference and mentoring in higher education administration. Kelly (1984) explored the initiation process of mentor-protégé relationships within student affairs. Participants for the study included a random sample of student affairs professionals listed in the *1980-1981 Directory of the Virginia Association of Student Personnel Administrators* ($n = 200$) and members of the Virginia College Personnel Association as of Spring 1981 ($n = 100$). Of the 300 potential subjects, 74% returned the questionnaire ($N = 222$). A total of 26 participants (13 male and 13 female) were selected for structured interviews. Results of the study include the following: (a) women in students affairs were just as likely as men to experience a relationship with a mentor; (b) women were more likely than men to report receiving emotional support from their mentor; (c) networking was an important factor or step in the initiation process; (d) most protégé-mentor relationships in student affairs were same-sex relationships; (e) most relationships were mutually initiated by both the mentor and the protégé; (f) women were significantly less likely than men to initiate the relationship with the mentor; and (g) women believed it was more likely for someone in the student affairs profession to have a mentor than someone in academic affairs or in business and industry.

Hubbard and Robinson (1996) investigated the presence and utilization of mentoring as related to administrative placement. The following research questions were

examined in the study: (a) was there a difference among administrators in various positions in higher education administration regarding the presence and utilization of mentoring? (b) was there a difference between males and females in higher education administration regarding the presence and utilization of mentoring? (c) was there an interaction between current administrative position and gender regarding the presence and utilization of mentoring? The participants for the study included males and females who held administrative positions in higher education institutions ($N = 370$).

Hubbard and Robinson (1996) mailed a survey consisting of open-ended and forced field questions to all participants. Results of the study indicated the following: (a) females, more often than males, reported having mentors in their early professional career; (b) females reported utilizing mentors to help them obtain their current administration position as an administrator in higher education; and (c) mentors provided advice, guidance, and help to deal with office politics and procedures as well as providing advice on tactics for advancement.

As evident by this review, numerous studies exist in the higher education administration literature on mentoring. The next body of literature reviewed dealt with another male dominated profession, the sport industry.

Sport Industry

There is a dearth of information in the area of mentoring in the sport industry. The existing research in this area does support the value of having a mentor for career development in the sport industry (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000; Strawbridge, 2000; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Yager, 1983). This section of the literature review focused on the benefits in different segments of the sport industry (intercollegiate

athletics, interscholastic athletics, leisure service management, professional sport, and campus recreation) and gender differences and mentoring in the sport industry. Mentoring functions and phases was not addressed because the researcher was not able to locate any studies in this area.

Benefits of Mentoring in the sport industry. Yager (1983) established a knowledge base of female campus recreation professionals in National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). The three main objectives of the study included (a) describing female Intramural-Recreational Sport administrators in terms of certain variables, and (b) describing the women in Intramural Recreational Sport Administration in terms of their career aspirations and expectations for achievement. The participants of the study included female directors ($n = 47$) and non-directors ($n = 116$) of Intramural Recreational Sports programs ($n = 163$). Of the 163 participants, 96.9% of the group returned the two-part survey for a total of 45 director and 111 non-directors ($N = 156$). Using content analysis the qualitative data were examined, and from this process, various themes for the open-ended questions emerged. The results of the study indicated few women campus recreation directors acknowledged significant levels of guidance from a mentor, but they believed more women mentors could improve the professional advancement of women in the Intramural-Recreational Sports profession. The directors believed additional shared information and support provided for each other helped those seeking higher level positions. Non-directors indicated receiving encouragement from a superior helped them improve professionally.

Young (1990) identified and analyzed mentoring and networking among selected male and female administrators in intercollegiate athletics. The participants for the study

were NCAA athletic administrators (157 females and 106 males) in Division I ($n = 131$) and Division ($n = 132$) institutions ($N = 263$). Each participant was given a questionnaire focusing on mentoring and networking. The results of the study indicated NCAA administrators perceived that having a mentor and actively networking assists in an individual's personal and professional development.

Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke, and Salmela (1998) examined the mentoring experiences of expert team sport coaches in interscholastic athletics. The study focused on the following three areas: (a) whether expert coaches were mentored by a coach during their athletic careers, (b) whether expert coaches were mentored by a coach during the early states of their coaching careers, and (c) to what extent did expert coaches feel it was important to mentor athletes and young, developing coaches. The participants for the study were interscholastic Canadian coaches ($N = 21$) from the team sports of field hockey ($n = 5$), ice hockey ($n = 5$), basketball ($n = 6$), and volleyball ($n = 5$). Each coach was interviewed by a senior researcher for a period of one and half hours. Results indicated coaches were mentored by more experienced coaches during both their athletic and early coaching careers. As a result, the coaches gained valuable knowledge and insights which were helpful in developing their coaching philosophies and enhancing all areas of their performance. Once the coaches reached a level of expertise, they began to mentor other younger coaches.

Strawbridge (2000) examined seven factors (education, work experience progression, sport participation and level of achievement, training subjects viewed as necessary for the career, recognition of a mentor, personal characteristics, and most helpful experiences) which traditionally appeared important to advancement to top-level

administrative positions. The participants included women athletic directors of men's and women's Division I college athletic programs ($n = 16$), directors or presidents of National Governing Bodies ($n = 7$), commissioners of athletic conferences ($n = 2$), and directors of international sport organizations ($N = 26$). Women were represented from all geographic regions of the United States. There was a 75% response rate. Results indicated the most important factors for preparing women who aspire to be top-level administrators were mentoring, ability to speak and write, strong business sense, and strong motivation.

Inglis, Danylchuk, and Pastore (2000) explored the multiple meanings associated with women's coaching and management work experience. To gain the most insight on the issue of importance, the researchers used purposeful sampling. Eleven women no longer involved with coaching or in the management of women's intercollegiate athletics were the participants for the study ($N = 11$). Each participant was interviewed using a semi-structured process focusing on the following areas: (a) experiences in athletic administrative and coaching work environments, (b) aspects and areas of work supportive of the women's experiences, (c) aspects and areas of work non-supportive of the women's experiences, and (d) changes/improvements that could be made by the individual, organization, and others to address these aspects.

Inglis et al. (2000) used Merriam's (1998) qualitative framework for data analysis which included establishing categories and subcategories. Three general categories and numerous subcategories emerged from the data: (a) support (mentors and role models, league support, support from the administration, and support from athletes and parents); (b) gender differences (the power of language, gender dynamics); and (c) change

94

(individual, personal efforts to change the conditions of work, institutional change). This study provided greater meaning to supportive and non-supportive aspects of work, as well as the types of individuals and organizational changes which were deemed necessary.

Gender differences and mentoring in the sport industry. Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) investigated the dynamics of mentoring in intercollegiate athletics. Participants for the study included male and female mid-level administrators of Division I and III intercollegiate athletics as listed in the *National Directory of College Athletics* ($N = 494$). Of the 494 participants, 55.3% ($n = 273$) were males and 44.7% ($n = 221$) were females. Participants were mailed a survey which consisted of items (a) eliciting demographic information; (b) containing McFarlin's (1990) *Mentor Role Instrument* (MRI); (c) Ragin and Cotton (1991) *Perceived Barriers Scale* (PBS); and (d) a scale of satisfaction specifically developed for the study. Six issues and six hypotheses associated with these issues were examined during this study: (a) gender differences in rates of mentoring (males had a larger percentage of mentors than females); (b) effects of mentoring on number of promotions and salary (those with a mentor received more promotions and money); (c) differences in perceived mentoring functions due to gender and divisional membership (no significant difference occurred in regards to "perceived" gender and divisional membership); (d) differences in preferred mentoring functions due to gender and divisional membership (no significant differences occurred in regards to "preferred" gender and divisional membership); (e) difference in perceived barriers due to gender and divisional membership (females in both mentored and non-mentored groups, experienced higher levels of barriers than males); (f) differences in job satisfaction due to gender,

95

divisional membership, and mentor status (males and mentored individuals were more satisfied with job satisfaction than females and non-mentored individuals); and (g) relationships of mentoring with job satisfaction (each of the five career functions were significantly correlated with job satisfaction).

Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) discovered the following related to intercollegiate athletics: (a) equal proportions of males and females had experienced mentoring relationships, (b) mentored individuals were more satisfied with work and extrinsic rewards than their non-mentored counterparts, (c) Division I respondents received significantly higher salaries than Division III and they were more satisfied in regards to extrinsic rewards, (d) there was a positive but weak relationship between mentoring functions and the satisfaction facets and (e) females perceived higher barriers in the form of willingness of would-be mentors.

Literature Review Summary

The literature review clearly identifies the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions from the seventeenth century until today in business, higher education administration, and the sport industry. Next the literature review identified the barriers women face, which contribute to this underrpresentation of women within business, higher education administration, and the sport industry. Finally, mentoring was a strategy identified to help overcome these barriers. Previous research on the mentoring relationship included mentoring functions, mentoring phases, benefits of mentoring for the protégé, benefits of mentoring for the mentor, benefits of mentoring for the organization, mentoring functions and benefits for women, and barriers to the mentoring relationship for women in regards to female and/or cross gendered mentoring. In the

literature review, an examination of the literature clearly provided evidence supporting the importance of the mentoring relationship for the advancement of women within organizations (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Morrison, White, Van Velsor, 1987; Ragins, 1989). Mentoring relationships were important to female protégés by helping them overcome barriers (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Mentoring relationships were important to female mentors because they provide career rejuvenation, organizational recognition and improved job performance (Kram, 1985). The literature review lent itself to several research questions regarding the mentoring relationship.

One problem which the literature points out is the lack of mentors for women due to barriers inhibiting the development of relationships. These barriers inhibited the willingness of a female or a male to enter a mentoring relationship (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Although there was a considerable amount of research on the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the protégé, little research was done from the perspective of the mentor and even less on the willingness to mentor others. Therefore, the current study focused on understanding the perspective of the mentor toward women in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship within campus recreation.

Second, features in an organizational environment can inhibit or facilitate the initiation of a mentoring relationship. Kram (1985) indicates those features could be performance management systems, organizational culture, rewards systems, and design of work. The current study attempted to identify organizational factors which mentors believe might enhance or interfere with their opportunities to mentor others within Campus Recreation. Third, research indicates a mentor's perception of expected benefits

97

and costs, and the decision to engage in the mentoring relationship was influenced by the protégé characteristics (Olian, Carroll, & Giannantonio, 1993). Little research has been conducted in attempting to find out information directly from mentors regarding protégé characteristics they find desirable. The current study attempted to identify protégé characteristics which positively influence a mentor's decision to develop a mentoring relationship within Campus Recreation.

Finally, research indicates a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship was influenced by the outcomes they realized by mentoring others (Newby & Heide, 1992). By examining the outcomes mentors believe they obtain from mentoring others, one could get a better understanding of the choice to serve as a mentor. Thus, the current study provided a list of outcomes associated with mentoring others in Campus Recreation.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Of the United States work population, 18 percent or 51 million people were

classified in 2000 as managers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2000). In terms of female

representation, women continue to be underrepresented in managerial positions (Bureau

of Labor Statistics, 2003). Women are especially underrepresented in managerial

positions within male-dominated professions such as business (Catalyst, 2002; Morrison,

1987), higher education administration (Blackhurst, 2000; Warner & DeFluer, 1993), and

the sport industry (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Hums & Sutton,

2000; 1999; Pastore, 1994; Varner, 1992). Often the lack of progress for women has

been attributed to barriers which decrease women's chances of advancement within these

professions (The U.S. Department of Labor, 1991).

These barriers include the glass ceiling (Ragins & Townsend, 1998), negative

stereotypes (Klenke, 1996), leadership style (Frisby & Brown, 1991), balancing work and

family (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1997), old boys network (Jackson,

2000), tokenism (Kanter, 1978), lack of training and career development (Oakley, 2000),

and sexual harassment (Hall, 1984). One initiative which received a considerable

amount of attention for helping women break the gender-related barriers in business

(Burke & Mckeen, 1990; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1989; Ragins, Townsend & Mattis, 1998),

higher education administration (Blackhurst, 2000; Twale & Jelinek, 1996) and the sport

industry (Sisley, Weiss, Barber, & Ebbeck, 1990; Strawbridge, 2000; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Yager, 1983) was mentoring.

Study Purpose

The purpose of this study was to understand the perspective of the mentor in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship with women within campus recreation. The present study investigated four areas of inquiry:

1. What were the individual reasons for mentoring women?

2. What organizational factors inhibited or facilitated mentoring women?

3. What protégé characteristics attracted mentors?

4. What were the outcomes associated with mentoring women?

Study Design

The researcher chose a qualitative research design to examine the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor for several reasons. First, most research on the mentoring relationships has been conducted from the perspective of the protégé and is quantitative in nature (Blackhurst, 2002; Chao, Waltz, & Gardner, 1992; Weaver & Chellarurai, 2002). This study examined the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor working in campus recreation administration which has not been done before in a qualitative format.

Second, the use of a qualitative design allows for a naturalistic, interpretive approach of inquiry (Denzin, 1994). The researcher gathered data in the natural world as opposed to experimental laboratory conditions, quasi-experimental designs, problematic sampling strategies, or using groups to compare interventions (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

This approach to inquiry did not remove participants from their everyday world and sought to understand their lived experiences (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Third, the interpretive approach allowed the researcher to focus on description, analysis, and interpretation as opposed to a quantitative approach which attempts to control and predict (Rossmann & Rallis, 2003). Specifically, the phenomenology tradition was the particular qualitative research genre used for the study. Creswell (1998, p. 51) described a phenomenological study as "the meaning of lived experiences for several individuals about a concept of the phenomenon." Rossmann and Rallis (2003, p. 72) further explained that, "the researcher seeks to understand the deep meaning of an individual's experiences and how he or she articulates these experiences". Since a phenomenological study utilizes in-depth, exploratory interviews as its main means of collecting data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003), a greater understanding of the participants and the meanings they make of their experience provided a "thick description" as opposed to quantifiable data. "As a method of inquiry, interviewing is most consistent with people's ability to making meaning through language" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, pg. 7).

Fourth, the exploratory nature of the study allowed participants to explain fully how they conceptualized the mentoring relationship from their perspectives as mentors and former protégés. Patton (1987) explained that exploratory research is used ". . . because sufficient information is not available to permit the use of quantitative measures and experimental designs" (p. 37). With little previous research upon which to base any quantitative measures, the conceptualization of the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor must be explored first to gain insights and collect data on the topic.

Finally, the use of an emergent design allowed the researcher to avoid imposing a rigid framework on the design of the study. The researcher was allowed to make changes to the conceptual framework and guiding questions during the study. Thus, the researcher incorporated an emergent design using principles of inductive logic. Inductive logic is "reasoning from the particular to more general statements to theory" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 11).

Participants

The research participants were selected based upon purposeful sampling. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), purposeful sampling provides the researcher with "reasons (purposes) for selecting specific participants, events, processes" (p. 137). Since these participants were identified as mentors, it was likely they had a better conceptualization of the mentoring relationship.

A group of campus recreation professionals from the Midwest were contacted for the study ($N = 5$). The participants consisted of four directors and one assistant director of university campus recreation programs. These professionals were identified by the researcher based on the following criteria: (a) they worked in campus recreation as a director or assistant director, and (b) are identified as a mentor in one of two ways.

First, the participants were identified by their protégés as mentors in a previous study by Bower and Hums (in press). This type of sampling, commonly used with a phenomenological study, is called "criterion" sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Miles and Huberman, "criterion" sampling works when all individuals studied represent people who have experienced the phenomenon forming the basis of the

study. Since these campus recreation professionals were identified as mentors, they logically experienced the phenomenon of the mentoring relationship.

Second, the participants were identified through a typical strategy for purposeful sampling called, "snowball or chain sampling". According to Miles and Huberman (1994), the purpose of "snowball" or "chain" sampling is to "identify cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information-rich" (p. 28). Since these campus recreation professionals were identified as mentors, they were more likely and able to provide an information-rich account of the mentoring relationship.

The sample size for this research project was five. This sample size was based on the recommendations for a phenomenological study. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), "if you are doing a phenomenological study with three very long interviews with participants, you would be unwise to have a sample of more than three to five people" (p. 138). The research design allowed for an increase of the sample size in the event the phenomenological study did not "yield rich, in-depth details about lived experienced" or a participant withdraws from the study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 138).

Other researchers suggested two criteria for determining the number of participants for a phenomenological study. Seidman (1998) labeled the first criteria as "sufficiency". "Are there sufficient numbers to reflect the range of participants and sites that make up the population so others outside the sample might have a chance to connect to the experiences of those in it" (p. 47)? In this study, the participants were from the Midwestern states, were of both genders, and had a wide variety of experiences. The second criteria used by many researchers is saturation of the information (Douglas, 1976; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Saturation of the

information is "a point in a study at which the interviewer begins to hear the same information reported" (Seidman, 1998, p. 48).

Access and Entry

According to Creswell (1998), "in a phenomenological study, the access issue is limited to finding individuals who have experienced the phenomenon and gaining their written permission to be studied" (p. 117). Creswell (1998) further explained that, "because of the indepth nature of extensive and multiple interviews with participants, it is convenient for the researcher to obtain people who are easily accessible" (p. 117). In this research study, for example, the researcher found five campus recreation professionals who were mentors and who could articulate their mentoring experiences

Creswell (1998) indicated that "gaining access to the site or individual (s) . . . regardless of the tradition of inquiry" (p. 115) requires several steps. First, permission was sought from the Human Subjects review board. This study received approval from the University of Louisville Human Studies Committee. Second, campus recreation professionals who were identified as mentors were informally approached at the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) conference regarding their desire to participate in the study. Third, those participants interested received a letter (Appendix A) describing the purpose and procedures of the study. Fourth, the researcher scheduled three separate interviews with each participant during the months of August, September, and October. Fifth, at the initial interview, the participants received another copy of the letter describing the purpose and procedures of the study. Finally, the researcher proceeded with the interview at this meeting after an informed consent form (Appendix B) was signed by the participant.

Pilot Testing

The initial mentoring interview procedures for this study were developed and used in a prior study (Allen, Poteet & Burroughs, 1997). Allen et al. (1997) examined mentoring from the perspective of the mentor. The participants for that study were employees from five different organizations ($N = 27$). The organizations ranged from municipal government, health care, financial, communications, and manufacturing. Questions were revised to reflect a campus recreation setting for the current study. A pilot of the interview was conducted to check for any problems with either procedure before data collection.

A pilot study consisted of one mentor from the campus recreation professionals recommended through the sampling process. The wording of interview questions was revised from the results of the pilot study. Since this was an emergent design, questions were added at the completion of each interview. Constant comparative analysis allows for those additional questions to be specific to each participant.

Data Collection

Although many qualitative studies rely on multiple ways of gathering data, phenomenological studies typically use a series of in-depth interviews (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). This research study relied on in-depth interviews for its primary means of collecting data. Demographic information was also collected from each participant.

Demographic Information

Demographic information was collected using forms developed by the researcher. The researcher used a background data collection form to determine the following for each participant: (a) gender, (b) age, (c) race, (d) highest level of education obtained, (e)

current job title, (f) number of years in campus recreation, and (g) number of years at current university (See Appendix C).

Phenomenological Interviews

The phenomenological genre uses a specialized interview technique in searching to define the meaning of lived experiences for several individuals about a concept of the phenomenon (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). According to Rossman and Rallis (2003, p. 190), a "phenomenology assumes that shared experiences have an effable structure and essence. Interviewing elicits people's stories about their lives." Van Manen (1990) further noted there were two purposes of the phenomenological interview which included, (a) "a means for exploring and gathering experiential narrative material . . . for developing richer and deeper understanding of a human phenomenon" (p. 66), and (b) "a vehicle to develop a conversational relation with a partner (interviewee) about the meaning of an experience" (p. 66).

Seidman (1998) recommends three iterative interviews for each participant for the phenomenological data-gathering process. The model of in-depth, phenomenological interviewing involves conducting a series of three separate interviews with each participant. Seidman (1998) indicates that "people's behaviors become meaningful and understandable when placed in the context of their lives and exploring the meaning of an experience" (p. 11). Patton (2003) further indicates that without context there is little possibility of exploring the meaning of an experience. Mishler (1986) indicates researchers tread on "thin contextual ice" when they propose to explore their topic with one interview. For the current study, the researcher used three iterative interviews.

106

Each interview was 90-minutes long. According to Schuman (1982), anything less than 90 minutes for each interview seems short and does not allow participants to reconstruct their experiences. When using the three-interview approach, it is recommended to space the interviews over a 2-3 week period (Seidman, 1998). Seidman (1998) also indicated "as long as a structure is maintained that allows participants to reconstruct and reflect upon their experience within the context of their lives, alterations to the three–interview structure and the duration and spacing of interviews can certainly be explored" (p. 15). Thus, the researcher interviewed the participants in August, September, and October due to the travel involved with the study.

Interview one. In the first interview participants narrated their personal life histories relative to the topic up to the present time. The researcher asked the participants to tell her about their lives up until the time they become a mentor, going as far back as possible within 90 minutes. Since the topic of the interview study was the mentoring experiences as a campus recreation professional, she focused on asking questions pertaining to the participants' past experience as protégés. The researcher asked questions such as "During your career, has there ever been an individual who has taken a personal interest in you and who has guided, sponsored, or otherwise had a positive and significant influence on your professional career development? and "What were some of the benefits of being mentored by this individual?" (See Appendix D for additional questions.) By asking these questions, the interviewees reconstructed a range of constitutive events from their past experience as protégés which placed their participation in the mentoring relationship in the context of their lives. Demographic data were also collected during this interview.

Interview two. The second interview included bringing the narrative to the present by focusing on specific details of participant experiences of the topic. The participants situated their experiences within the context of their social settings. The researcher asked questions such as "How many protégés have you mentored?" and "Please describe the reasons why you have served as a mentor to others." (See Appendix E for additional questions.) By asking these questions, the interviewees provided their experiences as mentors.

Interview three. The third interview consisted of asking the participants to reflect on the meaning of their experiences about the phenomenon of the mentoring relationship. Specifically, participants were asked about the factors which influence the willingness to mentor females among university campus recreation professionals. According to Seidman (1998), the third interview examines "the intellectual and emotional connections between the participants work and life" (p. 12). Essentially the mentor integrated the two previous interviews. The researcher asked questions such as "Think about your protégé experience and think about your most successful mentoring relationship. What factors made those experiences such a success?" and "How did this successful mentoring relationship end?" (See Appendix F for additional questions.) By asking these questions, the interviewees began to look at how the factors in their lives interacted to bring them to their present situation.

<center>Data Analysis</center>

The research study analysis was shaped by the phenomenological framework of the study. A phenomenological analysis requires the researcher to approach the data with an open mind while seeking what meanings and structures emerge (Rossman &

<center>108</center>

Rallis, 2003). According to Van Maanen (1990), "when we analyze a phenomenon, we are trying to determine what the themes are, the experiential structures that make up the experience" (p. 79). Thus, a categorical strategy of analysis was used for the research study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). A categorical strategy of analysis is one which emphasizes the development of analytic categories (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The categorizing strategies "identify similarities and differences among the data, coding and sorting them into appropriate categories" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, pg. 273). The identity of these themes were derived inductively based on regularities found in large amounts of data (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In a phenomenological study the strategy is often called "meaning categorization" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Data Analysis Procedures

Reducing the interview data was the first step in allowing the researcher to present the interview material, analyze it and interpret it (Wolcott, 1994). The researcher used four phases (organization, familiarization, categories/themes, coding) of a qualitative analysis in gaining a deeper understanding of the mentoring relationship. The researcher also used the constant comparative method of analysis throughout the study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

The constant comparative method is linked to grounded theory, although, "The constant comparative method of data analysis is widely used in all kinds of qualitative studies, whether or not the researcher is building a grounded theory" (Merriam, 2001, p. 18). The constant comparative method is a type of analysis focused on ". . . identifying categories and on generating statements of relationships" (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993, p.

256). This was done by comparing all data collected and coding it throughout the study. The information coded into categories was compared with previous information coded in the same categories. This process continued throughout data analysis.

Organizing the Data. The data were transcribed following each interview. The researcher organized each transcript by the interviewee's last name. The transcripts were entered into the qualitative computer software system called HyperResearcher 2.0. The software allowed the researcher to rely on a thematic organization, pulling together the data from all five participants. The researcher kept a list of the data collected throughout the study. The researcher also kept notes following each interview. The notes provided the following information: (a) interview location, (b) interview date, and (c) interviewee identity. The researcher also wrote down analytic ideas throughout the study in a journal.

Familiarization with the Data. According to Rossman and Rallis (2003), "thoughtful analysis demands a heightened awareness of the data, a focused attention to those data, and openness to the subtle, tacit undercurrents of social life" (pg. 282). The researcher read and re-read the transcripts to review the data. The focus of this reading and re-reading was to begin to code and categorize data describing the mentoring relationship. This process was continued until all fifteen interviews (five people x three interviews) were transcribed, coded, and categorized.

Generating Categories and Themes. Categorization provides an organizational structure for narrative presentation of phenomenological interview data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The researcher used inductive analysis to identify salient categories within the data. The inductive analysis allowed the researcher to explore where little was known

about the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This allowed the researcher to gain further understanding of the mentoring relationship phenomenon (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Since the constant comparative approach was used throughout the study, each interview built on the next to further confirm or modify pre-existing categories. Themes began to emerge during intensive analysis and categorization of data. The themes from the research questions were integrated with the personal life histories in developing an overall picture of the factors which influence the willingness to mentor females and males in campus recreation. Both categorization and thematic analysis are often thought of as coding data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003).

Coding. According to Rossman & Rallis (2003), "coding is the formal representation of categorizing and thematic analysis" (p. 285). A code is "a word or short phrase that captures and signals what is going on in a piece of data in a way that links it to some more general analysis issue" (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). By coding the data, the researcher discovered a clear understanding about what words and/or phrases illustrated and elaborated key concepts.

<div align="center">Plausibility of Study</div>

Trustworthiness is the quality of research that convinces others to pay attention to the researcher's findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To establish the "trustworthiness" of a study, Lincoln and Guba (1985) used the terms "credibility," "transferability," "dependability," and "confirmability," as the "naturalist's" equivalent for "internal validity," "external validity," "reliability," and "objectivity" (p. 300). Several of these methods were used to strengthen the "trustworthiness" of the study.

Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate credibility involves whether or not research is believable and is worth the attention of other researchers. One of the methods used in this study to provide credibility was authenticity. Authenticity means giving a "fair, honest, and balanced account of social life from the viewpoint of someone who lives it everyday" (Neuman, 2000, p. 31). Authenticity was established through tape-recorded conversations of the interview. Following each interview, "verbatim transcription" was used to collect the qualitative responses (McCracken, 1988).

Second, the three-interview structure incorporated features which enhanced the accomplishment of plausibility of the data: (a) the interview process placed participants' comments in context, (b) the participants were interviewed every three weeks to account for idiosyncratic days and to check for internal consistency of what the participant had to say, (c) the experiences of the interviewees could be connected and checked against one another, and (d) if the interview structure allowed the participants to make sense to themselves as well as the interviewer, then it has gone a long way toward plausibility (Seidman, 1998).

Third, interview questions for the study were used in a previous study by Allen, Poteet, and Burroughs (1997). The questions were modified for campus recreation professionals and then piloted tested before being used in the current study.

Fourth, the constant comparison method was used to strengthen validity. This included establishing categories and placing participant responses or actions from the interviews into broad classifications which eventually cultivated into themes.

Transferability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate transferability is the ability of other researchers to understand and transfer the findings to another group of individuals. Transferability was established through "thick description." Thick description enables readers to transfer information to other settings and determine whether the findings can be transferred because of shared characteristics (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

The "thick description" from the methods in Chapter III provided the information necessary to consider whether or not the findings could be generalized to a similar population.

Dependability

The dependability of the study relied on the method of external auditing. External auditing allowed the dissertation committee to examine the researcher's interviews and reflective notes during the process.

Confirmability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate confirmability depends upon the researcher's ability to consider subjectivity within the context of the trustworthiness of the findings. To promote confirmability, the researcher made every attempt to limit the bias and premature conclusions through the use of constant comparative analysis, external auditing, member checking, and rereading the data. The researcher also made a conscious effort to remain neutral in verbal responses and body language as the interviews were conducted.

Using these multiple strategies for gathering information, the researcher was able to strengthen the plausibility of the study while minimizing the chances of systematic bias.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to discover factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship within campus recreation. Interviews were conducted with five campus recreation directors from universities throughout the Midwest. Three interviews were conducted with each director. Round one consisted of questions focusing on the personal life history of the mentor as a protégé. Round two consisted of questions focusing on the current experience of the mentor as a mentor. Finally, round three consisted of questions focusing on the meaning of the mentoring relationship. The study focused on the following research questions:

(1) what were the individual reasons for mentoring women within campus recreation?

(2) what organizational factors inhibited or facilitated mentoring women within campus recreation?

(3) what protégé characteristics attracted mentors within campus recreation?

(4) what outcomes were associated with mentoring women within campus recreation?

The chapter is organized into six sections: (a) personal life history portraits including demographic information, the mentors' experiences as protégés, and their personal histories as mentors, (b) a matrix followed by an analysis which includes

themes, categories and examples from transcripts constructed from the research questions (one section for each research question); and (c) the mentor reflections of the mentoring relationship from their experiences as a protégé and mentor. The researcher now introduces each mentor by providing individual personal life history portraits.

Personal Life History Portraits

The personal life history portraits gather information about the experiences of the mentor as a protégé. This section is divided into three subsections: (a) demographic information, (b) the mentor as a protégé, and (c) personal histories as mentors.

Demographic Data

The first subsection of the personal life history portraits includes a detailed analysis for each mentor including, gender, age, race, educational background (including graduate assistantship information), official job title, number of years in campus recreation, number of years in current position, and number of years at current university. Demographic information is found in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Data of Mentors

Data	Doug Booster	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Gender	M	F	F	F	M
Age	46	49	52	59	36
Race	White	White	White	White	White
Undergraduate Degree	Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	History/ Political Science	Broadcast Journalism
Masters Degree	Teaching	Recreation Management	Physical Education	Education	Recreation
Official job title	Director	Director	Director/ Asst Dean	Director	Associate Director
Number years in campus recreation	24	25	29	32	17
Number years at current university	24	23	29	26.5	7.5
Number years in current position	21	23	12	5.5	3.5

Donald Booster. Donald Booster was from a public university with approximately 20,000 students. He had a Master of Arts degree in Teaching and a Bachelor of Science in Education with a concentration in teaching, coaching, and recreation. At 46, he was a well-respected veteran in the field with 24 years experience at the same university. He began his career in campus recreation as a Graduate Assistant for two years and as an Assistant Director for one year at his current university. At age 26, he became the Director of Intramural and Recreational Sports. He has been in this position at his current university for the past 21 years.

Rachel Sizemore. Rachel Sizemore was from a private university with approximately 8,500 students. She had a Master of Science degree in Recreation Administration and a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education. At 49, she had worked in this male-dominated field for 25 years. Her career in campus recreation included jobs at two other universities. At one university she became a Graduate Assistant and the year following her Graduate Assistantship she became the Coordinator of Recreational Sports at another university. Finally, she became the Director of Recreational Sports at her current university. She had been in this position for the past 23 years.

Kelly Bond. Kelly Bond was from a public university with approximately 25,000 students. She had a Master of Science degree in Physical Education and a Bachelor of Science in Physical Education. At 52, she had overcome adversity in a male-dominated field while helping to build one of the top recreational sports programs in the United States according to NIRSA standards. She began her career in campus recreation as a Graduate Assistant. She was hired at her current university as an Assistant Director of Campus Recreational Sports. She was an Assistant Director of Campus Recreational

Sports at her current university for two years before becoming the Director. She had been the Director for the past 12 years. Two years following her promotion to Director of Campus Recreational Sports, she was given the title of Assistant Dean of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. She had been at her current institution for 29 years.

Carmen Stellar. Carmen Stellar was from a public university with approximately 22,000 students. She had a Masters in Education and a Bachelor of Science in History and Political Science. At 59, she was recognized as a historian of women in the early days of recreational sports. She was one of the earliest women voted in as a member of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). Similar to Bond, Stellar began her career at a period of time when it was unusual to see women working in a recreational sports facility. Carmen was first a high school teacher. Eventually she decided to leave teaching and to return to school where she began her career in campus recreation as a Graduate Assistant. Upon graduation she was hired as Supervisor of Women's Intramurals and Administrative Assistant at the university where she was currently employed. Carmen became the Director of Recreational Sports after 26 years in the recreational sports program at the university. Overall, she had been in campus recreation for a total of 32 years.

Ted Vister. Ted Vister was from a public university with approximately 20,000 students. He had a Masters degree in Recreational Sports Administration and a Bachelors degree in Broadcast Journalism. At 36, he held one of the most unique positions in campus recreation. He had been the Associate Director of Sports Facilities and Recreational Services for the past three and half years. The position was unusual in that

it not only had recreational sports responsibilities (80%) but also administrative responsibilities for campus sport facilities (20%). His position, however was not in the athletic department. Ted began his career in campus recreation as a Graduate Assistant. Eventually he became an Assistant Director at a private university. He left the private institution for a position as Assistant Director of Sports Facilities and Recreation at the university where he was currently employed. He had been at his current university for seven and half years and in campus recreation for 17 years.

Mentor Experiences as Protégés

The second subsection of the personal life history portraits of the mentors provides experiences of the mentor as a protégé. The information included in this subsection includes number of mentors, gender of the mentor, initiation of the mentoring relationship, structure of the mentoring relationship (formal/informal, meeting place, times a week, etc), mentoring style of their mentor, mentoring characteristics of the their mentor, and sustaining of the mentoring relationship. The mentors' experiences as a protégés is found in Table 2.

Table 2

Portraits of the Mentor Experiences as a Protégé

Indicators	Doug Booster	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of Significant mentors	3	3	1	1	3
Gender of mentor (s)	M/F	M/F	M	M	M/F
Mentoring initiation	Both	Mentor	Mentor	Hiring Process	Protégé
Structure of relationship	Formal	Both	Formal	Informal	Formal
Mentoring Style	Empowering	Nurturing/ Caring	Assertive/ Aggressive	Authority	Authority
Mentoring Character	Listening/ Leadership	Comm. Skills	Emotional Control	Org. Tasks	Work Ethic
Mentoring Relationship Sustained	No	25-30 years	No	No	2 of 4

Donald Booster. Booster had several mentors throughout his life, including those

while he was in school and during his career. His mentors were male and female. The

relationships were initiated by both the mentor and the protégé. One particular mentoring

relationship consisted of weekly one on one meetings which lasted for approximately one

hour. During this mentoring relationship, he had a set schedule of weekly meetings, but

his mentors also had an "open door policy." Booster provided an example of his most memorable mentor:

> I probably went to her [his mentor] office at least once a day. That is just kind of how I am. I'm a morning person. She was a morning person. A lot of times I would just like stop in at 8:30 or 9 o'clock to see what was going on. Just to catch up on everything. And that was outside of our structured time together.

Booster indicated that his mentor acted as a role model by providing him with ways to deal with stress and how to handle criticism, "I look at how my mentor handled the stress, how she handled criticism is how I know I learned that from her. I may not have the grace she [had] or react the same way [but] I personally learned a lot from that."

Booster continued by explaining how other mentoring characteristics he developed came as a result of how his mentor mentored him:

> Listening. [She had] a sincere interest in helping other people. [She was] willing to go the extra mile and help the kids out. [She would] sit down and talk, making time [for students]. Her [the mentor] leadership style was to have good strong directors and then let them run their own shop. She was not a micromanager. She gave you the information that you needed to know. Her expectations were very clear and then she allowed you the latitude to do the job in the way that you saw fit.

Booster indicated the mentor stressed the need for him to understand the importance of the "student learning imperative", where the mentor helps the protégé to acquire knowledge and skills which are necessary to work in campus recreation. The mentor helped to teach the philosophy of campus recreation. The mentors as protégés learned the reasons "why" behind what they did as a Campus Recreation Director. Booster demonstrated how his mentor helped to transmit "why" people do the things they do in campus recreation, providing strategies needed to succeed, and offering feedback on projects or presentations. Booster explained, "You just don't throw a ball and have a basketball league, to have a basketball league. . . . There needs to be some type of

learning." Since his mentor was no longer at the university, the mentoring relationship had not been sustained throughout the years.

Rachel Sizemore. Sizemore had several mentors throughout her life, including those while she was in school and during her career. Her mentors were male and female. The relationships were initiated by the mentor. Sizemore experienced formal and informal mentoring relationships. Her meetings consisted of structured and unstructured meetings. Sometimes she and her mentor would meet outside of school or work and other times in the office. She always knew there was an "open door" policy. Sizemore described the mentoring style of her mentor:

> I think nurturing and caring, interested still – maybe not so much now [in terms of] direct leadership or guiding because the relationship [is] a little bit different at this point but still more of a checking in, still [the] nurturing, caring concern kind of thing is still always there. It may not be originally in those worlds when they were in a more of direct supervision type position for me. They [her mentors] were more of a teaching role at that point in time. Now they're not so much in that capacity but they're still in the nurturing and friendship and support role.

Sizemore indicated her mentor demonstrated skills of how to properly communicate and deal with people, "You learn communication skills in the way they deal with people and in the way they relate to people. . . . The way they dealt with tough situations." Sizemore continued by saying, "I think probably the concept of always passing on to others and asking others to pass on to others is a concept that we always use." Sizemore indicated she learned many attributes from her role model [mentor] when she was a protégé:

> I'm sure many of the technical skills and things I gained I learned from working with people because I think if you continually surround yourself with good people and just take one or two good ideas from each person you meet, you become a better person each time that you do that . . . . I think in our field you can continually find wonderful models.

Sizemore's mentor "coached" her through setting up student leadership programs:

> Thinking back on my experiences with my mentor and her coaching me and helping me to see and to develop and to invest in me and showing me how she set up student leadership. . . . That direct link I'm passing [on] to others in the experiences that I've had.

Sizemore indicated her mentoring relationships have been sustained over the past 25 to 30 years.

Kelly Bond. Bond discussed how one mentor in particular was influential during her life as a student and throughout her career. The mentor was a male and the relationship began while she was a student. Eventually she found herself working under her mentor in the position as Assistant Director. The relationship was initiated by the mentor and was structured through weekly meetings in his office. Bond described her mentor as a "strong advocate in creating opportunities for women:"

> He was very assertive, very aggressive even. He had incredible passion. I think zeal is appropriate for him . . . and he was really dedicated to setting up the program here . . . and so again I would choose to say very aggressive in trying to identify students that had this same interest in the non-athletes.

She described herself as a "product of a very intentional outreach." The intentional outreach was around 1973-1974 following the passage of Title IX in 1972. This intentional outreach was happening all across the country. The national governing body of campus recreation, NIRSA, was just emerging from a ten year ban on women joining the organization. Most universities did not have positions for women in campus recreation because few women participated in sport activities in a recreational setting. This is why it was not a surprise when Bond indicated her institution did not have a position specifically for women's intramurals. She described how her mentor provided leadership to women in engaging in recreational sports:

My mentor was aggressive about establishing that opportunity and expecting women to be brought into recreational sports and to provide leadership to other women at all levels of engagement in recreational sports . . . whether it was volunteerism, hourly wage employment, graduate assistantships, professional positions, presenting, writing, anything that has visibility.

Bond indicated a professional friendship could not truly evolve into a social friendship during her role as a protégé:

We really laid ourselves bare in personal and professional ways. But it never really became social friendship. You know let's go out to dinner. Oh let's go see a movie. I'll take you to this outing since we both have to go – let's go as couples you bring your spouse and I'll bring mine. No it never really evolved to that. It was a business friendship.

Bond used her experience as a protégé to depict a mentor who "immersed" himself into the program. She continued to describe several qualities which illustrate the benefits she received from her mentor. These qualities led to the success of her program which is one of the top campus recreation programs in the nation. She explained her program qualities, "There is a commitment to being thorough and to quality and pursuit of excellence . . . tremendous attention to detail . . . problem solving . . . . A tremendous sense of responsibility . . . learning about time management . . . . Learning about judgment and decision making . . . emotional control."

Bond also shed light on another side of her mentor. Bond explained how important it was to provide feedback, but there were also a way of providing the feedback:

Being genuine in how one provides feedback and what I really appreciate from my mentor was honesty, but there were also elements of unnecessary brutality taken to an extreme that became unhealthy. But I greatly appreciate the kernel of truth that was shared and the way that was motivational and stretching and growing for me. . . . It is odd to know how to describe it because there were – it was "I know you can do this" but it was more the prodding style, the whip style, not the carrot per se and when the carrots were thrown and they were valid and

were wonderful to receive, but it was more the intimidation style of motivation and derision. So it was a love-hate relationship.

Bond continued to explain how the mentoring relationship eventually ended:

> The relationship [still] exists but the nature of our relationship has changed [friendship not mentorship] and we aren't really in proximity enough for natural mentoring to take place, and because of the evolution of our duties there's been enough separation of time and duties that we've just not sustained the relationship at the same level.

Although Bond did not continue in the mentoring relationship, she indicated she was currently being mentored by others:

> In my mind when I think of mentor, I think I just naturally go to someone who is older and more experienced. But that's not how I'm mentored right now. I'm actually being mentored by my staff, and I just have a greater awareness that that's an avenue of mentoring. . . . I do not have one mentor, one person that I would look to [and say], oh that's my mentor. Probably the closest to it, because of the nature of work relationship, would be the Associate Director.

> Bond's mentors provided her with the academic background for writing and

making presentations: "There were benefits such as learning about how to make

presentations and how to prepare articles."

Carmen Stellar. Stellar was unique in this study in that she never directly said she

had a mentor. As the researcher began to talk about different people throughout her life,

however, it seemed there were mentoring qualities from one man she mentioned. This

person hired her for her current position as Director of Recreational Sports. They did not

have weekly one-on-one meetings and there was no indication that a real relationship

evolved. Stellar did use her boss to provide examples throughout the analysis which

makes the researcher suspect it was really a mentoring relationship. For example, Stellar

indicated her boss was good at completing organizational tasks which was something she

took pride in doing well herself. She further explained how that trait was important to mentoring, "I think completing organizational tasks is most important [to mentoring]."

Stellar explained the need to teach by guiding: "I saw the opportunity to teach some new skills, develop the new skills, give them [protégés] some kind of – see that they could do it."

Ted Vister. Vister mentioned three professional mentors who were influential in his life. The mentors were male and female. His first mentoring relationship was with a male football coach. This mentoring relationship was initiated by him when he was a 9th grader and wanted to be the manager of the football team. Vister explained his initial experience with the person who eventually became his first mentor:

> I can remember to this day that it was raining like heck outside. And I got out of the car and was scared to death and my mom kept pushing me saying, go on Ted, go do this. And so I walked in and he was busy and his secretary was there . . . and so I explained to her who I was and Coach gave me five minutes. He said, "I have never had anyone do that before and I welcome the opportunity to work with you. Call me when we get ready to start up summer ball conditioning." And that is how it started.

Vister explained this mentoring relationship did not include meetings on a consistent basis. He explained, "Ted, you have three or four days to figure out what you do, so here are the keys and go to it."

Vister described the mentor as being open, but very demanding. "He allowed me to make mistakes, but he evaluated that mistake after you made it. I mean he was very stern, he was very disciplined, his expectations were high." Vister reflects on these by responding, "It's amazing I'm saying this and I'm thinking this is exactly the same way I am now – exactly." Vister continued to explain characteristics of his first mentor:

> There was a lot of structure, but there was a lot of fun as well . . . . Coach was always smiling, and still does to this day. Coach is very friendly, is very open,

but very demanding. But, he does it in such a subtle way that you got the message. He could look at you and you got the feeling around him. I mean, he had that authority about him. And I respected that greatly, still do.

The second mentor mentioned by Vister was a female who was the Director of Student Activities and Recreation programs at a small university. This mentoring relationship was initiated by Vister during his freshman year in college, and they met daily in her office. He described how she was the one to open his eyes to recreation.

> She took me immediately under her wing and opened up a world of recreation to me that I never knew existed because prior to that, it was all varsity athletic based. There wasn't any kind of recreational base at all. She was the one (not NIRSA) that opened my eyes to recreation . . . didn't even know what NIRSA stood for. [I] couldn't schedule a tournament, couldn't do anything, had no knowledge of any kind, and still did a good job on organizing it.

When it came down to it, this mentor "provided" the means for Vister to really focus on making campus recreation his field. Vister provided an excellent example of how his mentor motivated him to pursue a career in campus recreation:

> I got into a conversation with my mentor about how I liked journalism but if I didn't do that I would really like to do what I'm doing here [recreational sports]. She was the one always pushing me. Saying that there are careers in this and I didn't know a lot about it, but here are the resources. She sent me to my first NIRSA conference in Cincinnati, OH in 1988. . . . [I was] a junior in college at that point and she paid for everything personally because we couldn't afford it financially.

Vister indicated she was very similar to his first mentor in allowing him to take things and run, but she was authoritarian at times. Vister explained, "She was the first person to say "Ted you did this wrong, and [I] don't agree with this, and why are you doing it this way." I didn't agree with how she managed me. Vister continued to explain the mentoring style of his mentor, "She was very authoritative, it's my way or the highway guys. And so it was a challenge in that I had to change the way I was in my beliefs to understand what she wanted."

His third mentoring relationship was with a male. The mentor was the Associate Director of Recreational Sports at a major university. Vister met him through a graduate assistantship. He explained his journey about flying three hours away to a national conference in another state to interview for the graduate assistantship position, even though the university he was interviewing for was only a one hour drive from his current residence:

> I thought that was the stupidest thing, but it was great. They forced my hand; they wanted to know what my commitment was. They told me that afterwards. So, I got the job and I learned most, I think most of what I am as a professional.

Vister explained this mentor as a "walking genius" in the field of campus recreation. "He works very much 'hands on.' And that's [what] I love about him. He also has the unique ability to get those around him involved as well. And keeps them motivated. His motivational techniques are good. [He] looks at the big picture." The true amazement was with the work ethic of this mentor, "The man's amazing. He's truly amazing. The man has a work ethic like no other human being I've ever known."

Vister continued by displaying an interesting portrait of this particular mentor by explaining, "He is so great. . . . He works very much 'hands on.' . . . His motivational techniques get people around him involved." Vister's mentor did provide him with qualities which he inherited as a protégé:

> I learned work ethic, patience, responsibility certainly, and I guess the last one would be the big picture mentality – knowing where you can make a difference and knowing where you can't. And I've learned to pick my battles. Primarily from mentors or primarily from supervisors.

Vister cited advantages to serving as a mentor: "Learning and education. . . . The norm is totally very active participation in things. . . . We offer our students whether male or female every opportunity to professionally develop themselves."

Vister summarized by indicating three of the four mentoring relationships were

sustained and are still going strong today:

> Three of the four I still talk with pretty much on a weekly basis. One of the four
> maybe every six months or so. So I guess with that one no. I think the mentoring
> relationship or the mentor/mentee relationship from them to me on that situation
> has decreased somewhat. The other three – the other ones are still active and still
> going big time.

Personal Histories as a Mentor

The previous section was a reflection of the mentors' personal life histories as

protégés. This section provides insight about each mentor personal history as a mentor.

This subsection is divided into the following areas: (a) number of "significant" protégés,

(b) the structure of the mentoring relationship, (c) number of years in the mentoring

relationships with protégés, (d) the initiation of the mentoring relationship, (e) successful

features of the mentoring relationship, (f) advice about the mentoring relationship, and

(g) characteristics of the ideal mentor. The mentors' personal histories as a mentor are

found in Table 3.

Donald Booster. Booster's protégé experience ultimately led him to mentoring

others within campus recreation. For example, Booster was currently mentoring six

"significant" protégés within campus recreation. Those relationships were prominent

because the relationships lasted between "12 to 15 years." Booster believed the

mentoring relationships were ones where the protégé motivated him to keep going. It

was as if he was benefiting as much as the protégé was from the relationship:

> I think I probably get more out of it [the mentoring relationship] than they do. It's
> just, I think one of those reasons I like being at a college is the eagerness kids
> have to learn. It kind of invigorates me, and motivates me and keeps me going.

Booster indicated the only unsuccessful mentoring relationships he has been involved in were due to students leaving school:

I have [had unsuccessful mentoring relationships] with a couple of kids who quit school. . . . We worked closely and they just – there was a lot of external factors that – small town influence, friends at home – their parents influence was more influence than I could help with.

Table 3

Personal Histories as a Mentor

Indicators	Donald Booster	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of significant Protégés	6	30	4	8	20-25
Gender of protégé (s)	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
Length of Relationship (yrs)	12-15	2-20	22-28	5-30	7 1/2
Mentoring initiation	Mentor	Both	Mentor	Both	Mentor
Ideal characteristics of Mentor	Listening	Listening Compassion Interested	Caring Emotional Intelligence	Sincere Caring Patient	Listen Caring

Rachel Sizemore. Sizemore's protégé experience ultimately led her to mentoring others within campus recreation. For example, Sizemore was currently mentoring 30 "significant" protégés. The relationships were prominent because they were sustained between two and 20 years. The sustained mentoring relationships were informal. The

initiation of the mentoring relationships was mutual between the mentor and the protégé. Sizemore explained that the relationships were sustained because the individuals themselves were ready to be mentored:

> The person that I was mentoring was in a situation where she was ready to be mentored – I mean she was open to a new challenge – just kind of found a profession at the right time.

Sizemore had several successful mentoring relationships including those she currently mentors in the Assistant Director position. Sizemore admitted one relationship was unsuccessful and created problems:

> I don't know if I would call it a mentoring – I've really only had one assistant director that was really a bad situation and I actually wouldn't really consider it mentoring. I would usually consider those people that come to that position – that I would try [to] mentor.

Sizemore indicated the ideal characteristics of a mentor were a reflection of her as a mentor, and they helped to develop part of her mentoring philosophy:

> I think caring, compassionate, interested. Ability to listen . . . so I think somebody that is willing to put aside the business of their day and stop when people need whatever they need. You know maybe just to talk, maybe just to crash, it may be just to listen.

Kelly Bond. Bond's protégé experience ultimately led her to mentoring others within campus recreation, although her experiences did not lead to her philosophy of mentoring:

> The different people that we've brought into the division have come through a different time where collaboration really is the norm, where it isn't as top down, it really is very participatory, and while in principle I've always embraced that and that has been I think more characteristic of my preference – that was not how I was mentored in leadership. It really was [that] the old school of information is power, information was not to be shared, that the leader was supposed to be the decision maker and be direct.

Bond indicated she was currently mentoring four "significant" protégés. These relationships were prominent because they were sustained between 22-28 years. Bond explained the relationships were sustained due to several reasons:

> Truthfully . . . perseverance. Because it wasn't easy. Common goal. I mean fundamentally now – a willingness to be taught and a willingness to contribute. And a willingness to question. Personal – taking personal responsibility. Meaning the person just didn't tell me what to do and I'll go out and do it . . . it was really an interactive process. Mutual respect. And really independence not dependence. But realizing it is a relationship and it wasn't lopsided. And the one that I'm thinking about has been sustained for quite a long time. I guess I will say I've been also fed by the relationship – it's really not been one way. I would say also then mutually affirming. I think we've both been provoked to grow.

She also indicated there were "scores" of students who were protégés, but those were not sustaining relationships:

> There were scores of students. Like every president of the student recreational sports association for the period of time I was the advisor of the steering committee of the Spirit of Sports All Nighter – every president and a handful of key chairpersons from that steering committee . . . graduate assistants.

Bond believed the relationships with these protégés provided her with additional insight on what she did not know:

> It's [the mentoring relationship] very humbling because you find out how much you still don't know. And how much you make mistakes. And how needy you are . . . and how tough it is to receive. It is a heck of a lot easier to give. Very difficult to receive.

All her mentoring relationships were developed through contact with protégés as students, graduate assistants, or staff members. The mentoring product evolved as a product of the hiring process as Bond explains:

> Some of the protégés with whom I've developed a mentoring relationship were hired into positions and it wasn't that I – "okay I'm going to mentor you." Most of this for me has been because of the nature of my position. As a result of the search process and then the day to day working relationship the mentoring took place.

Although Bond had several successful mentoring relationships, she had her fair share of unsuccessful mentoring relationships. Those mentoring relationships ended due to many reasons:

> Well, first of all we really didn't choose each other. There are relationships that get established by positional responsibility and this is a person who was the chair person of a program and I was the advisor. Being the advisor often carries with it a mentoring role. Really had a lot of neat things to come but lacked a graciousness about that. [I] was bothered by any real or perceived deficiencies in me. You know so by virtue of feeling, I didn't have anything to offer then "don't need you, don't want you, it's my show, stay out of the way." So yeah it was pretty tough. Gratefully in that relationship it was one year . . . the event's over, the roles concluded, and that's the end of that.

Bond indicated the ideal characteristics of a mentor were those which were a reflection of her as a mentor, and they were the building blocks for her personal philosophy:

> I think fundamentally you've got to have people that care about other people. And who have a pretty understanding of their own ego. Not real significant deficits in self-esteem or confidence. The need for attention. So I guess we are speaking about emotional intelligence.

Bond continued to focus on the character of the mentor:

> Every ounce of attention is focused on what is that person's character and how can we discern that character . . . fundamental character qualities of trust, honesty, care, humility wherever possible, then I think you're good to go.

Bond also mentioned something very important in regards to mentoring protégés:

> Don't make assumptions. I mean just, period. About what the person needs, what they want, what you have to give, what has worked in the past. I mean I really think that doing the best to be in the moment and fresh I think you draw on your experience but you don't let your experience dictate what's going to happen today or tomorrow.

Carmen Stellar. Although Stellar was not mentored in a traditional fashion, she ultimately became a mentor within campus recreation. For example, she responded to the number of "significant" protégés she was currently mentoring, "The ones that probably

are still outstanding are probably about eight. Not saying that there have not been more."

These relationships were "informal" as Stellar explained:

> Everything has been very informal. Should we [have a formal mentoring program?] Not necessarily. Somehow they just – it happens. I think the closest thing that we've had structure wise is when Doris Bannon was Vice President of Region III [referring to NIRSA] and she started the mentor/mentee program and we were matched up with a graduate student – a professional graduate student. And usually we would meet up – call them during sometime during the year hopefully it would be at the national conference, take them to dinner.

Stellar also indicated she was still mentoring those individuals, "I'm still mentoring all of those individuals in some way, shape, form, fashion." Those mentoring relationships have lasted from 5-6 years to 25-30 years and were initiated by both parties. Stellar believed the relationships were sustained for one particular reason:

> Just plain and simple chemistry between the two individuals was there. I know you can go back and look at all the characteristics we shared. There was a serious part of work and then there also was the fun part. It was the after hours type of activities as well.

Stellar believed these mentoring relationships resulted in lifelong learning, "Lifelong [referring to the mentoring relationship], you may be teaching them certain things, but they are teaching you." Although the four other mentors in the study experienced an unsuccessful mentoring relationship, Stellar indicated she has never been in an unsuccessful mentoring relationship.

Stellar described the ideal characteristics of a mentor. These characteristics were reflective of her as a mentor, and they were the building blocks for her mentoring philosophy:

> I think they [mentors] need to be sincere, caring and [a] patient teacher[s]. I think they've got to develop – there's got to be mutual trust and commitment from them [the mentors] developing that mentoring. I think you really need to be patient with them [the protégés]. And I think of all the things, yes, you need to motivate, you need to inspire them. I think it goes back once again to teaching.

Ted Vister. Vister's protégé experience ultimately led him to mentoring others within campus recreation. Vister indicated, for example, that he was currently mentoring approximately 20-25 "significant" protégés and 95% of past mentoring relationships were sustained today:

> I would talk to most of those people at least once a month whether it's via email, whether it's via the telephone and it's not so much done from a mentor/mentee situation . . . sometimes I'm calling them asking them for advice too on things that we have going on.

He continued by discussing factors which made the mentoring relationship a success:

> Listening. Listening at a time when I felt that individual needed some ears. Allowing that person to make mistakes on his own. And without butting in and without – allowing him to make those mistakes but also allowing him to correct the mistakes after he acknowledges [the] mistakes and this is long but allowing him to do that on his own without me saying "you made this mistake I would do this." Giving – making them understand a worldly concept I think is what made it successful as well. I think those are the big three things.

The majority of his mentoring relationships were developed by him approaching the protégé:

> The majority of them [mentoring relationships] are me going to them [protégés] and just trying to get them to open up a little bit. Some of these too are what people hear from other people who've I helped, who[m] I've served. This is particularly from people in the association [NIRSA] who I've met. . . . I'll get a call from somebody saying 'hey you did an article about this in 1997 what do you think about this' and that develops into more and more and more and suddenly I'm talking to them quite often and they are asking all sorts of things and I'm helping them. But I would say that I'm probably the instigator for the most part.

These mentoring relationships were not structured, but developed over time. Vister explained, "People just stop in. With me once I make that relationship known to them that I'm willing to do that, your people (protégés) will stop in after the fact."

Although Vister had several successful mentoring relationships, he had his fair share of unsuccessful mentoring relationships. Those mentoring relationships ended due to many reasons, as Vister explained:

> I believed in the person and I shouldn't have. And what I mean by that is I put a lot of trust and faith into that individual and it came back to bite me because I don't think that individual was mature enough to handle that relationship at that point in their lives. And the other I'll talk about was just a personality conflict. It was a situation where it was a female. She did not have the work ethic and I did not know that until she came on here. And she fooled us like you can't imagine. It was frustrating and I felt like a failure because I couldn't see it – nobody saw it. She just came on campus and just that's it – end of story – I'm done. I've got what I want out of this [job] and I'll take my paycheck and go home. It was awful.

The majority of the mentoring relationships were ended either because the individual received another job or graduated.

Vister reported the ideal characteristics of a mentor were a reflection of him as a mentor, and they provided support for his mentoring philosophy:

> I think the most important thing is the ability to listen and not judge what you're listening. The ability to sit there and just look you in the eye and just not only take in but to understand what you're receiving from the person that is talking to you . . . again caring, somebody that is very honest.

Analysis

The mentors in this study were from private and public universities ranging from approximately 8,500 to 24,000 students. The mentors had masters degrees ranging from Recreational Sports Management to Education. The mentors were all Directors or Associate Directors who had a variety of responsibilities in recreation and/or sport facilities.

The average age of the participants was 48 with a combined average of 25 ½ years in the field. The average age of the participants is significant because it indicates

the majority of the mentors were a part of the 1950s – 1970s which were difficult times for women in campus recreation since it was an extremely male-dominated field during those years. The years 1950-1975 represented a period of time which was truly pioneering. Women were banned from the only national campus recreation organization, the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) in 1959, not returning until 1970. This was a time when mentoring was especially important for women in the field, but there were limited opportunities. If opportunities for mentoring did occur they were from the men in the field of campus recreation. The mentors were also loyal to their current universities with a combined average of 23 years of service and 13 years in their current position.

The portrait of the mentors as protégés indicated three out of five had at least three significant mentors. One of the mentors as a protégé had one significant mentor and the other mentor as a protégé indicated she really did not consider anyone a mentor to her. Although she did not consider anyone a mentor to her, she did mention her boss as a professional figure in the field during her early years. This professional relationship was the closest this mentor as a protégé had towards a mentoring relationship.

Four of the five mentors as protégés indicated the relationships were initiated as Graduate Assistants and continued throughout their professional life. The other mentor as a protégé developed her relationship as a professional. It is not unusual for protégés to find their first mentor when they are Graduate Assistants. In the field of campus recreation, the best way to begin is through a Graduate Assistantship which pays for college and also provides a possible route for a position in campus recreation following graduation.

Three of the five mentors as protégés were mentored by males and females. The other two mentors as protégés were mentored or professionally developed by a male. This is not unusual considering there were limited numbers of females to be mentors during the timeframe of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The women in this study who excelled obviously found mentors who were dedicated to the equality of women and men in the field of campus recreation.

Two of the five mentors as protégés were approached by their mentor in initiating the relationship. One mentor as a protégé initiated the mentoring relationship with his mentor. The final mentoring "professional" relationship developed through the hiring process. In most cases the mentor was the one initiating the mentoring relationship. This is not unusual considering the campus recreation setting where the leader of the organization has so much one on one contact with students who are potential protégés.

Three of the five mentors as protégés had structured one-on-one weekly meetings which lasted approximately an hour. One of the mentors as a protégé had structured and unstructured meetings while the final mentor as a protégé had no meetings. The meetings usually took place in the mentor's office. There were times the mentor and mentor as protégé would meet outside of the university or work.

The portraits of the personal histories as a mentor included three of the five mentors having less than 10 "significant" protégés. The other two mentors had more than 10 "significant" proteges. The protégé were "significant" because the mentoring relationship was sustained for an average of 17 years. All of the mentors had mentored male and female protégés. Three of the five mentors initiated the mentoring relationship with the protégé while two of the mentors indicated it was mutually initiated. All five of

the mentors mentioned "nurturing" characteristics as ideal characteristics of a mentor. Those nurturing characteristics included listening, compassion, caring, and being interested in the protégés' experiences. These nurturing characteristics are a reflection of the mentors' mentoring experiences.

The researcher introduced the personal life history portraits including demographic data, mentors' experiences as protégés, and personal histories as mentors. The researcher now provides findings related to the four research questions: the individual reasons why the mentor's mentor women, the organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate the mentors' mentoring relationships, the protégé characteristics which attract the mentor, and the outcomes associated with mentoring women. Initially these questions were focused on women in campus recreation, but as the study progressed the mentors described how they did not mentor males or females differently. The only differences described were during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

This section is organized by providing a matrix for each research question followed by an analysis including themes and categories. The data analysis that follows provides examples from transcripts in "grounding" the themes.

Research Question One: What Are the Individual Reasons

for Mentoring Women?

The data findings for Research Question One are displayed in a matrix in Table 4. Three major themes emerged: (a) the mentors described struggling times for women in leadership positions, (b) the mentors described the lack of female leaders, and (c) the mentors described helping students learn and grow.

140

Table 4

Theme One: Struggling Times for Women in Leadership Positions.

The mentors as protégés provided responses directed specifically to females being in the male-dominated campus recreation field during the 1950s, 1960s, and the 1970s. This was a time when women were truly struggling.

Theme Two: Lack of Female Leaders

The mentors described the lack of female leaders as a reason for mentoring women in the early 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Today the lack of women in female positions was not as a prevalent reason to mentor women as it was in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

Theme Three: Helping Students to Learn and Grow

The mentors established the importance of wanting to help students in campus recreation regardless if they were female or male. It was necessary the mentor provided leadership in guiding, nurturing, and encouraging students to the next step in their lives.

The analysis of the mentors' responses to individual reasons for mentoring women follows and was developed through their experiences as a mentor and/or protégé. The themes and categories with examples are presented to support the matrix in Table 4.

Theme One: Struggling Times for Women in Leadership Positions

As illustrated in Chapter Two and at the beginning of this chapter, the 1950s – 1970s were difficult times for women in campus recreation because it was a male-

dominated field. The mentors described the years 1950-1975 as a period of time which was truly pioneering. Women were banned from the national campus recreation organization, the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA), from 1959 to 1970, so mentoring was especially important for women in the field, because there were limited opportunities. If opportunities for mentoring did occur they were from men in the field of campus recreation. Booster explained those times as times of limited opportunities for females in the sport industry:

> I think if you look back then there weren't many opportunities for women in sport, period. You look [and] that [time] was predominately male. Title IX didn't happen until 1975 [1972.]

Sizemore described the era as a time when there was "intentionality" of investing in women. She also explained this "intentionality" was slightly different today:

> I think, particularly 25 years ago, it was even more intentional type of involvement because [at] that point [in] time the involvement of females in sport and females in recreational sports, females in leadership and officiating, in just leadership positions within those within the ranks of recreational sports was not as strong as it is today. . . . I think probably the intentionality of bringing up women and developing and investing in women is something that is not quite done with the same intentionality as it was 25 years ago."

Sizemore continued to explain how "intentionality" is not needed as much today:

> I think that "intentionality" is not needed as much today as it was 25 years ago. An example in our program includes our leaders and supervisors who decided to change our coed volleyball rules to eliminate the 'one female must hit the ball rule' because they feel at this point our female athletes are as strong or stronger than our male athletes as such that rule is no longer needed to protect the female athlete . . . it has taken 20 some years to get to this point.

The mentors described the individual reasons for mentoring women as "cause driven" during this era. Bond illustrated this by explaining how women went through a period of time which was truly the "pioneering time" created special relationships that

were "natural." These distinctive set of experiences motivated women to mentor other

women:

> I think the names that I've shared with you [referring to her mentors] have been sustained because we went through a period of time that was truly the pioneering time and so it kind of galvanizes a special relationship and it was natural. . . . I think it is just something that happened because we really lived through a fairly distinctive set of experiences. . . . I think that the distinction gave us a bond that we've continued. . . . Mostly I have gravitated to women. And I think it still probably somewhat "cause driven." The advancement of women and their experience in leadership.

Along the lines of the pioneering experience, Stellar illustrated how NIRSA and the state

organization commemorated and remembered a legacy of women in leadership:

> When you relive that [the experience of allowing women in NIRSA] with these peers, protégés, you know you are continuing to build memories and cement the relationship. So we keep in relationship and that has helped the mentoring.

Vister believed women were mentored to help in the advancement of women in

leadership positions:

> I know men still dominate the field especially within a NIRSA affiliated institution in a campus recreation setting, but women are catching up. The latest statistic saw about 60-40 as far as the numbers but that's incredible. I think that's great. I think more opportunities – more women are becoming directors so they are put in those leadership roles or associate directors. They're being forced to take on a mentor role and a mentor position and I think most women excel in that.

Vister continued by providing an example of his own issues of not having a female in a

leadership role:

> I think we do need more women [in mentoring positions] and I think we need – but again it's tough and I'm speaking with my own department. I don't have a woman in a leadership role. And that's the negative side of what we have. . . . I just get the sense that they [female protégés – employees] are not as comfortable [with men as leaders.] I can't prove that – I don't have analysis to back that up. I just wish I had that person there – that female in that leadership role there that could do that.

This theme illustrated that although these mentors believed there were more struggling times for women during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the mentors also believed there may be issues with women in leadership positions today. Thus, the struggling times women encountered in being a part of campus recreation and moving into leadership positions during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, and to a lesser degree the current underrepresentation of women reflected a reason why mentors' mentor women in campus recreation today.

Theme Two: Lack of Female Leaders in Campus Recreation

The mentors described the lack of female leaders as a reason for mentoring females within campus recreation. Booster believed the lack of female leaders was crucial when it came to why people mentored women during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, "I think that's how whatever relationships they [women] had they [women] would have had to develop [through mentoring.] I would think that was crucial back then."

Sizemore indicated there was a different perspective on mentoring women to help them advance in leadership positions in the 1950s, 1960s, and/or 1970s as she illustrates:

> I do think probably it [mentoring to advance women] was different in the 1950 – 1960's. Seventies I think – and that was when I was coming up in the 70's – I think by the 70's I don't know that was necessarily an intentional thing but I think it was probably a little bit more of influence than it is now. But today I don't think it [mentoring to advance women] has that much of an impact. But early on I'm sure it probably was. . . . And I think the early women in our profession were there for a reason. I think and I'm guessing probably those early women would say that there was a different feeling.

Bond illustrated how mentoring created opportunities for women during the 1970s:

> It [mentoring] was very intentional. There's no question. It was my mentor who was deliberate and a strong advocate in creating opportunities for women. Let's consider the era that I'm referring to. This was in 1973-1974, 1972 pretty banner

144

year in terms of affirmative action. And so right on the heels of that this institution (Ivy University) didn't have a position specifically for women's intramurals. And so my mentor was aggressive about establishing that opportunity and expecting women to be brought into recreational sports and to provide leadership to other women at all levels of engagement in recreational sports. Whether it was volunteerism, hourly wage employment, graduate assistantships, professional positions, presenting, writing, anything that had visibility. It was a product of a very intentional outreach.

Stellar provided an example of how it felt to be an administrator in the 1960s and the 1970s. This example illustrated how there was a lack of female representation in campus recreation during the 1960s and 1970s: "You go to the Big Ten meetings and it would be primarily men administrators and one female, maybe two. So you were just trotting along your own ground. Sometimes the men would make you feel inferior."

Vister provided an overview of the field of campus recreation which illustrated its lack of female leaders:

> We are in a very male dominated field – that's kind of the old boys network and that is an old boy not an old girl's, it is an old boys network. I think women have come very far in the field. Although it's my opinion, it is still a difficult avenue for women to follow. It is still male dominated. . . . I see women struggle sometimes. Not from a job performance standpoint. It is just trying to find their way in a very male dominated field and that is what this is.

This was one reason Vister strived to mentor women. Vister said, "I personally try to identify women who I thought would be strong leaders in the field."

This theme illustrated that the lack of female leaders from the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, was an individual reason for mentoring women within campus recreation. The mentors indicated mentoring was crucial in helping develop women into stronger leaders during that time period.

Theme Three: Helping Students Learn and Grow

The mentors described having the desire to help students regardless if they were male or female. The mentors expressed ideas about how people in this profession need to be committed to working with students. They need to have a genuine interest in helping students develop and mature.

Booster mentioned, "You do need to commit the time to try and help influence these kids. You know if you don't, I think you're doomed." Booster proceeded to describe how important it was to give back to the profession, "I think anyone who is going to be in a leadership position you need to give back to the profession. One of the best ways you can do that is being a mentor."

Booster not only believes that it was important to mentor students to help them grow, but it also helped him to grow as a mentor: "You know probably I think I probably get more out of it than they do. I think one of the reasons I like being at a college is the eagerness kids have to learn. It kind of invigorates me, and motivates me and keeps me going."

Sizemore expressed the need to invest in students beyond providing them with the basics in order to succeed in the field:

> I love working with people and investing in people . . . but when I got to Ivy University, they coined the term student development or student enhancement. Everything we do is intentional about trying to develop our students beyond just throwing out the ball, here's a league, here's a bracket, here's a tournament. I think for me, the nurturing role was just very natural for me.

Sizemore indicated helping people develop and grow were important reasons for mentoring people, not just women:

> I think developing people and helping people grow . . . so investing in people and sharing that and loving them and going beyond the classroom, beyond the

workforce, beyond begging them to work for me tomorrow to teach swimming lessons, is just kind of the very natural thing for me to do.

Sizemore continued by explaining how she cared about the students, "I just care about kids – I want them to have that relationship – I want them to succeed in life – I want them to be happy." Sizemore also indicated it was important for students to learn and grow so they may eventually become mentors:

> Because if those people then also mentor others and they give back to others and it continues and continues and continues. So the circle is never broken so it's just like putting money in the bank, it keeps growing, growing, and growing. And so the pay back is huge not only for you personally and professionally but for your organization and for future organizations. So it's a wonderful thing.

Bond has a few different ideas when it comes to student development:

> I think you just live out your values. And one of them happens to be a developmental approach that recognizes the choices we make impact other people positively and negatively. I think our field lends itself to give back and wanting to help along the way, nurture, and encourage others to do things that way.

Bond also expressed the greatest joy in mentoring is watching students grow and succeed:

> That is [watching students grow and succeed] probably the greatest joy is watching that change take place to discovery. And even the difficult growth. You know for me the pleasure is how people walk through the valleys not just the mountaintops. So it is wonderful to celebrate when I think people are flying and things have gone well, their presentations got accepted after they worked so hard to prepare the proposal or the event really comes off better than expected, all those are great. And then so, too, is watching someone handle serious disappointment and setback. And just falling on their face, hitting the wall, picking themselves up and dusting off. I was hard pressed to say that's probably even the bigger satisfaction.

Stellar supported the need to help people. Stellar explained, "I think there was a need there. I saw the opportunity to teach some new skills, develop the new skills, give them [the protégé] something they could see that they could really do it." Stellar reiterated the importance of seeing the protégé grow and succeed:

That's [the] whole purpose of what you're doing it for. If you didn't want to see them grow and succeed then don't do it. I'm looking back at the one person again and how this person has developed now into [I think she is] an Assistant Vice President. I think that's her title. But now [she] is also in charge of the [student] union and some other student organizations as well as rec sports.

Vister explained how he liked to help people by giving back what he had gained, "The human side of this is that I just enjoy helping people. You know everybody says this but you always want to give something back that you've gained."

Vister also stressed the importance of seeing students grow and follow in his footsteps:

I think there is no greater pleasure that any person in this field has [than] to see one of their students somewhat follow in their footsteps is I guess a good way to put that. Students you've directed, you've been involved with two, three, four years and now see the light at the end of the tunnel. And they come to you and you're an integral part of their first step in their career.

Vister then explicated the "joy" of achieving success with protégés:

To see people get it, to see people just in their eyes, it hits them and they get it and they understand it. And to know that you're a part of that, and know that you brought that to their lives. There's nothing better.

This theme illustrated the need and desire for mentors to want and see students grow and succeed in the field of campus recreation. Mentors wanted to see students develop into fine leaders within the field of campus recreation and pass the knowledge onto others within the field.

Analysis

The mentors utilized their experiences as protégés to develop their individual reasons to mentor women within campus recreation. The mentors described struggling times for females within campus recreation during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The mentors described a male-dominated field where women were not seen as leaders and mentoring was crucial. Today, the field is not as male-dominated, but is still lacking in

148

female representation in leadership positions. This is where mentoring continues to be important for females. Finally, these leaders entered the field of campus recreation for reasons and these reasons included working with students. This explained the mentors' consistency in describing the need to help students grow and succeed regardless of their gender.

The second research question addressed organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate the mentoring relationship. A matrix is followed by a supporting analysis.

Research Question Two: What Organizational Factors Inhibit or Facilitate

Mentoring Females within Campus Recreation?

The findings for Research Question Two are displayed in matrix found in Table 5. Two major themes emerged: (a) the mentors described inhibiting dimensions, and (b) the mentors described facilitating dimensions.

Table 5

Matrix for Research Question Two: What Organizational Factors Inhibit or Facilitate Mentoring within Campus Recreation?

Theme One: Dimensions Which Inhibit Mentoring

Category One: Barriers to Women Advancing within Campus Recreation

Category Two: Mentoring Style of the Mentor

The mentors described inhibiting dimensions from the perspective of the protégé and mentor.

Theme Two: Dimensions Which Facilitate Mentoring

Category One: Support for Women

Category Two: Professional Development Opportunities

The mentors described facilitating dimensions from the perspective of the mentor. The mentors described how important "support" in the organization was to women. The mentors also indicated professional development opportunities, such as workshops and developing new skills were important for both male and female protégés.

The analysis of the mentors' responses to inhibiting and facilitating factors follows. These responses were developed through their experiences as a mentor and/or protégé. The themes and categories with examples are presented to support the matrix in Table 5.

Theme One: Dimensions Which Inhibit Mentoring

The first theme was described to the researcher from the perspective of the mentor as a mentor and/or protégé. The first theme included two categories: (a) barriers to women advancing and (b) mentoring style.

Category One: Barriers to Women Advancing Within Campus Recreation. The mentors described barriers women experienced in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s as organizational factors which inhibited mentoring relationships. Booster described his experiences observing how women went through these obstacles to finally be recognized and rewarded with opportunities at his current university:

> I think I guess I've kind of seen it [women moving into leadership positions] evolve since I've been here over 20 years. I think when I first came here in student affairs there were five primary administrative positions. They were all [male] – the vice president was a male and all five big administrator heads were all male. I've seen it [women moving into leadership positions] evolve where they [upper administration] saw the need to diversify and give women the opportunities in these [leadership] positions

Bond explained organizational factors which inhibit the mentoring process for women from her experience as a protégé. When she was a protégé, it was a pioneering time for women because campus recreation was initially male dominated:

> We [women] had no where to go but up because there wasn't a systematic involvement of women. It was a response to male interest for the sport experience not how do we allow for, cultivate, even determine what women wanted out of a recreational sports experience. . . . So I know that initially it [campus recreation] was very gender driven and it was difficult to overcome the obstacles and history of discrimination.

Sizemore indicated there were still barriers which could hinder the mentoring relationship:

> I think there [are] still barriers and I think there's still obstacles there [women reaching leadership positions.] And there probably always will be as long as there are men. But I think there's a lot more opportunity also and there's a lot more

open mindedness. But they're [barriers for women to advance] still there –
they're [barriers for women to advance] not ever going to go away. But they're
not nearly as great or as prevalent and it's more the rare case.

Stellar indicated she did not think there were any obstacles or discrimination which

inhibited the mentoring relationship, but she could not remember 32 years back.

Vister explained his experience with organizational factors which inhibit the

mentoring process for women started within NIRSA:

> I don't go to NIRSA general session anymore. I just don't do it . . . . One of the
> first NIRSA conferences I went to in Cincinnati and this was 1988/1989 . . . .
> There was a speaker – I can't tell you what the guy's name was but he was very
> biased against women in the speech and I took it as that. And his tone was that he
> made an analogy and I can't remember the exact analogy it was but he made an
> analogy somewhat that degraded not just women but minorities in general.

This category describes the challenging times women faced in the 1950s, 1960s,

and 1970s within campus recreation. Women were not accepted within the field of

campus recreation, and therefore were not rewarded with the same opportunities as men.

The category also described how women have fewer obstacles and discrimination today

and are given more opportunities within leadership positions. Finally, although the

obstacles and discrimination are not as prevalent today, they can still inhibit the

mentoring relationship.

Category Two: Mentoring Style. The mentors indicated mentoring style as an

inhibiting dimension if the style is not conducive to the students. Booster believed the

mentoring style could play a role in individuals approaching mentors. Booster explained

what he thought a protégé looked for in a mentor in terms of style, "I think [protégés]

look for someone that is going to think [I will] listen to them, that can [I] appreciate the

position that they are in."

152

Sizemore made several remarks pertaining to the style of a mentor: "I think that allowing yourself to be available is important . . . . I'm not a power person." Sizemore continued by explaining a story about a previous employer who held certain expectations which were not important in her eyes as a protégé:

> The one thing that bothered me about Ivy University, I'll tell you this was not my style at Ivy University, it was so formal. You had to have your desk cleaned off, you had to have everything prim and proper and it was so "Miss Professional" and it was so funny cause you know I could get into that mode real quickly. . . . I can be "Miss Professional" if I have to be that way, but I don't think that's necessarily conducive to mentoring students. You know that's not my style.

Bond believed mentoring style has something to do with why people seek others out:

> I do think style has a lot to do with who people seek out. I absolutely do. I think there's a comfort level, there's . . . some common ground – there are just personality styles and preferences [and] I think people kind of gravitate toward a comfort zone . . . sometimes its emotional need and comfort. Affirmation. Attention. Reinforcement. Kick in the seat of the pants. Discipline. But one thing is for sure what I do see as being common is "investment".

Vister believed mentoring style was important to the mentoring relationship:

> If I give off the presence or somebody just sees one portion of me that I'm standoffish or I'm not caring by all means they're not going to come to me and ask for that input. And that's why I have an open door policy. That's why – I'm just speaking personally for me, I talk to staff, I talk to men and women alike. You know how's your day going, how are your classes going, those things.

Vister reiterated the need for a mentoring style which is caring within the organization:

> I want the department that I work in and to create the atmosphere that we care about them and we do. It's not a fake atmosphere at all. It's a caring atmosphere that I want to create. Sometimes I don't have the time to do that. And that's frustrating. Students look at that as "well he doesn't care." And that's not what I want to create.

Vister also mentioned the need to have an authoritative mentoring style. Vister explained, "And there are times when I have to be rough. The stepper breaks and nobody tells anybody who's responsible. Well, somebody needs to pipe up and figure it out."

This category describes how the mentoring style can be an organizational factor which inhibits the mentoring relationship. The mentoring style may intimidate a potential protégé. An authoritarian type of style may lead to conflict between a supervisor and his or her employee. The category also explained a "good kick in the butt" is warranted for students who are not willing to "follow the rules."

Theme Two: Dimensions Which Facilitate Mentoring

The directors described the second theme from the perspective of the mentor as a mentor and/or protégé. The second theme included two categories: (a) organizational support for women, and (b) professional development opportunities.

Category One: Organizational Support for Women. The mentors described "support" from the boss and fellow workers as a key component for helping women establish themselves within campus recreation. Today, mentors are just as important in providing support for young females and males in the profession as in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s when women were extremely underrepresented in the field. The need for support was evident from all of the mentors interviewed during the study. Booster provided this example of the support for women in the field through his dedication of being serious about his female employees' interests:

> To me if someone has an interest in something, like one of my staff people, then I owe it to them to take a genuine interest in what that is, because obviously it is important to them. You know like BPW [Business Professional Women], I may not know a whole lot about that myself, but if it is important to her [female employee in his office], then it should be important to me, too.

People sawBooster as someone who could sympathize about some of the issues women

faced due to his experience with an organization on campus:

> One thing that really kind of helped me is that I was named to the first
> Commission on the Status of Women at the University of Long Island. I think
> they had three males on it [the committee]. That is when people [professional
> women on campus] saw that I was on that committee, organizationally, not
> students as much . . . and [women] looked at me a little bit different. And in a
> positive manner, it was kind of like "hey here is someone who can sympathize
> with some of the issues in this position."

Sizemore believed she developed from her protégé experiences. The protégé experiences

helped her develop a philosophy supporting women in her organization today:

> Some of the things that I experienced [when I was a] young professional, women
> are experiencing now, whether it is in rec sports or just in general, it definitely
> gave me experience. It [protégé experiences] has definitely given me empathy and
> an opportunity to share those experiences with others, and to help them [women]
> hopefully, to bridge the gap or improve upon their experiences in their lives right
> now and to make things better for them.

> Bond illustrated the need to show organizational support for women through her

experience as a protégé. The mentor indicated support from her boss as a key component

for women to advance within campus recreation. Bond described the importance of her

boss helping her through difficult challenges in this male-dominated field:

> My mentor was dedicated to women in leadership. He was the most affirmative
> of anyone I know, and he was the one that influenced the institution to move in
> this direction. He influenced our national association [NIRSA] to recognize how
> provincial the thinking was in the terms of women being excluded from
> membership.

> Stellar believed in providing support to her Associate Director and providing the

necessary tools for females and males to advance within the organization. Stellar

explained:

> I'm trying to provide the necessary tools such as monies for professional
> development, encouragement of taking the leadership classes that are offered here
> on campus, being involved with campus committees. You can hear so much but

the doing portion, being involved is what really captures I think the essence of things.

Due to the male-dominated staff he had this year, Vister explained there was not a woman other females, or males for that matter, could go to. Vister explained it would be nice "to have a woman or female in an administrative role that females could go to talk with." Vister continued to explain, "If a woman doesn't think she is supported [within the organization], she needs to know she is respected."

This category illustrates the need for support of women within the organization This organizational factor which facilitated the mentoring relationship provided information for those individuals who may desire to be a mentor. Mentors need to support females as they pursue a career in campus recreation. This support may be through awareness of female interests and/or needs within the organization. A mentor may want to re-evaluate his or her current practices and determine if this support is genuine or present within the organization.

Category Two: Professional Development Opportunities. The mentors provided professional growth for female and male protégés through their mentoring relationships. Booster explained the key to professional development was finding out what the professional growth opportunities may be and helping the protégés pursue them in a timely manner:

> I think to me every employee is different in that they have different goals, they have different aspirations. I know my fitness coordinator has taken the past few years an interest in developing some specialized classes, such as Pilates. I've helped her get different training . . . we pay the Business Professional Women dues for our business manager.

Sizemore indicated that professional development opportunities in the 1970s and 1980s were targeted towards women:

I think earlier on in the 1970s maybe even in the 1980s there . . . used to be a women's breakfasts, women's lunches, professional – there used to be more working moms, working whatever – there used to be a few more things targeted for women and professional development opportunities that were more targeted.

Sizemore continued to explain there were not professional development opportunities targeted towards women today in campus recreation:

I don't see that nearly as much anymore. . . . You know I don't think [there] are or I haven't found them [professional development opportunities targeted to women] but I really don't think there are specific things that are targeted for women per se too much.

Sizemore further illustrated there is not a need for professional development opportunities specifically geared towards women because there is not a difference between the needs of men and women anymore within campus recreation: "And I'm thinking probably because I don't know that there is a specific need or difference for men and women anymore or as much."

Bond described professional development opportunities, including workshops and conferences as factors which serve to facilitate the ability to mentor women:

Organizationally we try to identify ways to support people with resources that further their development and we do workshops [one of the in-service workshops for staff this year is on mentoring] and send people to conferences and have growth opportunity plans and structure the organization in ways that try to help cultivate growth that is specific to the individual.

Bond also hypothesized how the upper administrative staff expected their employees to be mentors. "We put people [employees] in situations where they're expected to be mentors. So that you learn what it is to be both the mentor and a protégé." Bond also took pride in her structured mentoring program set-up for the graduate program:

The graduate assistantship program I think is a really strong example of a very intentional mentoring process – of bringing students in while they are getting their degrees and giving them an assistantship and work experience and an immediate staff parallel who is a mentor.

Stellar pointed out providing professional development opportunities for females

and males was essential during this stage of her professional career:

> Within our organizational structure currently I am looking to the Associate
> Director more [for] that particular function [mentoring]. And I'm trying to
> provide the necessary tools such as monies for professional development,
> encouragement of taking the leadership classes that are offered here on campus,
> being involved with campus committees. You can hear so much but the doing
> portion, being involved is what really captures I think the essence of things.

Vister agreed professional development opportunities were organizational

factors which facilitated the mentoring relationship for women in campus recreation to

get women involved:

> When you're talking about professional development, you're talking about
> opportunities to present at conferences and those sorts of things, but I look at
> professional development even more than that. I look at professional
> development even within our own institution, getting them [protégés] on campus,
> getting them [protégés] visible, getting them [protégés] out there, leading – the
> more opportunities we can do with that – the much better we are.

Vister provided an example of his GA's experience with professional development:

> We just had one of my young ladies [sic] who is a GA here on campus, Annie,
> who came in here right before we started, we sent her down to take the certified
> calibrator exam over the weekend and she was just glowing about the opportunity
> to do that and we paid for it.

This category described how important it was for the mentors to offer professional

development opportunities to their protégés regardless if they were male or female. These

professional development opportunities were geared toward helping the protégés obtain

leadership positions.

Analysis

The themes introduced in this section included organizational factors which

inhibit and facilitate mentoring within campus recreation. The first theme introduced

gendered and non-gendered categories to organizational factors which inhibit the mentoring relationship: (a) barriers to women advancing with campus recreation, and (b) mentoring style. The categories differed in terms of gendered and non-gendered responses depending on the time the mentor described. The first category, barriers to women advancing within campus recreation, displayed gendered responses which evolved during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s when women were not accepted within the field of campus recreation, and therefore were not rewarded with the same opportunities as men. This lack of acceptance into the field led to an inhibiting factor to mentoring relationships during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Although the barriers are not as prevalent today, the mentors indicated they can still inhibit the mentoring relationship.

In the second category, mentoring style, the mentors provided non-gendered responses and introduced mentoring style as a factor which may inhibit the mentoring relationship. This category determined the authoritarian style of leadership may intimidate the protégé into not pursuing a relationship with the mentor. The mentors, however indicated the mentoring style may need to be disciplinary at times if the protégé does not react in an appropriate manner. For example, the protégé might need a good "kick in the butt" as Bond put it to get the "ball rolling" in leading to the protégé's true potential.

The second theme introduced organizational factors which facilitate mentoring within campus recreation: (a) support for women in campus recreation, and (b) professional development opportunities for advancement. This theme illustrates the need for organizational support for women especially in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Today, the need for support is not as prevalent for women. Support is needed for females as well

as males within the organization. Professional development opportunities were also mentioned as a facilitating factor in the mentoring relationship. The mentors stressed the importance of providing professional development opportunities for males and females to gain skills needed to excel and advance with the organization. The key to providing the professional development opportunities was to realize the needs of each individual person within the organization. For example, if a protégé was located in "fitness" then it would be important to allow the protégé to pursue professional development opportunities with those organizations focused in the fitness area.

The third research question addresses protégé characteristics which attract the mentors within campus recreation. A matrix is followed by a supporting analysis.

Research Question Three: What Protégé Characteristics Attract Mentors

Within Campus Recreation?

The characteristics which attract mentors within campus recreation data are displayed in a matrix in Table 6. Three themes emerged as mentors described (a) personality indicators, (b) motivational factors, and (c) campus recreation skills were not a necessity.

Table 6

Matrix for Research Question Three: What Protégé Characteristics Attract Mentors within Campus Recreation

---

Theme One: Personality Characteristics

Category One: Attitude of Students

Category Two: Integrity

Category Three: Protégés who were People-Oriented

Category Four: The Protégés ' Willingness to be Mentored

The mentors described distinctive characteristics related to the personality of the protégé. It was important to see these characteristics in the individuals whom they mentor.

Theme Two: Motivational Characteristics

Category One: Work Ethic

Category Two: Sharing Success and Enabling Others

The mentors described characteristics of the protégé which were inspiring and allowed others within the organization to see their passion.

Theme Three: Campus Recreation Skills were not a Necessity

The mentors described how "skills" specific to campus recreation were not characteristics which necessarily attracted them to the protégé. Skills were a part of the development process while they were a part of the organization.

The analysis of the mentors' responses to the protégé characteristics which attract mentors is presented below. These responses were developed through their experiences

as a mentor. The themes and categories with examples are presented to support the matrix in Table 6.

Theme One: Personality Indicators

The mentors described three characteristics which reflected what they would like to see in a protégé. The first theme included four categories: (a) attitude, (b) integrity, (c) people-oriented, and (d) protégés' willingness to be mentored.

Category One: Attitude of Students. The mentors described positive attitude as an important characteristic which attracted them to the protégé. The mentors indicated positive attitude was often missing with the students within campus recreation because of the misconception of it being an "easy" field. Booster illustrated an example of how an attitude could play a difference in the mentoring relationship:

> Don [a student employee] – he has been a four year project. He worked in the facility and was just kind of taking up space. And we fired him. And he came back and kind of had a little different attitude.

Booster demonstrated how a student with a good attitude may learn through constructive criticism and become a better worker in the field:

> [If] a [student had a] great attitude . . . basically had an open mind, they listened. I felt the person had tremendous amount of respect for me. [If a] person would take criticism constructively, didn't take it personally, and that's hard with a lot of students, then they can learn. Sometimes you tell them something negative and it's like you hate them and all that. But this person kind of took it for what it was, learned from it, moved on, and didn't make the mistake again.

Sizemore indicated if a protégé had a good attitude then she would be willing to invest in him or her:

> I think attitude is probably everything because if somebody has a positive attitude even if they're not particularly skilled as long as they're willing to learn and wanting to learn and have a desire to prove themselves and excited about whatever it is you're doing or want to do and want to be with you then I'm willing to invest in them. They [the protégés] could be the worst technically skilled

162

person[s] in the world but if they really want to and have an attitude then I'm willing to invest in them. So for me [positive] attitude is probably everything. If somebody has a bad attitude even if they're a terrific technician that usually doesn't mean a whole lot to me.

Bond remarked on how attitude can be receptive in mentoring the protégé with a positive or negative attitude:

I do know the likelihood of people coming together is increased by a positive attitude. But I will say I can see the opposite sometimes being just as compelling. Someone who is dour, rebellious, resistant, angry, fighting, can be interestingly compelling and mentoring material. And so frankly sometimes I see people being challenged in outreach to those who tend to be the most needy whether they recognize it or not. A positive attitude is the easiest to work with but often times the troubled soul is the more compelling person to seek out and to see indeed what is going on.

Bond continued to remark on the challenges of a protégé with a negative attitude:

Sometimes I'll take as a challenge a personality that is a little bit of a whiner you know, "chicken little", "the sky is falling" and try to undertake it as a little bit of a challenge. But if that really is their orientation toward life then I really don't want that around me. There is a difference between people who have difficult life situation that beat them down for a period of time and people who just have that outlook on life.

Stellar remarked on how students often display an attitude of "knowing it all" and those individuals are hard to mentor:

We have right now, this is my personal perception, many graduate students, many young professionals out in the field who think they know it all and they have all the answers. This generation is becoming very hard to mentor because of their attitudes.

Vister provided a good example of how individuals perceive certain personality attributes, related to attitude, may help in the campus recreation field:

I like people that come across cocky and not so much cocky I guess, very sure of their ability – confident I guess. Cause I've learned in this field that if you're not confident at times, you don't come across the way, you get eaten alive. And I've seen very few people who start out very timid that can change and become confident by the end of their tenure and their regime. . . . So certainly I think attitude has a lot do with mentoring anyone.

This category described how important the attitude of the protégé was in attracting a mentor. Does the student have a good attitude or does he or she think it is so easy he or she just does not need to learn anything from the mentor? This creates a challenge for those mentors and actually becomes a protégé characteristic not desired by the mentor. The mentors in this study attracted to students with a "good" attitude, regardless of gender, which consisted of wanting to learn and become better campus recreation professionals.

Category Two: Integrity. The mentors described how important it was for the protégé to be honest within the organization. Booster explained integrity makes it easy to invest in a protégé:

> I think if I see someone who is trying to do the right thing and doing it the right way, then I'm willing to invest some time in that person. If it's someone who maybe they come to class once a week if you're lucky, if they always try to con and get around you then I'm not as enthusiastic about that. Now I might sit down with them and they might get more of a kick in the butt you know. I think for someone like that the best thing that you can do, is give them give them a kick in the butt and say "the way you're going you're not going to get it done."

Sizemore indicated integrity was a definite protégé characteristic which she was attracted to:

> That one [integrity] goes right up there with attitude. Actually that is probably more important than attitude. So honesty and integrity are probably right up at [the] top on that. Because in any field or any profession or anything you do in life, your integrity and your honesty and looked upon as you know your value – worth – I think. It doesn't matter what you do whether you're a garbage man or you're a police officer or whether you're a life guard or whether you're a store clerk.

Bond described integrity as one of the most important indicators which attracts her to a protégé. "I'm really big on this notion of integrity. It doesn't mean perfection by any stretch."

164

Stellar indicated integrity was what a mentoring relationship consisted of. Stellar explained, "I think this is where you get your trust in a relationship. And respect in that relationship. That is [the] key."

Vister believed integrity was a strong characteristic which attracts mentors to protégés. Vister provided an example of an individual who did not have integrity." Vister explained, "I've been in situations where I was the mentee and then I learned something about an individual that I felt was a mentor I didn't like – that turned me off or turned me away. They didn't have integrity."

This category described how most mentors agreed integrity was more important than attitude. Being able to trust the protégés was an important characteristic which attracted mentors regardless of gender. This trust leads to the mentor being secure in pursuing the mentoring relationship. Once the security is in place, the mentor can be more confident and comfortable in the mentoring relationship with the protégé.

Category Three: People-Oriented. The mentors indicated it was important for the protégé individual to be able to work with people. This is especially important in campus recreation because of the amount of people the protégé comes in contact with throughout the day regardless of the specific area to which they are assigned. Booster indicated being "people oriented" was something he stressed in his entry level recreational sports class he teaches at the university:

> I tell people in my class all the time if you don't like working with people then get up, walk out of class, go find your advisor and change your major because you won't make it in this field. I mean what we are about is dealing with people. And not everyone is comfortable with dealing with people and that doesn't make them bad it just they won't be a success in this field. If they can't relate to people then they need to do something else.

Sizemore indicated it was important to be "people oriented" in this field to be successful:

In our particular field, yes. I think you'll be more successful if you are people oriented. I don't think you absolutely have to be people oriented but I think it sure helps. I don't think it is as important as the other two [attitude and integrity], but certainly a good characteristic to have.

Sizemore further explains most people would not be in this field if they did not want to work with people:

I don't think people would be in our field if they're not people oriented because unless you like people you're not going to do what we do. They'll find something else to do.

Bond explained how being "people oriented" was an important attribute to be successful regardless of the field and that it is difficult for those who have only technical proficiency to be able to provide mentoring, education or teaching:

I think that it [being people oriented] is an important attribute to be successful, period. I mean if they're – you can have such a technical proficiency, but if that's what you bring to the table apart from an interest in people and some people skills – [success is] extremely difficult. I mean there's likely a place for a person like that who is very technically proficient and process oriented but it's unlikely it will be in a leadership role. They may be able to manage things well and function efficiently and effectively but in terms of influencing other people and mentoring and educating and teaching, personally I would find that very difficult to expect from an individual that is heavily weighted on the content knowledge side only and not the people skill sides.

Stellar indicated people in this profession need to have "people skills". To Stellar it was a way of caring and giving back to people: "It's [people oriented] a good characteristic. I think that's why we are in this profession. You care about giving back."

Vister indicated "people orientated" individuals were more capable of making a difference in people's lives, "I know that they [protégés who are people orientated] can make a difference in somebody else's life. That [making a difference] is the sole thing right there. By learning to be "people oriented," Vister explained eventually the protégé

may have an impact on the lives of others: "[I think] they [protégés] can have an impact on others in their lives."

This category explained how important it was for the protégé to display the characteristic of being "people oriented." This was important because the campus recreation field requires a protégé to work with people every day. The mentors believe if protégés are not able to interact with people then this is not a field for them. Although being "people orientated" was important for this field, mentors also believed it was important for all professions.

Category Four: Protégés' Willingness to be Mentored. The mentors described the need for protégés to want to be mentored. Booster indicated the desire for the mentoring relationship needs to be there in order for it to be a success:

> They've got to have the desire. I mean they've got to. . . . This really kind of represents desire and their willingness to learn. I don't need a perfect person. . . . They've got to want the help, they've got to want direction. And they've got to be prepared [that] all of the direction they're gonna get is not positive. You know they're gonna get – get some criticism. They've got to be willing to accept that.

Sizemore explained how the mentoring process has to be a two way street with the mentor and protégé desiring the relationship:

> I think they [protégés] have to have the desire to [be] mentor[ed] as well. They have to be open and want to. I mean I don't think you can just pick somebody and say well I'm going to mentor you – it's gotta be a two way street.

Bond agreed there has to be a willingness to want to be mentored. Bond explained her experience by using an analogy of a teenager and a parent:

> Like oil and water [referring to the protégé willingness to be mentored]. And I don't know how to describe this really. Well, the description that comes to mind [is] analogous to me of a teenager just needing to break free from the parent. Where often times [they] really want it but they're they don't want it because they're trying to establish independence. And this feels too restrictive. It feels too 'I want to prove myself – you don't tell me what to do and how to do it. I

know.' And my belief was no they didn't know. And yeah I was going to intervene and the resistance was strong and sustained and very trying. Very difficult. Very difficult. And that protégé shall remain unnamed.

Stellar provided a specific example of the protégé desiring to be mentored through learning, "I think the willingness to learn." She continued, "I mean it's not doing any good if they [protégé] do not want to learn."

Vister described how the protégé may want to be mentored but he or she is just too shy or introverted:

> It's [willingness to be mentored] based on either them being shy or them being an introvert or them being – it's there it's within them and they want to come out with this so bad and they want that relationship but they just don't know [how]. I'm not very good at getting that out of somebody.

This category illustrated how the willingness to be mentored was an important characteristic desired by the mentor. The mentoring relationship is a two-way street where the mentor and the protégé work together. The category also illustrated the need for mentors be aware students may be shy or introverted and they do not know how to establish the relationship. This can be tough for many mentors who have to deal with this type of protégé. Other protégés may find the mentoring relationship too restrictive and boycott it. This was illustrated in the example provided by Bond in demonstrating the similarities between mentoring and parenting.

Theme Two: Motivational Factors

The mentors described motivational factors which inspired others within the organization. The second theme included the following categories: (a) work ethic, and (b) enjoying sharing success and enabling others.

Category One: Work Ethic. The mentors described the importance of the protégés' understanding the need to start from the beginning and work themselves up within the

organization. The mentors described the importance of emphasizing the work ethic in relation to the long hours throughout the week and the weekends common to campus recreation. Booster described his philosophy on work ethic:

> They [employees] need to have a work ethic. They have to be willing to learn the business from the ground up. I see some kids who aren't willing to get their hands dirty. They want to be administrators. They have got to be willing to start at the absolute bottom and work their way up.

Booster continued to explain his philosophy on what work ethic was all about by sharing an example of one of his protégés:

> The mentee had a work ethic. . . . Basically this person just kind of had all of the intangible qualities, viewed the job as something that needed to get done – didn't look at it in terms of hours whatever the job was we would go the extra mile to do what was needed. [That] in effect gained my trust and I knew if I gave this person something to do then I could forget about it cause it would get done. Not only would it get done – it would get done the way I wanted. It would get done the right way.

Booster continued to describe his experience as a protégé in moving up the ladder to his current position:

> I try to teach them by doing. . . . I think that one of my great benefits is I've did my graduate assistantship here [current university where he is director]. I've lined fields, I've washed jerseys. Everything anyone in the program is doing, I've done so that I think that really gives me some credibility with them.

> Sizemore indicated that work ethic was definitely an important protégé characteristic:

> Work ethic is definitely important. If people are not willing to give of themselves and give of their time and not worry about punching a clock and about being paid, they won't like our profession either.

Bond explained work ethic was an important protégé quality which attracts mentors:

> For me, it [work ethic] is not as much a workaholic. There are a lot of people that can work 'beaucoup hours' but that doesn't mean they're productive. It doesn't mean the outcome of the effort is meaningful. It can mean they are very busy and active and you know they have good intentions. I've got – I've had plenty of

people – I've been surrounded by a lot of people whose passion has been authentic but they are immature. Very frustrating. So their work ethic has been solid, but their grasp of the best way to do their work can be seriously lacking and that can be very frustrating. So they go and they're working, working, but that doesn't mean they're working on the right things in the best way. They can be stubborn as all get out and can often use the fact that they have this great work ethic as their crutch, their excuse. . . . And so the mentoring for me is trying to help them to see the difference between hard work and smart work.

Stellar believed work ethic was an important characteristic of a protégé. Stellar explained the importance of work ethic, "The work ethic is – you do whatever it is to get the job accomplished and if it takes staying hours into the night, you do that. If it takes working on weekends, you do that."

Vister explained how he expected a lot from his protégés in terms of work ethic:

I expect the world. I expect the universe and sometimes I only get a solar system or a planet or I don't know how you want to even put it. It's – that to me is the number one characteristic [work ethic] we have to have in this field and if you don't have it, you're not [going to] gain anything.

This category described how mentors expected protégés to have a good work ethic. Within this field or any other, the protégé needed to be able to put in the work to advance. It was expected individuals in this field to work the hours needed to finish the job in a respectable fashion. The long hours throughout the week and the weekends are common to the campus recreation field. If an individual does not have a work ethic or want to work the long hours or weekends, then campus recreation is not a field they should pursue.

Category Two: Enjoying Sharing Success and Enabling Others. The mentors described the need for protégés to be sharing and be happy for others who succeed within the organization. Booster indicated it was important for mentors to share their successes:

I guess I look at myself and I tell them I came here as a graduate student two years and 10 months later I was the director. And that I certainly wasn't ready

for. . . . I think we can inspire them, we help them along the way. Give them a hand up when they need, a kick in the butt when they need that too.

Sizemore explained a "ripple down" effect for enabling protégés to share in their success:

It [mentoring] is such a neat thing and they share also when you invest in someone else then they invest in someone else, someone else, and someone else so it goes on and on. It's just so wonderful to look out there and see just see all the different things and to see what you start or what somebody else actually has started because anything that I've invested in it's because somebody else invested in me and probably because somebody invested in them.

Bond explained, "I am typically attracted to individuals who enjoy sharing success. You know who really like enabling others, [and] who are developmental in their outlook and their approach."

Stellar explained how her protégé continued to give back to her staff. Stellar explained, "I'm thinking of my one protégé, while that protégé has gone on . . . she continues to give back to her staff and I'm certain it is going to continue."

Vister stated the mentoring relationship works when protégés begin to share their success and start enabling others to become better:

That's how you know it [the mentoring relationship] works in my opinion. Well, that's part of how you know it works. I mean your hope is as a mentor that your mentee or your protégé has some success in what they do and it is based on advice that you've given or based on the work that you've done for them – that's where we gain satisfaction as mentors and I mean you know that. I think that's a part of it.

This category described how mentors enjoyed seeing protégés who had the characteristic of sharing success. This theme described motivational factors of work ethic and enjoying success while enabling others. It was important to see the protégé "pass" the knowledge on to others so the success continued to grow. The third theme was campus recreation skills were not a necessity.

The mentors indicated skills were a great asset to have within a protégé, but they were not a necessity for obtaining an initiated job in campus recreation. Booster illustrated this concept by providing an example:

> Here's something that an old boss of mine showed me. I think if you've got skill, I think it is important but I don't think it is a big deal. My boss showed me – it took two pieces of paper and said one is the job and what it requires and this piece of paper is your skills. You are rarely going to find one that matches like this [overlapping.] What he would say or what he told me was not matter how it fit if someone had the right attitude and work ethic then over time you can get a match there.

The majority of the protégés Booster mentored were graduate students who had the skills needed to get the job done, "I look for someone who had the skills that I needed in our program and [recruited] . . . those people [who had] an interest in recreational sports."

Booster also provided reflections on his philosophy of mentoring a low performing (without skills) or a high performing (with skills) employee:

> I would take the low performer every time. . . . I think that is something I have always done or have tried to. The people that are not flashy, they're solid everyday, you can count on them coming in and doing what they need to do.

Sizemore indicated skills were a great asset for a protégé to possess, but having those skills were not the most important characteristic:

> Skills are nice but not important – I mean they are important – nice but not necessary, to put it that way. So that of all those would probably be the least important. Certainly nice but – not essential. I can train them.

Sizemore also provided reflections on her philosophy of mentoring a low performing (without skills) versus a high performing (with skills) employee:

> I would definitely try [to mentor a low performing employee], but there may be a point that you break it off, too . . . definitely I would invest in them and try to

bring them along but again there may be a point where [you] just have to break it off and go on to someone else.

Sizemore continued by explaining why she liked to mentor high performing as well as low performing entry level employees:

> I think it is a lot easier to [mentor] high performing. I mean there's a whole lot of rewards if you take somebody that's low performing then they perform well. So you know there's the flip side. . . . I think at the time initially the high performer is much easier to mentor. But in the long run, it's just as rewarding or even more rewarding to see the low performer accelerate and turn around. Now if your low performer never accelerates then that's tougher, but it's still rewarding.

Bond did not really describe the protégé characteristics as skills but as on-going learning:

> I did not come through a professional preparation program and was not taught programming skills to do this job. I learned on the job. There was no professional preparation program . . . so I can't say that I find myself filtering it through 'okay what skill set does that person have and do they have a skill set at a sufficient level' [for] me to feel like I can mentor them. I don't use that grid at all I don't think.

To further support the relevance of skills, Bond provided reflections on her philosophy of mentoring a low performing (without skills) or a high performing (with skills) employee:

> Well I think the low performer needs more direction. It is exhausting and I'll be honest there are times when I'm like 'oh god I don't want to do this.' But I think the need is greater there. There is more fun with the higher performer. But you know what that takes energy too. High performers don't always govern themselves well. . . . I would take the higher performer that isn't egocentric and I'd take the low performer that isn't clueless.

Stellar agreed the skills the protégés need to learn to do the job in campus recreation can be taught. Stellar explained, "If you're asking if you have to have the skills to draw an intramural tournament, no. That is something that you can teach."

Stellar provided additional reflections on her philosophy of mentoring a low performing or a high performing employee. Stellar said, "I think the entry level

employee. . . . I think that is who needs it the most." In regards to mentoring a low

performing versus a high performing employee, Stellar responded, "Sometimes it is

easier to do the low. The high also gives you the challenges and makes the challenges to

you as well."

Vister believed skills were an important protégé characteristic which attracted

mentors but developing skills was a part of maturing in the field. Vister explained, "That

[skills] is a part of the maturity process I would believe. So I think it's something that

they're trying to figure out on their own." Vister provided reflections on his philosophy

of mentoring a low performing (without skills) or a high performing (with skills)

employee:

> I think I would gain more pleasure in mentoring the low performer than I would a
> 25 year veteran, because I can gain more out of that. I can't gain that from the 25
> year veteran. . . .These are people [low performing] who don't know any better.
> They have no track record, they have no title . . . that's what you can focus on,
> you can give them the opportunity to do that. To forge that new road for them.

This category illustrated that technical skills were not characteristics highly

regarded as needed for a protégé entering the campus recreation field. Specifically, the

mentors found protégés with the desire to learn new skills more appealing than those who

had the skills but lacked the drive and/or were not open to learning.

Analysis

In summary, the need for protégés who had a good attitude, were honest, worked

well with people, and had the willingness to be mentored were seen as important

personality characteristics to the mentor. The need for enthusiasm which inspired others

within the organization, an understanding of working from the bottom to the top of the

organization, and enjoying the success of others were seen as important motivational

characteristics to the mentors. Finally, mentors found protégés with the desire to learn new skills more appealing than those who had the skills but lacked the drive and/or were not open to learning. All the mentors agreed that skills were something learned on the job and the low performers without skills were more attractive than the high performers with skills. All the themes related to both females and males within the organization.

The fourth research question addressed outcomes associated with mentoring women within campus recreation.

Research Question Four: What Outcomes are Associated with Mentoring

Women Within Campus Recreation?

The data are displayed in a matrix in Table 7. As demonstrated, five themes emerged. The mentors described: (a) lending acceptance and confirmation, (b) assigning challenging tasks, (c) friendship, (d) separation, and (e) negative consequences.

Table 7

Matrix for Research Question Four: What Outcomes are Associated with Mentoring Women in Campus Recreation?

Theme One: Lending Acceptance and Confirmation

The mentors as protégés shared personal experiences of how their mentor expressed confidence in them by confirming their abilities, creating a mutual trust, and lending them support and encouragement.

Theme Two: Assigning Challenging Tasks

The mentors assigned tasks which the protégés might not do on their own. The tasks of learning new skills included writing a grant or being a woman running a men's basketball tournament for the first time.

Theme Three: Friendship

The mentors described their mentoring relationships as those which develop into lasting friendship.

Theme Four: Separation

The mentors described how eventually the protégé becomes independent and the separation phase is a happy time for the mentors as the protégés follow in their footsteps.

Theme Five: Negative Consequences

Category One: Time Commitments

Category Two: Discussing Sensitive Issue and Breaking Confidentiality

Category Three: Being Vulnerable

Table 7 *(Continued)*

Matrix for Research Question Four: What Outcomes are Associated with Mentoring Women in Campus Recreation?

Theme Five: Negative Consequences

The mentors described outcomes which were disappointing to the mentoring relationship.

The analysis of the mentors' responses to the outcomes associated with mentoring women is presented next. These responses were developed through their experiences as mentors. The themes and categories with examples were presented to support the matrix in Table 7.

Theme One: Lending Acceptance and Confirmation

The mentors provided examples of how acceptance and confirmation were created through the whole mentoring experience. The dual processes of acceptance and confirmation enabled the mentors as protégés to share personal experiences of how their mentors' expressed confidence in them by confirming their abilities, creating a mutual trust, and lending them support and encouragement.

Booster explained the support and encouragement can go both ways in terms of females and males:

> I think they [males and females] all have different confidence levels. I think you kind of need to cater it or tailor it towards whatever the individual person needs. I wouldn't personally generalize that women need more support than men. I've seen some guys that basically needed to be stroked everyday. And if they thought you were mad at them, they were devastated. So I think that just depends on the individual person.

Sizemore explained how essential acceptance and confirmation were to women 25

years ago because of the barriers women faced within the field. Sizemore continues to explain how the view of people within organizations has changed today when it comes to acceptance and confirmation:

> I think it [acceptance and confirmation] is very important. And I think 25 years ago it was more – not more important but it was really essential 25 years ago. I am not looked upon the same way stepping on the football field and running a football rules meeting as I was 25 years ago – 25 years ago it was like "who are you and what the heck do you know about football?," where as today I walk in there and I'm running the program. They don't question my authority nearly as much as they did 25 years ago when I took over the men's program.

Sizemore continued to explain how important self-confidence and self-esteem were for women:

> To have that self-confidence and self-acceptance, and feeling confident in what I'm doing is very important. It is very important especially for young professionals, I think, because the world of sport is having a much better knowledge base than 25 years ago. It's still – it's still an up hill battle in some arenas. So I think your confidence level [is] still very important – in a lot of the areas of rec sports too – I mean in anything that you're doing anything with authority you have to have that as a basis to have authority. So it's essential to anything you do.

Sizemore also acknowledged that there is a difference in the way men and women interact in the office in terms of emotional control. Sizemore explained how important it was for the mentor to distinguish between these needs when it comes to mentoring women:

> I think with women there's still the "touchy feeling" emotional aspect. That's just part of our nature. And I think it's something that we can nurture and we can help to grow. And not that men don't have it but I don't think that in a business or a professional setting, if you were talking to my husband sitting beside me nurturing a professional that he would nurture that person's spirit, but not in the same type of emotional way I would. Just because he's male and I'm female. . . . Not that it's negative either way but positive either way but it's just the way the interaction is in the office and the way things are because that's just the way we're wired.

Bond's acceptance and confirmation were established through her experience as a protégé. The mentors as protégés provided examples of how acceptance and confirmation were created through the whole mentoring experience. This allowed the mentors as protégés to share personal experiences of how their mentor expressed confidence in them by confirming their abilities, creating a mutual trust, and lending support and encouragement to them. Bond said, "There were benefits in terms of self confidence, self esteem . . . emotional control."

The personal experiences of confidence, self-esteem and emotional control are still expressed by the mentors today. Although women are seen as having less self-confidence than men, Bond indicated this may be something "projected" and not necessarily true:

> There's no question men project confidence and self esteem. I have had the experience that being confident and possessing self esteem doesn't always correlate with owning it. I mean I think men have learned how to project an image of confidence and self-esteem, but I have seen a lot of times when you strip away the layers of the onion there is every bit as much self-doubt, you know uncertainty.

Bond believed if this was true, women may only be perceived as less confident than men because of the ability of men to hold their emotions:

> I don't believe men emote about it in the same way as women. I think they just kind of acknowledge it and say 'got to make a decision.' I think we [women] sit here and go – 'oh, I've got to make a decision and I want it to be the perfect decision, I want everybody to like the decision.'

Bond believed mentoring may help female protégés to control their "emotions" and confirm their abilities:

> I do believe it is important for women to be affirmed and to maybe even have to practice risk taking behavior and debate over exchange of ideas that depersonalizes the ideas and focus on content not having it be personalized. I do believe women could learn more there. . . . You know and I do think there is a

tendency for women that we cling to an emotional experience in a way that could undermine the way we are perceived by others as being capable, emotionally secure, and able to take the hits.

Stellar remarked on how "extremely important" self-confidence and self-esteem were to those individuals wishing to advance within the organization. Her personal experience with protégés resulted in the following regarding self-confidence and self-esteem, "Depends on the individual. Some are coming in with that [self-confidence and self-esteem] and some of it needs to be developed. [It] depends on their emotional maturity level."

Stellar continued by providing an example of a "leaders group" she once taught. She indicated this group helped with "building self-confidence, self-esteem and showing yes, you can do it."

Vister explained how he believed women were more mature than men and did not need any additional acceptance or confirmation:

> The women that I've been around are much more mature than the men I've been around. . . . I think women live with a better sense of the world around them than what men do.

This theme illustrated a time when women were not accepted and had no support within campus recreation, to an era where women were more accepted with support and encouragement. This theme also described the importance of the self-confidence and self-esteem of women which help with acceptance. Self-confidence and self-esteem are developed through support and encouragement of the mentor. The second theme is the mentors assigning challenging tasks.

The mentors provided challenging tasks to their protégés. One example of a challenging task for a woman is running a men's basketball tournament. A men's basketball tournament can be challenging even for a man, but for a woman it can be impossible at times. Booster provided this example of one of his female graduate assistants who was put to the test when assigned men's undergraduate basketball:

> She wanted to run men's undergraduate basketball. It was also the toughest program. We had to deal with football players and stuff. I just said that if it is something you want to do that is fine. . . . She ran men's undergraduate basketball and one night there was this guy who was about 6'5" who was kind of getting out of hand like they do. She stood up on a chair so she could look him in the face. She wanted to get the point across because he was kind of being condescending and she dealt with it. . . . If I didn't think she could handle it, I wouldn't have given it to her.

Other mentors believed that challenging tasks provided their protégés with greater responsibility regardless of whether the protégé was male or female. Sizemore, for instance, argued that challenging assignments help individuals grow as professionals:

> I think that no matter whether you are male or female your foundation still has to be based upon your technical [skills] – and your knowledge, your expertise, your ability . . . so I think having those experiences and those opportunities to have those challenging work experiences helps you grow as a professional. And it helps to build your worth and your repertoire and your resume and all the things that make you a strong professional whether you are male or female.

Bond believed it was challenging for students to learn how to network, but it was important to teach them those skills:

> I think women need to really understand how to do networking. I believe men have got that down pat. Not necessarily always in complimentary ways. But I don't see women [calling] upon other women for advice as a sounding board as a gateway to opportunity and men call favors all the time.

Stellar used her experience as a protégé in describing the importance of taking on challenging assignments: "He [my mentor] gave me an opportunity. . . . I had my choice

of doing intramurals – women's intramurals or doing club sports." By attempting

challenging assignments in these areas, protégés may have a better chance of advancing

within the organization as Stellar pointed out:

> I think you need to be able to communicate to users, with your vice president,
> your president. I was thinking that I need to take the time now. . . . I need to write
> the necessary speech that the president gives on this radio show when he starts
> talking about recreational sports – athletics – he doesn't do his writing. . . each
> year I change it, so I think that is a [challenging] skill.

Vister provided an example of how he believed females were ready for the

challenging assignments in campus recreation:

> I asked every female [who] interviews with us as far as a GA. . . . Can you handle
> the 6'5" 300 pound offensive lineman in your face on a basketball night in the
> middle of February after their season is over with, because you will get that here
> [referring to the university].

This category illustrated the need for mentors to provide challenging assignments

to both female and male protégés within campus recreation. It might have been even

more important for females because it allowed females to be challenged by being in

charge of the male-dominated sports such as basketball.

Theme Three: Friendship

The mentors described how their mentoring relationships eventually developed

into friendships. The mentors provided examples of how a friendship was created

through the whole mentoring experience. The mentors shared experiences of developing

friendships as protégés and as mentors.

Booster recounted his personal experiences of how the mentoring relationship

helped relieve the pressures of his work when he was a protégé. Booster was named the

mentor's "personal stress consultant." He explained "I was always encouraging her [his

mentor] to come down and workout. . . . We would pump each other up when we would

get together." Booster's relationship with his mentor developed into a friendship continuing into their professional lives. The mentoring experiences with his staff have also developed into friendships:

> I think one the greatest benefits that has been around a long time – I get a phone call from one of my former students at least once a week. I've got them all over the place, both men and women. And you know we're friends.

Booster continued:

> I think that is one of the great things I enjoy about the relationships with some of the kids I've mentored because they still call me. Even 10-15 years later they are still calling me for advice about this and that. I got one that was getting ready to buy a house and he called and he wanted to ask me about that. So it is not just professional, it is for personal issues as well.

Sizemore demonstrated how her mentors became family. Sizemore said, "They [mentors] are still very important in my life. . . . I consider them, besides being my mentors and close friends, I consider them family . . . That's [friendship] a real beauty of a mentoring relationship." Although Sizemore might not have established a friendship while acting as a protégé, she did develop one with her protégé:

> I will say my current relationship with a protégé is both personal and professional and very social. This person is my partner in business and my deep best friend . . . it has been something that has evolved over 22 years ago.

Stellar indicated friendship was "absolutely" something which developed within her mentoring relationships with protégés. Stellar remarked some of the friendships have lasted as long as 25 to 30 years:

> I think the ultimate is having them as a friend. Being able to pick up the phone and ask any question and it's not unreasonable. You aren't going to say 'oh goodness how in the world could you ever ask anything like that.' I think it's just being very caring.

Vister supports the idea that a friendship would evolve from the mentoring experience:

183

All of the females I've interacted with I would certainly consider friends. I would certainly consider some of them colleagues, some aren't in the field. Students, over the years they've all gone off, they've started families, they're doing their own thing. When I'm able to talk to them or if we email back and forth or we do things, certainly I think there's a good friendship.

This theme illustrated that friendships developed through mentoring relationships. These mentoring relationships occurred with the mentors both as protégés and as mentors. The mentors really enjoyed this experience following the mentoring relationship. Some mentors believed they were still mentoring their protégés while others believed the relationship eventually turned into something that was priceless.

Theme Four: Separation

The mentors explained how separation is an outcome of the mentoring process. The mentors indicated that separation may be dealt with in many ways, but it's a part of the growth which takes place during the mentoring relationship. Booster explained how technology facilitates the separation phase of the mentoring relationship:

I think one thing that has helped that [separation] is technology and email. I mean who's got time to sit down and write a letter, put it in an envelope, put a stamp on it and mail it. But you know how easy it is to be sitting at your keyboard and just fire out a quick note to someone. So I think that technology has helped that [separation]. I know I get a lot more emails in the technology age than I did before that.

Sizemore explained the separation phase of the mentoring relationship as a growth process:

It's [separation from protégé] a growth process when you leave. But it's an exciting process too because it's kind of like the bird leaving the nest. And you never really leave because you know that you have that relationship and that friendship that's always there and you know that you're only a phone call or an email away. And most of the time those relationships stay together until you are in touch so you're not really or you're not really physically underneath any longer or close to them or in the same building or whatever. But you don't really ever lose that contact with them so – it's kind of – I think it's an exciting thing because you're out on your own and it's exciting as the mentor to see the mentee out being

184

successful and then to be able to console them or help them out with whatever they are doing and listen to them and to find exciting things that they are doing and to see their successes.

Sizemore continued to explain how it was like a mother and her child:

I mean as part of the process that's what you want. I mean it's just like a mother and her child. I mean you want them to leave home eventually. It's not a happy time at the moment when they have to walk out of the door but you wouldn't want them stay there forever.

Bond explained how separation was a disadvantage to mentoring: "I think a disadvantage is not letting go and I think you have to." Bond expressed a concern for those who become dependent upon their mentor:

I think that while you can look to your mentor and you want to engage over ideas, you don't need them to become emotionally dependent on what you say for them to move forward.

Stellar believed separation was a part of sharing the knowledge one learns from the mentoring relationship:

You're taking a little piece of what you have given them and they're going across the country and you can only hope that the little piece is going to go further and further. And it's not just one area, hopefully [it is] scattered all over.

Vister believed separation was part of the mentoring process:

It's [separation] part of growing up. It's [separation] part of – you know in your heart you're always going to know how you feel about that person and how that person feels about you. And sure there may be a separation and distance. There maybe a separation in time – I see Calvin [his mentor] once every five or six months and I still walk in and it's still like it was yesterday.

This category established that there is an emotional consequence when protégés leave. All mentors believed this was part of the process, a time of mixed emotions.

Theme Five: Negative Outcomes

The mentors described outcomes of the mentoring relationship which were difficult. These outcomes were not related specifically to women but both genders. The

mentors' negative outcomes fall into three categories in which the mentors describe: (a)

time commitment involved, (b) discussing sensitive issue and breaking confidentiality,

and (c) being vulnerable.

Category One: Time Commitments. The mentors explained how it was difficult

to be available to the protégés at all times needed as perceived by the protégé. Booster

discussed how time can be a negative consequence to mentoring when people need a lot

of attention:

> Some people need more attention and that could be a negative. I think on the
> other side of that is you get to decide you're about helping people or you're not. I
> guess I would like to think that I am. I had a little note up here [on the computer]
> to remind myself a few students are opportunities, not interruptions.

Sizemore illustrated how mentors need to be selective in choosing protégés that

have the potential due to the time involved in mentoring:

> The time investment [is] that you only have so much time and energy and you
> have to be selective in investing [is a disadvantage to mentoring] . . . we
> [professional staff] need to pick a core of kids that we really think has potential
> and we need to really invest in them and see who is going to surface to become
> our next leaders.

Bond viewed the time constraints as a two-way street. Bond explained how she

does not consider herself readily available:

> I know for me there have been times I believe the protégés have reached out and
> I'm not always sure I've been available. And that is a funny downside and I do
> think it is a downside.

Bond continued to explain how she has been in mentoring relationships where the

protégé wanted more time than she was willing to give:

> I think there have been times when people have wanted more of me than I've
> been willing to give or able to give. And there is discomfort with that. It may
> have created some hard feelings.

Stellar selected to focus her attention on the graduate students she was unable to provide enough time during the mentoring process:

> Sometimes, it [mentoring] can be extremely time consuming. And that is the only thing that I can think of as a down side and then I'm going to go back when I worked with grad students more than I currently am doing on a day to day basis. And it was an era that about three years that there some outstanding graduate students. And not being able to give the time to every single one that needed to the time and sometimes they felt slighted.

Vister indicated he would have more time to grow professionally if he was not mentoring as many protégés:

> It's tough. If I had all the time I did in doing what I do for students and staff members and I did that solely something professionally or something for myself where I could write articles or I could do this I'd be – it'd be great.

This category explained how mentoring takes a substantial amount of time from a mentor's day. Far from viewing this as a major problem, mentors accepted it as part of "territory" as well as an investment of the job as being a mentor.

Category Two: Discussing Sensitive Issues and Breaking Confidentiality. The mentors described how certain issues were difficult to discuss due to the content of the problem. Booster discussed specific issues women might present in a mentoring relationship, "If I'm mentoring a female and she wants to talk about the sex life or the boyfriend I mean, we're not going there."

Sizemore indicated the sensitive issues were bound to happen in any type of relationship, but the mentor needs to learn to take the good and the bad and deal with it:

> I've been in it [sensitive issue cases with protégés] couple times, I've been in situations where there's been physical illnesses or I've been concerned for health reasons about the person or I've been fearful for – for some reason for that person. It's a very uncomfortable feeling to have to approach that person and say "hey because I love you I have to tell you this." I'm really concerned I need you to do this. You know [the protégé] can say I'm nuts and never talk to me again or whatever. But I have a few times had to [deal with sensitive issues] with a couple

of students. It's hard, it's very difficult [dealing with the sensitive issue]. But I think when you accept [the responsibility] – it's just like being family – the child – the spouse- or with anybody else – when you accept that responsibility to be in a relationship like that [mentoring relationship] you take the good with the bad.

Sizemore continued by explaining confidentiality sometimes needs to be broken when the protégé is in danger. This was just another part of the mentoring relationship:

A couple of times you know the confidentiality with another professional or whatever – confidentiality situation kind of thing – yes I've had to do that. But in situations that I felt were life threatening or could be potentially life threatening. And you just have to make that judgment call.

Bond explained how the mentoring relationship was a safe place for protégés:

You want to establish a safe place. Then I try to appeal to that person and do everything possible to respect their privacy and their right to choose and recognize [that] I can't force that choice. I can try to influence it and try and give – be a sounding board and do the "what ifs." And there really has only been one situation where that level of intervention was my choice. There have been others that I've been sorry that people didn't take advice or didn't pay attention but again I've really come to see that you – it is true that you only lead the horse to water. That's not my job. My job isn't to control them.

Bond continued to explain her experiences with confidentiality and the times it was broken to help the protégé:

It isn't uncommon that is a certain level of trust gets established and confidential sharing takes place, and there have been occasions where – well in one situation that I recommended professional counseling and then honored the confidentiality of that . . . but if a person is at risk to themselves or to someone else, then I don't have any problem coming back and saying it is my belief, my strong conviction that you are not in a position to recognize the danger to yourself or to another person. And this could be the end of our relationship but I'm willing to risk and I'm going to break the confidentiality.

Vister explained how mentors become close to their protégés, and it was difficult to see them go through what they were going through:

You can become too close sometimes. . . . I've had to make some very difficult professional decisions that went against my personal philosophy. I've had mentees indicate relationships that have gone bad, abuse, personal choices they've

made about pregnancies, and yeah, it has been difficult. In times, I've known more about people than I've wanted to know.

Vister provided an example of a mentoring session which involved an issue he did not feel comfortable:

> Divorce – Very early on here there was a young lady who worked on campus who came to me about resumes. . . . I had questioned her about something that she had put down there [on the resume] and that opened the flood gates completely. . . . I regret that to this day because her husband and I were not colleagues but we knew about each other so I learned more about the husband through the wife than I really wanted to know.

Vister continued to explain how confidentially became an issue when there were problems he could not deal with on his own:

> And there was time that I was not very careful in keeping my relationships from a mentor/mentee standpoint very confidential. Because what I was doing at that point was if somebody was to come to me and say something and I would be dealing with that so much I would have to go to somebody else and say okay, I've got this situation, you're my mentor how do I deal with this with my mentee. I wouldn't get very specific. . . . The confidentiality issue I think bothers me.

This category established the difficulties mentors face in dealing with issues which fell outside the scope of their professional training.

Category Three – Being Vulnerable. The mentors described it was hard "putting yourself on the line" for protégés who might disappoint them, although many of the mentors explained how this was part of the process. Booster explained how he realizes protégés are going to make mistakes, and he needs to be more tolerant and understanding when it happens:

> I think we have to realize people are human and everyone is probably doing the best they can with students at different maturation levels, and I think a lot of it is kind of where they [students] are on the continuum. I mean they're gonna screw up big time. And I think we [mentors] have to understand that [we] might be disappointed. That's when they [protégés] need you [mentors] more than when they're doing great. So I think it's important that you don't kick them out when

189

that [failure of protégé] happens. I mean you let them know that this isn't going to go on forever.

Sizemore explained how mentors place themselves in vulnerable positions of getting hurt:

> One [disadvantage] is that you put yourself on the line and you're vulnerable and so there are times when you will get hurt because sometimes someone will disappoint you or hurt you and that is just like in any relationship because people are human. So there may be a time when you invest in someone and they'll let you down. . . . Or you'll go to bat for someone you've mentored and then they won't [succeed], they'll fail or they'll fall through for you and then you, and then you feel very bad because you've put your neck out on the line for someone. And that has happened a few times to me. Not too often but occasionally.

Bond does believe vulnerability can be a negative consequence of mentoring, therefore she approaches a mentoring relationship realizing "failure" of the protégé may occur throughout the mentoring relationship:

> I go in expecting that [protégé failing you]. I mean I've let people down. I've let myself down. So I don't expect anything different and sure it is frustrating. But that's the human condition. And I think if one were to go into mentoring expecting that the outcomes are always as one would hope – yeah you're setting yourself up – probably for not doing much mentoring. That's the truth. I have not always been a good mentor. I've not always given good advice so I appreciate the person's graciousness back to me. It works both ways. I mean somebody puts a lot of faith in the mentor and the mentor doesn't come through – so I just try to remember it is a shared responsibility. It really isn't one way.

Stellar indicated a protégé could open a mentor up to being "vulnerable" but she was fortunate to have top notch protégés. Stellar explained, "It [protégé might fail, protégé might let you down] could happen. But I have been fortunate the individuals that I have feel as though [they] have been a mentor to have turned out [on] top. Really have."

Vister described how he questions himself and wonders if he did something wrong when a protégé fails:

I think sure you feel bad at times. You question yourself, well did you do something wrong with that individual – did you tell them something – did you not motivate them enough – did you – but everybody is their own person, and I've learned to accept that."

This category illustrated the awareness mentors had about being vulnerable, and realizing sometimes they probably failed. The mentors needed to be tolerant and understand when the protégé failed. Although the protégé was failing the mentors described this failure as a process of learning for the protégé.

Analysis

Although this research question was focused around outcomes associated with mentoring women, the responses from the mentors included outcomes associated with mentoring both females and males. The mentors provided acceptance and confirmation while providing challenging assignments in developing skills needed to excel in campus recreation. The mentors discussed how the mentoring relationship eventually because a friendship. The mentors also described negative consequences of separation from the protégé, time commitment, discussing sensitive issue and breaking confidentiality, and realizing the protégé will make mistakes.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

Personal life history portraits and the research questions provided valuable information about the perceptions of the mentoring relationship. The personal life history portraits of the mentors showed how their trade of mentoring was conceptualized through their experiences during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. These experiences led to the mentors mentoring both male and female protégés. These mentors indicated the females did not have to be mentored any differently than the males within campus recreation after the 1970s, which began the post Title IX era. So, the mentors did not provide gender

specific data unless discussing the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The information revealed

significant factors which influence the willingness to mentor females in campus

recreation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, GENERALIZABILITY, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study provided suggestions for professionals and students on what factors influenced the willingness to mentor females in the field of campus recreation. This study examined the mentoring relationship in campus recreation from the perspective of the mentor.

This chapter is designed to provide the reader with an understanding of each factor influencing the willingness to mentor. The chapter is broken down into the following sections: (a) integration of personal life history portraits and the research questions, (b) major findings unique to campus recreation, (c) generalizability of the study including information from personal life history portraits and the four research questions, (d) implications for campus recreation professionals, and (e) future research derived from the study.

Integration of Personal Life History Portraits

and the Research Questions

The first section in chapter IV dealt with personal life history portraits of the five mentors. The next four sections of chapter IV dealt with the integration of the personal life history portraits and the research questions. The integration of the personal life history portraits and the research questions establish grounds for determining factors

which influence the willingness to mentor females along with males in campus recreation.

This section integrates the personal life history portrait consisting of the demographics, the mentors' experiences as protégés, and the personal histories as mentors within and across the research questions. The mentoring factors examined included gender, age, initiation of mentoring relationship, mentoring structure, and mentoring style and characteristics.

Gender

The majority of the mentors in this study were mentored by males. This is understandable since the mentoring experience happened mostly during the 1950s to 1970s and the mentors mentioned there was a "lack of female leaders" and "struggling times for women in leadership positions." Females were banned from the national campus recreation organization (NIRSA) and had to survive in a male-dominated field with a lack of female mentors. This created many barriers for females in campus recreation as indicated in the organizational factors which inhibit the mentoring relationship such as "old boys network," authoritarian leadership style, and sexist remarks. Mentors stressed the importance of "support" for women during this time as a factor which facilitated the mentoring relationship.

Age

The average age of the mentors was 48. The age difference between the mentors and the current protégés was between 25-30 years. Thus, the mentors were old enough to have accumulated the experience necessary to benefit the protégé. The mentors in this study were in the field for an overall average of 25 ½ years. The mentors were all

directors and associate directors who had earned their master's degree. The age

difference may create problems within campus recreation because the mentors are much

older than the protégé. This may indicate the mentoring relationship becomes one of a

parent-child, and the attendant feelings interfere with the mentoring function. It seemed,

in this study, the mentors spoke highly of having a "nurturing" relationship, but it did not

interfere with the mentoring function. It maybe the age gap is a norm in campus

recreation that does not interfere with the mentoring function but strengthen its value.

The length of the relationships was an overall average of 20 years. The average number

of years is related to the age of the mentor and their number of years in campus

recreation.

Mentoring Initiation

The majority of the mentors initiated the mentoring relationship. This may be

related to the initial contact made by the mentor during the hiring process. The mentors

indicated personality and motivational characteristics attracted them to protégés. If the

protégé had a "good attitude," integrity, the willingness to be mentored, a good work

ethic, and enjoyed sharing success and enabling others within the organization, the

mentor was more than likely to hire the student. Hiring student may have then led to a

formal mentoring program.

Mentoring Structure

The majority of the mentors had formal mentoring programs. This may be due to

the nature of campus recreation being housed in an educational setting. The majority of

students on campuses make formal meeting times with professors and administrators.

This may lead to a more effective means of mentoring the student than an informal

mentoring program. The mentors also indicated some informal mentoring occurred. This may be connected to why the mentors indicated friendship was an outcome of the mentoring relationship. If a friendship did occur then it is not unusual for friends to stop by the office without an appointment.

The Mentor-Protégé Characteristics and Style

The mentoring process may be influenced by the mentor's style. When the mentors in this study were protégés, they indicated that their mentoring often used an authoritarian style. This may have been a result of the time period when they were protégés, which was the 1950s-1970s. This mentoring style was not recommended by the mentors as protégés. This may indicate why the mentors as protégés became mentors, and developed a mentoring style which was empowering and shifted more towards psychosocial functions (i.e., listening, emotional control) than career functions (i.e., communication skills, work ethic, organizational tasks, and assigning challenging tasks).

Mentors indicated they were more likely to enter into a mentoring relationship with a protégé if that protégé possessed certain characteristics. The mentors were attracted to individuals who were more life they perceived themselves. The mentors agreed that personality characteristics including having a good attitude, integrity, being people oriented, and willingness to be mentored were important to have in the campus recreation field. The mentors also agreed the motivational characteristics of strong work ethic, sharing success, and enabling others were important. These personality and motivational characteristics led mentors to hire students into their program. The hiring of the students may have then led to a formal mentoring program.

By understanding the struggles the mentors went through during the 1950s through the 1970s, the researcher began to conceptualize why the mentors indicated non-gendered responses such as "helping students to learn and grow." Essentially, the mentors through their protégé experience influenced their decision to mentor young and upcoming students regardless of gender. More important, these mentors indicated they had a positive mentor-protégé experience and thus were more likely to want to become mentors themselves when they had the opportunity. It was important for the mentors to provide a more "supporting" mentoring style compared to some of the authoritarian mentoring styles they experienced when they were a protégé. The mentors were willing to give back through lending acceptance and confirmation, assigning challenging tasks, providing friendship and professional development opportunities as indicated in their responses to outcomes associated with mentoring in campus recreation.

Although the mentors indicated many rewards to mentoring, there were also negative consequences. Discussing sensitive issues was mentioned as an negative outcome of the mentoring relationship. Discussing sensitive issues may be unique to campus recreation or a segment in the sport industry due to the topic areas students may deal with, in comparison to professional staff members in other sport industry segments. Campus recreation deals with health related issues, including both physical and emotional well-being. Students may want to talk about issues such as pregnancy, drugs, boyfriend/girlfriend problems, sexual issues, and much more. Also, one must remember that students are at a time in their lives when they are gong through many new experiences, and need someone with whom to share their thoughts. Often times, this

person is the Campus Recreation Assistant Director or Director the student will turn to

for advice. Although time commitment and "being vulnerable" were mentioned as

negative consequences, the mentors in this study still averaged about 15 protégés at one

time. This may indicate the mentors were able to look past the amount of time and

possible failure of a student. Instead, the mentors would focus on "helping students to

learn and grow" regardless of the time it took.

<div align="center">Major Study Findings Unique to Campus Recreation</div>

An analysis of the major study findings is found in this section. The researcher

presents evidence of the uniqueness of campus recreation related to the mentoring

relationship, including: (a) gender related responses, (b) students as protégés, (c) time

commitment, (d) discussing sensitive issues, (e) vulnerability in a campus recreation

setting, and (f) professional development opportunities.

Gender-Related Responses

Although the research study was focused on females within campus recreation,

the participants did not provide a substantial number of "gender related" responses. The

gender related responses mentioned were analyzed as contextualized within the 1950s,

1960s, and early 1970s. Past research indicates those were difficult times for women

(Varner, 1992; Yager, 1983). Gender related responses such as "struggling times for

women in leadership positions," "lack of female leaders," "barriers to women advancing

within campus recreation," and "support for women," described the campus recreation

work environment for women during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Today, there

are more females in campus recreation, and the status of women in leadership positions

has improved, but women are still not equal to their male counterparts in terms of number

of leadership positions, according to the *2002-2003 NIRSA National Sport Recreational Directory*.

Mentioned Students as Protégés

The mentors, in most cases, referred to students as the protégés without ever mentioning other professional staff within the organization. This is unique to campus recreation because it would indicate the majority of the mentoring is centered on students and their career development and not current entry level professionals. The majority of mentoring in other industries is with professional staff members (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997). This indicates that current professionals entering campus recreation are actually the ones expected to mentor students because of the nature of the position.

Time Commitment

The mentors cited time commitment as a disadvantage to mentoring others. Research indicates the majority of employees are willing to mentor (Allen et al., 1997), but the amount of time devoted to these types of activities may be on the decline due to the increasing time demands within the organization (Allen et al., 1997; Weaver & Chelladuri, 2002). However, campus recreation is a unique profession in that the mentoring almost becomes part of the job description, and the numbers can be overwhelming at times. Professional staff, within the organization, are expected to mentor students and although the time commitment is a disadvantage, mentoring still continues to happen. This is a process that happens naturally because professionals in campus recreation are always working alongside students.

Discussing Sensitive Issues and Breaking Confidentiality

The mentors described "discussing sensitive issues and breaking confidentiality" as a negative outcome associated with mentoring others. These issues may become more complex when students are the protégés, not professional staff members due to the nature of campus recreation in relation to health and body issues. Campus recreation professionals need to be aware there are issues that may be uncomfortable and there might be a time when confidentiality may need to be broken. Campus recreation professionals need to be prepared to refer the students to counseling for a variety of reasons.

Vulnerability in a Campus Recreation Setting

The mentors described how mentors were quite vulnerable in a campus recreation setting. Since their protégés are students, the mentors are aware the students are more likely going to disappoint them due to their maturity and skill level (Ragins, Townsend, & Mattis, 1996). Most industries have more mature and skillful individuals in a entry level positions.

Professional Development Opportunities

The mentors described professional development opportunities as an organizational factor which facilitates the mentoring relationship. The literature indicates professional development is more important for women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985a; Abney, 1991), but the participants in this study would disagree in terms of the campus recreation profession. The participants believed there should be ample opportunities for career development for females and males. This indicates that there is not a perceived problem in campus recreation in terms of women "lacking the skills" to advance within

the organization. The need for professional development was seen for both genders. This may be due to the sampling method and transferability of the results to other populations.

This section demonstrated how the mentoring relationship was unique to campus recreation. The section to follow demonstrates how some of the findings of this study could be generalized to other professional settings in the literature.

<center>Generalizability of This Study</center>

Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate transferability is the ability of other researchers to understand and transfer the findings of one study to another group of individuals. Transferability was established through "thick description." Thick description enables readers to transfer information to other settings and determine whether the findings can be transferred because of shared characteristics (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993).

This section illustrates how each theme is reported in the literature, and has five subsections: (a) personal life history portraits, (b) individual reasons for mentoring women, (c) organizational factors inhibiting or facilitating mentoring within campus recreation, (d) protégé characteristics which attract mentors within campus recreation, and (e) outcomes associated with mentoring women within campus recreation.

Personal Life History Portraits

The personal life history portraits gathered information about the mentors by collecting information on (a) demographics, (b) the mentor as a protégé, and (c) their personal histories as mentors.

Demographic Data. The mentors in this study were three white females and two white males. The average age of the participants was 48 with a combined average age of 25 ½ years in the field. The mentors all had masters degrees in areas including, recreation management, physical education, education, and recreation administration. All of the mentors were Directors except for one who was an Associate Director. One mentor was also a Dean in addition to being a Director. The mentors were loyal to their current universities with a combined average of 23 years of service and 13 years in their current position. Table 8 is a summary of the demographic data.

Table 8

Demographic Data

Data	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Gender	M	F	F	F	M
Age	46	49	52	59	36
Race	White	White	White	White	White
Under-Grad Degree	Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	History/ Political Science	Broadcast Journalism
Masters Degree	Education	Recreation Management	Physical Education	Education	Recreation Admin.
Official job title	Director	Director	Director/ Asst Dean	Director	Associate Director
Number years in campus recreation	24	25	29	32	17
Number yrs current university	24	23	29	26.5	7.5
Number yrs current position	21	23	12	5.5	3.5
Number of mentors	3	3	1	1	3

All but one of the mentors had a true mentoring experience. The mentoring experiences were developed through Graduate Assistantships and professional experiences. The mentors were mentored by males and females. Both the mentor and the protégé initiated the mentoring relationships. Some mentoring relationships were structured while others were unstructured. Table 9 is a summary of the mentors as protégés.

Table 9

Portraits of the Mentor Experiences as a Protégé

Indicators	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of Significant mentors	3	3	1	1	3
Gender of mentor (s)	M/F	M/F	M	M	M/F
Mentoring initiation	Both	Mentor	Mentor	Hiring Process	Protégé
Structure of relationship	Formal	Both	Formal	Informal	Formal
Mentoring Style	Empowering	Nurturing/ Caring	Assertive/ Aggressive	Authority	Authority
Mentoring Character	Listening/ Leadership	Comm. Skills	Emotional Control	Org. Tasks	Work Ethic
Mentoring Relationship Sustained	No	25-30 years	No	No	2 of 4

Personal Histories as Mentors

The majority of the mentors had more than 10 "significant" mentoring relationships. All the mentors had male and female protégés, and the relationships were initiated by both parties. All the mentors suggested "nurturing" characteristics

as essential for an ideal mentor. The nurturing characteristics included listening, compassion, caring, and being interested in the protégés' experiences. Table 10 is a summary of the personal histories as mentors.

Table 10

Personal Histories as a Mentor

Indicators	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of significant Protégés	6	30	4	8	20-25
Gender of protégé (s)	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
Length of Relationship (yrs)	12-15	2-20	22-28	5-30	7 1/2
Mentoring initiation	Mentor	Both	Mentor	Both	Mentor
Ideal characteristics of Mentor	Listening	Listening Compassion Interested	Caring Emotional Intelligence	Sincere Caring Patient	Listen Caring

The personal life history had four areas which were transferable to other studies. The four transferable areas included: (a) age, (b) past mentoring experiences, (c) gender, and (d) number of years in campus recreation.

First, the average age of the participants in this study was 48. This meant the age differentiation between mentor and current protégés was greater than 20 years in the

majority of the cases. Age differentiation in mentoring relationships has long been studied by Levinson et. al (1978). Several studies indicate mentors must be old enough to accumulate experience, but the age differential separating them from their protégé should not be more than 20 years. Levinson et. al (1978) indicated if the age differentiation is greater than 20 years, there will be more of a parent-child relationship. Hunt and Michael (1983) indicate there may be significant communication or value problems caused by historical generational differences, as may be found in a parent-child relationship.

Second, four out of five mentors were protégés when they were younger. This may be a reason why they became mentors in campus recreation today. According to Kram (1985), experiencing a mentoring relationship, either as a mentor or a protégé, influences the decision to mentor in the future. This may indicate the mentors in this study believed they were treated professionally in their mentoring relationship, which influenced their decision to mentor in the future. This was an opportunity the mentors to "give back" something that was given to them.

Third, the majority of the mentors were mentored by both males and females. This indicates campus recreation may take an organizational perspective of cross-gender mentoring. Cross-gender mentoring provides a highly visible model of women and men working closely together in an organization (Ragins, 1989). These relationships may have educational value in that they may be models for other types of cross-gender working relationships (Ragins, 1989). This may lead to less barriers and more leadership opportunities for women.

Fourth, the mentors were in the campus recreation field for an average of 25 ½ years, with their current university for an average of 23 years, and in their current position for an average of 13 years. This may contribute to why mentors enter a mentoring relationship within campus recreation. Hunt and Michael (1983) indicated mentors were likely to be in the higher ranks of the organization and the length of employment at the organization may influence the decision to mentor others. All the participants in this study were veteran administrators, and therefore more predisposed to mentoring others.

The Research Questions

Given this background information on the mentors in the study, the researcher now provides a summary for each of the four research questions. Table 11 provides a summary of the themes and categories for each research question. The first research question is now presented.

Table 11

Themes and Categories for Each Research Question

Research Question One: What were the individual reasons for mentoring women?

Theme One: Struggling times for women in leadership positions

Theme Two: Lack of female leaders

Theme Three: Helping students to learn and grow

Research Question Two: What organizational factors inhibit or facilitate mentoring women within campus recreation?

Theme One: Dimensions Which Inhibit Mentoring
Category 1: Barriers to Women Advancing within Campus Recreation
Category 2: Mentoring Style of the Mentor

Theme Two: Dimensions Which Facilitate Mentoring
Category 1: Support for Women
Category 2: Professional Development Opportunities

Research Question Three: What protégé characteristics attract mentors within campus recreation?

Theme One: Personality Characteristics
Category 1: Attitude of Students
Category 2: Integrity
Category 3: Protégés Who Were People-Oriented
Category 4: Protégés Willingness to be Mentored

Theme Two: Motivational Characteristics

Category 1: Work Ethic
Category 2: Enjoying Sharing Success and Enabling Others

Theme Three: Campus Recreation Skills Were Not a Necessity

Table 11 *(Continued)*

Themes and Categories for Each Research Question

Research Question Four: What outcomes were associated with mentoring women within campus recreation?

Theme One: Lending Acceptance and Confirmation

Theme Two: Assigning Challenging Tasks

Theme Three: Friendship

Theme Four: Separation

Theme Five: The Mentors Described Negative Consequences
Category 1: Time Commitment
Category 2: Discussing Sensitive Issues
Category 3: Being Vulnerable

Research Question One: What Were the Individual Reasons for Mentoring Women?

The first research question illustrated how three themes were transferable to other research studies. As indicated in Table 11, the themes for Research Question One included: (a) struggling times for women in leadership positions, (b) lack of female leaders, and (c) helping students learn and grow. Each is described below.

First, the mentors as protégés described *struggling times for women in leadership positions* as an individual reason for mentoring. When talking about this, the mentors as protégés were referring to the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s when it was difficult for women to be in the field of campus recreation. The National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) organization was formed in 1952 by a group of 17 men and three women (Varner, 1992). By 1959 women were banned from organizational membership only to return ten years later in 1969. During the late 1950s and 1960s, campus

recreation was a typical male-dominated organization (Varner, 1992). This supports the literature on women having fewer formal and informal opportunities than men for developing mentoring relationships (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 2001). During this time, women in campus recreation did not have opportunities to participate in important projects. Often mentors selected protégés partially on the basis of their involvement in these projects (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Zey, 1984). Thus, the mentors had limited work experience with women, and this supported the "barriers to women advancing in campus recreation."

Second, the mentors described the *lack of female leaders* in campus recreation during the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s as an individual reason for mentoring women in campus recreation during that time. Due to the lack of females in leadership positions, the mentors described the importance of mentoring females specifically to help them advance within campus recreation administration. The lack of female leaders equated to a low number of female mentors within campus recreation. Women were often denied an opportunity to develop a mentoring relationship with a female or male. This may be related to the reasons why there was a lack of female leaders in campus recreation. Since there was a lack of mentors for females during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, and mentoring has been linked to professional advancement (Kram, 1983, 1985), women in campus recreation were faced with a lack of upward mobility within the organization. Thus, mentors described the lack of female leaders in campus recreation as an individual reason for mentoring.

Third, the mentors described *helping students learn and grow* as an individual reason for mentoring. This theme supports the literature linking the willingness to

mentor to altruism (Allen et al., 1997; Aryee et al., 1996). The mentors in this case are mentoring students, and thus their response to helping students to learn and grow is a motivating factor for them and their job. This is supporting evidence of mentoring being related not only to improving the welfare of others but related to improving the welfare of the self (Allen et al., 1997).

Research Question Two: Organizational Factors Which Influence the Willingness to Mentor Females in Campus Recreation

The second research question illustrated how two themes and their individual categories were transferable to other research studies. The themes and categories for Research Question Two included: (a) dimensions which inhibit mentoring (barriers to women advancing within campus recreation, mentoring style of the mentor), and (b) dimensions which facilitate mentoring (support for women, professional development opportunities).

The first theme of *dimensions which inhibit mentoring* included two categories. The first category included the mentors mentioning *barriers to women advancing within campus recreation* as an organizational factor which inhibited the mentoring relationship during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. This was a time when women were not accepted by their peers within campus recreation. Token women were placed in the organizational limelight and faced with increasing performance pressure and stereotypical expectations. This increased visibility for the "token" woman within the organization created barriers for women to advance within the organization. These barriers are illustrated in the research conducted by Ragins (1996). Ragins (1996) indicated women face barriers

within their organization because the supervisors and co-workers disapproved of women working in the field.

The second category included the mentors describing the *mentoring style* as an organizational factor which influenced the mentoring relationship during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. The mentors described how their mentors provided them with support and encouragement, but did so using an authoritative style. The mentors suggested being a supportive and encouraging mentor, rather than an authoritative mentor, made for a better mentoring relationship.

The second theme of *dimensions which facilitated mentoring* included two categories. The first category included the mentors describing support for women within the organization as an organizational factor which influenced the willingness to mentor. The mentors were referring to the support from supervisors, co-workers, and others within the organization. If the supervisor had a "mentoring style" which was supportive of women, the male co-workers were more likely to also be supportive of women. In some cases, however, male co-workers still created problems for women in the early 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s due to the low acceptance rate of women within this field. Research indicates support from others is a precursor to developmental activity (e.g., Allen et. al, 1997). The present study suggests that perceived support for women within the organization facilitates mentoring.

The second category included the mentors describing *professional development opportunities* for women and men as organizational factors which influenced the mentoring relationship. This is important for both females and males within campus recreation because mentoring is how young professionals become prepared or socialized

to accept powerful leadership positions (Scanlon, 1997). The mentoring relationship is used frequently in organizations as an informal means of providing employees with guidance on how to develop within their profession (Scanlon, 1997).

Research Question Three: What Protégé Characteristics Attract a Mentor Within Campus Recreation?

The third research question illustrated how three themes and their individual categories were transferable to other research studies. The themes and categories for Research Question Three included: (a) personality characteristics (attitude of students, integrity, protégés who were people-oriented, and the protégés willingness to be mentored), (b) motivational characteristics (work ethic, sharing success and enabling others), and (c) campus recreation skills were not a necessity.

The first theme of *personality characteristics* included four categories. Categories one, two and three included the mentor describing greater rewards for those protégés who were perceived as displaying a *good attitude, integrity,* and *protégés who were people-oriented.* Essentially, the mentors were attracted to protégés who were similar to them (Allen et. al, 1997). The mentors in this study displayed a good attitude and integrity by their willingness to be in this study and be honest. Due to the nature of campus recreation, the mentors worked with people on a daily basis.

The fourth category included the mentors describing the *protégés' willingness to be mentored* as an attraction to the mentoring relationship. This supports the Allen et. al., (1997) claim that protégé motivation and willingness to learn are necessary to generate further development of the relationship. If the protégé lacks the drive to learn, then the relationship will not progress and, therefore will not be successful.

The second theme was *motivational characteristics* which included two categories. Category one and two included the mentors describing greater rewards for those protégés who were perceived as having a good *work ethic* and *enjoyed sharing success and enabling others*. Essentially, the mentors were attracted to protégés who were similar to them (Allen et. al, 1997). The mentors in this study displayed a good work ethic. As displayed in the personal life histories, the mentors had good work ethics which helped them to hold a director position.

The third theme was the mentors indicating *campus recreation skills were not a necessity* for the mentor to be attracted to the protégé. Specifically, the mentors found protégés with the desire to learn new skills more appealing than those who had the skills but lacked the drive and/or were not open to learning. This is similar to the Allen et. al, (1997) study indicating mentors found the importance of the protégé displaying motivation and a learning orientation.

Research Question Four: What Outcomes Were Associated With Mentoring Women in Campus Recreation?

The fourth research question provided information on outcomes associated with mentoring women within campus recreation. Research Question Four revealed five themes: (a) lending acceptance and confirmation, (b) assigning challenging tasks, (c) friendship, (d) separation, and (e) negative consequences.

The first theme included the mentors describing how the mentoring relationship provided *acceptance and confirmation* within the organization. The mentors described how important it was to provide confidence while lending support and encouragement to the protégé. This supports Kram's (1983) psychosocial function of the mentor providing

acceptance and confirmation to the mentoring relationship. As a younger employee develops competence in the work world, upper management's acceptance and confirmation provide support and encouragement.

The second theme included the mentors describing *assigning challenging tasks* to the protégé. These challenging tasks were specifically targeted as useful for women in campus recreation. The tasks revolved around making sure the female protégé had the opportunity to experience difficult tasks within campus recreation, for example, overseeing a men's basketball league. These challenging assignments are an example of Kram's (1983) career function of challenging assignments. This function is limited in its direct impact on career advancement, but it is critical in preparing young protégés to perform well on difficult tasks as they move forward.

The third theme included the mentors describing *friendship* as an outcome of the mentoring relationship. Some of the mentoring relationships were sustained for an average of 20 years. Kram (1983) indicated friendship is a psychosocial function of the mentoring relationship. The friendship usually occurs in the final stages of the mentoring relationship. This stage is called the separation stage of the mentoring relationship.

The fourth theme included the mentors describing *separation* as an outcome of the mentoring relationship. The mentors described how the protégé becomes independent and the separation phase is a happy time for the mentors, as the protégés begin to follow in their footsteps. Kram (1983) indicated that separation is the third phase of the mentoring relationship. Separation occurs following two to five years of being in the relationship. This makes sense considering students are only in school for approximately four to five years, and the participants described mentoring students.

The fifth theme of *negative consequences* included three categories. The first category included the mentor describing time commitment as a negative outcome to the mentoring relationship. Regardless if the mentoring relationship is with a female or male protégé, the time commitment involved can be a problem for the mentor. Although, the mentors in this study were well-established within their career, there were a limited number of mentors within their organization. Often times having fewer mentors within an organization leads to decreased energy and time for these mentors (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

The second category included the mentor describing *discussing sensitive issues and breaking confidentiality* as a negative outcome for mentors within campus recreation. Although dealing with the sensitive issues was a negative outcome, the mentors also indicated it was a learning process for them. This supports Kossek and Lobel (1995), who described mentors as "co-learners" within the mentoring relationship. The mentors in this study indicated they believed they learned as much from the protégé as the protégé learned from them.

The third category included the mentor describing *being vulnerable* as a negative outcome for mentors within campus recreation. The mentors described how protégés were young and more likely to make mistakes. This could lead to negative exposure for the mentor. This outcome is evident in the literature concerning men who might not mentor women because of the negative exposure within the organization (Ragins, 1993). As mentioned campus recreation is unique because the mentors do expect the students to be inexperienced and therefore they will make mistakes.

Implications for Campus Recreation Professionals

This study had several implications for campus recreation professionals. First, there were few gender related responses but the ones mentioned included a reason for specifically mentoring women. It was voiced by the participants more so in terms of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. During this time period women struggled to enter the campus recreation field. The mentors believed a reason for mentoring women in campus recreation was due to a lack of female leaders. However, the mentors in this study also believed there was not a shortage of women in leadership positions today. This perception contradicted the study conducted by Bower and Hums (2004) which illustrated there was an underrepresentation of females in leadership positions within campus recreation. This may be due to the fact the majority of the mentors were older and experienced the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s where leadership positions for females were scarce. The mentors believe the females have come along way since the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s in campus recreation, and therefore have a perception of not being underrepresented in the field. The mentors also indicated mentoring should be directed towards both males and females entering the field and there was not a difference in the way they mentored females and the ways they mentored males. Professionals in the field of campus recreation need to realize there may not be a difference in the way a female or a male is mentored.

Second, mentors in this study indicated the majority of their protégés were students. A primary reason these mentors enter the campus recreation field and mentored others was to help students to learn and grow. Campus recreation professionals need to be aware that they may be mentoring students even when employed in an entry level

position within this field. Unfortunately, the mentor at this stage of his or her life may not have accumulated the experience necessary to benefit the protégé. Levinson et. al (1978) indicated if the age difference is less than six to eight years, the mentoring relationship is likely to cause the participants to relate to each others as peers, and the mentoring aspects will be minimal. Organizations within campus recreation need to be aware of the responsibilities of the entry level employees and realize they may need mentoring as well.

Third, professional development opportunities for females and males were important organizational factors which facilitated the mentoring relationship. By focusing on career development opportunities, females and males are perceived as equally able to advance within the field of campus recreation. Since professional development is so important, campus recreation professionals who are mentoring need to be aware of the trends of the variety of segments in the field. Students need to be encouraged to attend professional conferences such as the NIRSA National Convention or state workshops. The segments include intramurals, fitness, wellness, outdoor adventure, club sports, extramurals, and special events. By understanding the professional development needs in each of these segments, the professional in campus recreation will be better prepared to mentor.

Fourth, the mentors did not focus on skill level as an attraction to mentor the protégé, rather on characteristics in terms of personality, motivation, and competency. Professionals mentoring in campus recreation need to be aware students may not be as mature or may not have developed the skills necessary to do the job right away.

Therefore, professionals in the field need to be more tolerant of mistakes and not expect too much too early.

Fifth, time commitment was considered a negative consequence of mentoring. This may be due to the fact mentoring is in essence a part of the everyday job description of being a professional staff employee in a campus recreation setting. Professional staff employees work alongside students everyday. It seems as though mentoring becomes a part of the daily routine. Professionals entering the field of campus recreation need to be aware of the time commitment involved when mentoring and working alongside students.

Sixth, sensitive issues may become a negative consequence of mentoring. Students have a variety of problems and need to share them with someone. That someone may be the mentor and the issues can become very serious. Campus recreation professionals need to be aware there are issues that may be uncomfortable and there might be a time when confidentiality may need to be broken. Campus recreation professionals need to be prepared to refer the students to counseling for a variety of reasons. Being prepared is the first step. Following through is the second step. Being able to handle the aftermath is the hardest step.

These implications for campus recreational professionals illustrate both the importance of this study and the need for further study of the mentoring relationship.

Future Research Derived From the Study

The study revealed some interesting areas for future research in campus recreation administration. These areas could not be investigated by this researcher as they were outside of the scope of the present study.

First, this study took the perspective of the mentor. What would the same type of study reveal if the participants were protégés in campus recreation? Could it be the protégés support the mentors' perspectives or is there a difference of opinion? It could change the views of both the mentor and the protégé in campus recreation if the two have conflicting visions of the mentoring relationship.

Second, this study started out being "gender related," focused around illustrating the factors which influence the willingness to mentor women. However, the study indicated very few gender related responses when the mentors reflected on the 1980s to the present. This seems unusual considering there is still a lack of females in leadership positions within campus recreation according to the *2003 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory*. It seems the mentors in this study had a different perception on the reality of the current situation for women in campus recreation. Although the *2003 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory* indicated there were a lack of female leaders, mentors in this study believe there was equal representation. If mentoring is not the answer, then what can be done to improve the representation of women in leadership positions?

Third, this study focused on four questions to examine the factors which influenced the willingness to mentor females in campus recreation. There could be four separate studies focusing specifically on each research question without making it gender specific: (a) what are the individual reasons for mentoring others in campus recreation, (b) what organizational factors inhibit or facilitate the mentoring relationship within campus recreation, (c) what protégé characteristics attract a mentor in campus recreation, and (d) what outcomes are associated with mentoring in campus recreation?

Fourth, this study indicated that mentors spoke about students as their protégés but failed to mention young professionals. In addition young professionals are asked to mentor as they enter an entry level position. If the focus is on mentoring students in campus recreation, who is focused on mentoring young professionals?

Fifth, this study examined mentoring from a director level position within campus recreation. Since young professionals are mentoring when they enter the campus recreation field, it would be interesting to examine mentoring from their viewpoints. What is the perspective of the mentor from an entry level position?

These speculations are worded as questions to investigate in future research. The answers to these questions need to be derived through inductive, phenomenological research methodology as was used in this study. These speculations reveal that mentoring in campus recreation can be a complex and rich arena for future research.

Conclusions

This study examined the factors which influenced the willingness to mentor females in campus recreation. The research questions and personal histories of the mentors generated rich data which shed light on mentoring relationships within campus recreation.

The major study findings unique to campus recreation were the following: (a) lack of "gender related" responses, (b) the majority of mentoring takes place with students rather than with professional staff members, (c) time commitments were a disadvantage to the mentoring relationship, (d) sensitive issues are more complex when dealing with students, (e) mentors were vulnerable, and (f) females and males need to be offered professional development opportunities within campus recreation.

As mentioned, the study did not support many of the gender related responses to the mentoring relationship seen in the related literature. However, previous literature and the findings of this study supported common factors which influence the willingness to mentor others in campus recreation. In generalizing to the literature, the researcher was able to find evidence supporting factors which influenced the willingness to mentor both females and males in campus recreation. It is hoped that numerous related studies of this topic will be conducted to further examine mentoring in campus recreation.

REFERENCES

Abramovitz, M. (1988). *Regulating the lives of women: Social welfare policy from Colonial times to the present.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (1985a). Status of women in athletics: Changes and causes. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 56,* 35-37.

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (1985b). Women in athletics—a status report. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 56,* 30-34.

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (1988). *Perceived causes of declining representation of women leaders in intercollegiate sport.* Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College.

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (1992) *Women in intercollegiate sport-A longitudinal study-15 year update 1977-1992.* Retrieved October 15, 2003 from http://www.getcited.org/pub/103369638.

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (2002). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study-Twenty- third year update.* West Brookfield, MA: Carpenter/Acosta.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 70-89.

Amott, T., & Matthaei, J. (1991). *Race, gender, and work: A multicultural economic history of women in the United States.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Arnold, M. L., & Shinew, K. J. (1996). Career advancement perceptions held by female middle managers compared to male middle managers. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 15,* 40-57.

Aryee, S., & Chay, Y. W., Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to mentor among managerial employees. *Group and Organization Management, 21,* 261-277.

Beaton, R. (1998, July 7). Selig sensitive to conflict of interest issue. *USA Today.* Retrieved on September 22, 2002 from http://www.usa.com/sports/baseball/mlbfs18.htm.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, Y. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing.* New York: Basic Books.

224

Berlage, G. (1994). *Women in baseball: The forgotten history*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Blackhurst, A. (2000). Effects of mentoring on the employment of experiences and Career satisfaction of women student affairs administrators. *NASPA Journal, 37*, 573-586.

Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N. Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 29*, 267-281

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Boudreau, C. A. (1994). Professional challenges and coping strategies of women superintendents from selected school districts in Illinois. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*, 19. University Microfilms No. AAC94134.

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2004). Women working in the administration of Campus recreation: Career paths and challenges. *NIRSA Recreational Sports Journal*.

Bray, C. (1988). Sport and social change: Socialist feminist theory. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 59*, 50-53.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2003). United States Department of Labor. *Monthly Labor Review Online*. Retrieved on September 22, 2002 from http://wwwstats.bls.gov/opub/mlr/mlrhome.

Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group and Organization Studies, 9*, 353-372.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1989). Mentor relationships in organizations: Issues, strategies and prospects for women. *The Journal of Management Development, 8*, 33-42.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1989). Developing formal mentoring programs in organizations. *Business Quarterly, 53*, 76-99.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1990). Mentoring in organizations: Implications for women. *Journal of Business Ethics, 9*, 317-332.

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1995). Proportion of men employees in organizations and the experience. *Equal Opportunities International, 14*, 27-36.

225

Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1997). Benefits of mentoring relationships among managerial and professional women: A cautionary tale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 43-57.

Byrne, S. (1998). Just doin' her job. *Yankee Magazine, 19,* 28-30.

Byrne, E. M. (1991). *Mentorship in human resource and career development: A policy approach.* Unpublished Paper, University of Queensland.

Caiozzi, N. N., Seidler T. L., & Verner, M. E. (2003). Networking practices among Illinois high school athletics administrators. *International Journal of Sport Management, 4,* 110-129.

Catalyst (1993). *Women on corporate boards: The challenge of change.* New York, NY: Catalyst.

Catalyst. (2002). *2002 Catalyst census of women business directors of the Fortune 1000.* New York, NY: Sara Lee Corporation.

Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 15-28.

Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Garnder, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with non-mentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology, 45,* 619-636.

Coynor, C., & Towne, E. (1992). *Sports guide of high school and colleges-coaches directory.* El Paso, TX: Craftsman.

Crawford, F. B. (1992). A case study of women superintendents in Georgia: Exploring the common grounds. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 12,* 4144. University Microfilms No. AAC 9312148.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five Traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Danylchuk, K. E., Pastore, D. L., & Inglis, S. (1996). Critical factors in the attainment of intercollegiate coaching and management positions. *The Physical Educator, 53,* 137-146.

Davies-Netzley, S.A. (1998). Women above the glass ceiling: Perceptions on corporate mobility and strategies for success. *Gender & Society, 12,* 339-355.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 500-515). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dominquez., C. M. (1991). The glass ceiling and Workforce 2000. *Labor Law Journal*, *42*, 715-717.

Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative social research: Individual and team field research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dreher, G., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 539-546.

Dreher, G., & Cox, T. H. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity. A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Vocational Behavior, 41*, 48-60.

Drum, A. (1993). From dean of women to woman dean. *NASPA Journal, 31*, 2-7.

Edson, S. K. (1988). *Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégé vs non-protégé. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 309-320.

Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 29-42.

Federal Glass Commission. (1995). *Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Feldman, D. C. (1988). *Managing career in organizations*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Feitelberg, R. (1996). Women's new sport: Climbing activewear's corporate staircase. *WWD, 72*, 1-3.

Finlay, C. S. (1986). *Perceptions of chief administrative officers at Pennsylvania colleges and universities concerning the career advancement potential of women administrators within higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

Fitzgerald, M. P., Sagaria, M. A., & Nelson, B. (1994). Career patterns of athletic directors: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Sport Management, 8*, 14-26.

Foundation for Women. (1992). *Women's voices: A policy guide.* New York, NY: The Center for Policy Alternatives.

Fowlkes, M., Bonner, P., Coons, B., & Koppein, L. (1987). The Wisconsin idea: A grassroots approach to quality coaching for girls' sports. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 2*, 36-39.

Frisby, W. (1992). Women in leisure service management: Alternative definitions of career success. *Society and Leisure, 15*, 155-174.

Frisby, W., & Brown, B. A. (1991). The balancing act: Women leisure service managers. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research, 16*, 297-321.

Gallese, L. R. (1993). Do women make poor mentors? *Across the Board, 30*, 23-26.

Gaskill, L. R. (1993). A conceptual framework for the developmental, implementation, and evaluation of formal mentoring programs. *Journal of Career Development, 20*, 147-161.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine.

Haas, V. B., & Perrucci, C. C. (1984). *Women in scientific and engineering professions.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hall, M. A. (1984). Feminist prospects for the sociology of sport. *The Arena Review, 8*, 1-9.

Harris, B. J. (1978). *Beyond her sphere: Women and the professions in American History.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Hart, B. A., Hasbrook, C. A., & Mathes, S. A. (1986). An examination of the reduction in the number of female interscholastic coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57*, 68-77.

Hartmann, H. (1976). Capitalism, patriarchy, and job segregation by sex. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1*, 137-169.

Hasbrook, C. A. (1988). Female coaches: Why the declining numbers and percentages? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 5*, 59-63.

Hasbrook, C. A., Hart, B. A., Mathes, S. A., & True, S. (1990). Sex bias and the validity of believed differences between male and female interscholastic athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 61,* 259-267.

Hastings-Ardell, J. (1998, March). Women in the owner's box. Presented at the Diamonds in the Desert International Baseball Conference, Phoenix, AZ.

Haynor, P. M. (1994). The coaching, perceptions and mentoring roles of the leaders within an organizational setting. *Holistic Nursing Practice, 9,* 31-40.

Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed? Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 935-942.

Heishman, M. F., Bunker, L., & Tutwiler, R. W. (1990). The decline of women leaders (coaches and athletic directors) in girls' interscholastic sport programs in Virginia from 1972 to 1987. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 61,* 103-107.

Henderson, K. A., & Bialeskchki, M. D. (1996). Career development and women in leisure services. *Management Strategy, 20,* 4.

Hill, M. S., & Ragland, J. C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Householder, V. H. (1988). *Women, work, and fertility, 1900-1986.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Holmen, M. G., & Parkhouse, B.L. (1981). Trends in the selection of coaches for female athletes: A demographic inquiry. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 52,* 9-18.

Hubbard, S. S., & Robinson, J. P. (1996). Mentoring: A catalyst for advancement in administration. *Journal of Career Development, 24,* 289-299.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hums, M. A., Barr, C. A., & Doll-Tepper, G. (1998). Roles and status of women in sport management. *ICHPERSD Journal, 34,* 12-17.

Hums, M. A., Moorman, A. M., & Nakazawa, M. (1998). International status of women's professional sports leagues. *Proceedings of the 6th Congress of the European Association for Sport Management.* Madiera, Portugal, 113-119.

Hums, M. A., & Sutton, W. A. (1999). Women working in the management of professional baseball: Getting to first base? *Journal of Career Development, 26*, 147-158.

Hums, M.A., & Sutton, W.A. (2000, June). Women working in the management of professional sport: Comparison of careers in professional baseball and *basketball*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the North American Society for Sport Management, Colorado Springs, CO.

Hunt, D., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review, 8*, 475-480.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Personal networks of women and minorities in management: A conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review, 18*, 56-87.

Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Patore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's experiences in coaching and athletic management: Listening to the voices. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 9*, 1-26.

International Health, Racquet, and Sportsclub Association. (1995). *The 1995 IHRSA report on the state of the health club industry*. Boston, MA: International Health, Racquet and Sportsclub Association.

Jackson, J. C. (2000). Women middle managers' perception of the glass ceiling. *Women in management review, 16*, 30-41.

Kanter, R. M. (1978). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kelly, K. E. (1984). Initiating a relationship with a mentor in student affairs. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 21*, 49-54.

Kessler-Harris, A. (1982). *Out to work: A history of wage-earning women in the United States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

King, J. E. (2000). *Gender equity in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, Center for Policy Analysis.

Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: A contextual perspective*. New York, NY: Springer.

Knoppers, A. (1987). Gender and the coaching profession. *Quest, 39*, 9-22.

Knoppers, A. (1989). Coaching: An equal opportunity occupation? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 3*, 38-43.

Kossek, E. E., & Lobel, S. (1995). *Managing diversity: Human resources strategies for transforming the work place.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Kowalski, T. J., & Stouder, J. G. (1999). Female experiences related to becoming a superintendent. *Contemporary Education, 70(4),* 32-39.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work.* Glenview, IL: Scot, Foresman.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28,* 110-132.

Ladies Professional Golf Association (1997). *1997 LPGA guide.* Daytona Beach, FL: Ladies Professional Golf Association.

Ladies Professional Golf Association (2002). *2002 LPGA guide.* Daytona Beach, FL: Ladies Professional Golf Association.

Lapchick, R. E. (2003). *2003 Racial & Gender Report Card.* Orlando, FL: University of Central Florida.

LeBlanc, D. S. (1993). Barriers to women's advancement into higher education administration. In P.T. Mitchell (Ed.), *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 41-49). Washington, DC: The College and University Personnel Association.

LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research (2nd ed.).* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lemons, M., & Parzinger, M. J. (2001). Designing women: A qualitative study of the glass ceiling for women in technology. *Advanced Management Journal, 66,* 1-11.

Levinson, D. J. (1979). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. G., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York, NY: Alfred Knopf.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. D. (1994). "Good old boys" and "good old girls" clubs: Myth or reality? *Journal of Sport Management, 8,* 27-35.

231

Maack, M. N., & Passet, J. (1994). *Aspirations and mentoring in an academic environment.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Maier, M. (1997). Invisible privilege: What white men don't see. *The Diversity Factor,* 28-33.

Mark, S. F. (1986). *Gender differences among mid-level administrators.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.

Mathes, S. A. (1982). *Women coaches: Endangered species?* Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance National Convention, Houston, TX.

McCracken, G. (1988). *The long interview.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McKay, J. (1997). *Managing gender: Affirmative action and organizational power in Australian, Canadian, and New Zealand sports.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mezey, S. G. (1992). *In pursuit of equality: Women, public policy, and the federal courts.* New York: St. Martin's.

McGovern, J. R. (1968). The American woman's pre-World War I freedom in manners and morals. *Journal of American History, LV,* 323.

McNeer, E. (1983). Two opportunities for mentoring: A study of women's career development in higher education administration. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 47,* 8-14.

Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from "Case study research in education."* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Moore, K. M. (1984). Careers in college and university administration: How are women affected? *Women in Higher Education Administration, 45,* 5-15.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can Women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

National Women's Football Association (2003). History of the NWFA. *NWFA Website*. Retrieved on July 6, 2003 from http://www.nwflcentral.com.

Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (4th edition)*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Newby, T. J., & Heide, A. (1992). The value of mentoring. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 5*, 2-15.

NIRSA. (2003). *About NIRSA*. Retrieved October, 1, 2003 from http://www.nirsa.org/about/index.htm

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 457-479.

Oakes, J. L. (1999). Women as capable leaders in higher education administration: A historical journey with implications for professional mentoring. *A Leadership Journal: Women in Leadership – Sharing the Vision, 3*, 57-62.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics, 27*, 321-334.

Offermann, L. R. (1992). Achievement styles of women leaders and their peers: Toward An understanding of women and leadership. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*, 37-56.

Oglesby, C. A., Shelton, C. M., Demchenko, V., & Thumler, B. B. (1987). COACH project. Coaches and officials acquire competencies here. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58*, 40-44.

Olian, J. D., Carroll, S. J., Giannantionio, C. M., & Ferern, D. B. (1988). What do protégés look for in a mentor? Results of three experimental studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 33*, 15-37.

Overall, C. (1987). Role models: A critique. In K. Storrie (Ed.), *Women: Isolation and bonding* (pp. 179-186). Toronto: Methuen.

Pastore, D. L. (1991a). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. *Journal of Sport Management, 5*, 128-143.

Pastore, D. L. (1991b). The status of female coaches in two-year colleges. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 62*, 22-26.

Pastore, D. L. (1992). Administrative recommendations for increasing the number of female coaches at two year colleges. *Physical Educator, 49*, 67-75.

Pastore, D. L. (1994). Strategies for retaining female high school head coaches: A survey of administrators and coaches. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 82*, 169-182.

Pastore, D. L., Danylchuk, K. E., & Inglis, S. (1996). Retention factors in coaching and athletic management: Differences by gender, position, and geographic location. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 24*, 427-441.

Pastore, D. L., Danylchuk, K. E., & Inglis, S. (1999). Confirmatory factor analysis of retention factors for American and Canadian coaches and athletic managers. *Journal of International Council for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (ICHPERD), 35*, 26-30.

Pastore, D. L., & Meacci, W. G. (1990). Coaches' recommendations for recruiting and retaining female college coaches. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 61*(1), 86-89

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ragins, B. R. (1989). Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human Relations, 42*, 1-22.

Ragins, B. R. (1996). Jumping the hurdles: Barriers to mentoring for women in organizations. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 17*, 37-41.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 939-951.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1993). Gender and willingness to mentor in organizations. *Journal of Management, 19*, 97-111.

Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1994). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 957-972.

Ragins, B. R., Townsend, B., & Mattis, M. (1998). Gender gap in the executive suite: CEO's and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling. *Academy of Management Executive, 12*, 28-42.

Reich, M. H. (1985). Executive views from both sides of mentoring. *Personnel, 3*, 42-46.

Roche, G. R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 1*, 14-28.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research, 2nd edition.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (19950. *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sagaria, M. A., & Johnsrud, L. K. (1992). Administrative promotion: The structuring of opportunity within a university. *The Review of Higher Education, 15,* 191-210.

Sampson, S. N. (1987). Equal opportunity, alone, is not enough or why there are more male principals in schools these days. *Australian Journal of Education, 31,* 27-42.

Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13,* 169-174.

Scandura, T. A., & Viator, R. (1994). Mentoring in public accounting firms. An analysis of mentor-protégé career outcomes. In D. F. Ray & M. E. Schnake (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association (pp. 206-208).* Mississippi State, MS: Southern Management Association.

Scanlon, K. C. (1997). Mentoring women administrators breaking through the glass ceiling. *Initiatives, 58,* 39-48.

Schafer, S. P. (1987). Sports need you: The Colorado model. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 58,* 44-47.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider D., & Schneider, C. J. (1993). *American women in the progressive era, 1900 -1920.* New York, NY: Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc.

Schuman, D. (1982). *Policy analysis, education, and everyday life.* Lexington, MA: Heath.

Schwartz, F. N., & Zimmerman, J. (1992). *Breaking with tradition: Women and work, the new facts of life.* New York: Warner Books.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and social sciences,* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). *Women in educational administration.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Silverhart, T. A. (1994). A model of factors affecting the treatment of disabled individuals in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 21,* 352-401.

Sisley, B. L., & Capel, S. A. (1986). High school coaching: Filled with gender differences. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57,* 39-43.

Sisley, B. L., Weiss, M. R., Barber, H., & Ebbeck, V. (1991). Developing competence and confidence in novice women coaches: A study of attitudes, motives, and perceptions of ability. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 6,* 57-60.

Stangle, J. M., & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: Case of homogolous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 8,* 47-60.

Strawbridge, M. (2000). The professional preparation of women in leadership of sports. *Women in Sports Leadership, 4,* 46-53.

Tavakolian, H. R. (1993). Break on through to the other side of the glass ceiling. *Equal Opportunities International, 12,* 14-24.

Tedrow, B. (1999). A qualitative study of women's experiences in community college leadership positions. *Community College Review, 27,* 1-18.

True, S. (1986). Coaching: Study evaluates reasons behind declining number of women coaches. *Interscholastic Athletic Administration, 12,* 18-19, 21.

Turbin, C. (1992). *Working women of collar city: Gender, class, and community in Troy, 1846-86.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Twale, D. J. (1995). Gender comparisons of NASPA membership. *NASPA Journal, 323,* 293-301.

Twale, D. J., & Jelinek, S. M. (1996). Protégés and mentors: Mentoring experiences of women student affairs professionals. *NASPA Journal, 33,* 203-217.

Uglow, J. S. (1985). *International dictionary of women's biographies.* New York, NY: Continuum.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1991). *Statistical abstract of the United States, 111th edition.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of the Census..

U.S. Department of Labor. (1991). *A report on the glass ceiling initiative.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau (1997). Factors on working women, Retrieved on September 22, 2002 from
http://www.dolgov/dol/wb/public/wb_pubs/wmgt97.htm.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (2001). Factors on working women, Retrieved on September 22, 2002 from
http://www/dolgov/dol/wb/public/wb_pubs/wmgt01.htm.

Van Maanen, J. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Varner, H. S. (1992). Women in the NIRSA. *NIRSA Journal, 17(1),* 26-30.

Vincent, A., & Seymour, J. (1995). Profile of women mentors: A national survey. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, 60,* 4-12.

Ware, S. *Holding their own: American women in the 1930s.* Boston: Twayne.

Warner, R., & Defluer, L. B. (1993). Career paths of women in higher education administration. In P. R. Mitchell (Ed.) *Cracking the wall: Women in higher education administration* (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.

Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management, 16,* 96-116.

Wentling, R. M. (1995). Breaking down barriers to women's success. *HR Magazine, 40,* 79-84.

Whitely, W., Dougherty, T. W., & Dreher, G. F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers' and professionals' early career progress. *Academy of Management Journal, 34,* 331-351.

Wilkinson, S., & Schneider, P. M. (1991). The representation of men and women in secondary physical education and interscholastic athletic programs in the state of Illinois. *The Physical Educator, 48,* 100-103.

Wilson, J., & Elman, N. (1990). Organizational benefits of mentoring. *Academy of Management Executives, 4,* 88-94.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Women's National Basketball Association (2003). The first lady of basketball. *Virginia Onlinemag: The University of Virginia Alumni News.* Retrieved on July 6, 2003 from http://www.alumni.virginia.edu.

Women's Professional Football League (2003). The Women's Professional Football League: Administration. *WPFL Website.* Retrieved on July 6, 2003 from http://www.womensprofootball.com.

Women's Tennis Association (2003). A long way indeed. *WTA website.* Retrieved on July 6, 2003 from http://www.wtatour.com.

Yager, G. M. (1983). Career patterns of women in NIRSA. *Personnel,* 1, 113-124.

Yeh, S., & Creamer, D. (1995). Orientation to moral reasoning among men and women leaders of higher education in Taiwan. *Journal of College Student Development, 36,* 113-122.

Yoder, J. D. (1991). Rethinking tokenism: Looking beyond numbers. *Gender and Society, 5,* 178-192.

Young M. D., & McLeod, S. (2001). Flukes, opportunities, and planned interventions: Factors affecting women's decisions to become school administrators. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37,* 461-502.

August 14, 2004

Glenna G. Bower
1813 Marbo Avenue
Evansville, IN 47714

Dear Ms. Bower

As partial fulfillment of my Ph.D. in Education Administration with a concentration in Sport Administration, I am conducting a study of factors influencing the willingness to mentor among Campus Recreation professionals. There has not been a qualitative research study conducted from the perspective of the mentor in Campus Recreation. You are being invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to understand the perspective of the mentor in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship within Campus Recreation.

Please remember that your participation in this study is voluntary. I am requesting three interviews of approximately 90 minutes each. The interviews will take place in September, October and November. If you agree to participate, please contact me via email at gbower@usi.edu. There are no risks or benefits to you for participation; however, the knowledge gained may benefit others. Your feedback is vital to the success of this study. More importantly, your responses will help get realistic mentoring information out to men and women aspiring to work in campus recreation.

Your interviews will be stored at the University of Louisville. Individuals from the University of Louisville Human Subjects Committee (HSC) for the protection of human subjects of research may inspect these records. In all other respects, however, the data will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Should the data be published, your identity will not be disclosed.

You may refuse to participate without being subject to any penalty or losing any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you have any questions about this study, you may contact myself Glenna G. Bower at 812-461-5269, or the dissertation co-chair Mary A. Hums at 502-852-5908. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact the University of Louisville Human Subjects Committee (HSC) at 502-852-5188. Please confirm your participation by emailing me at gbower@usi.edu. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Glenna G. Bower

**Factors Influencing the Willingness to Mentor Female Campus Recreation Professionals
Subject Informed Consent**

Introduction and Background Information

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Dr. Mary A. Hums and Glenna G. Bower. The study is sponsored by the University of Louisville, Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Human Resource Education. The study will take place at the University of Louisville. Approximately five subjects will be invited to participate. Your participation in this study will last for three 90-minute interview sessions.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to understand the perspective of the mentor in discovering factors which influence a mentor's decision to engage in a mentoring relationship within Campus Recreation. The present study will investigate four areas of inquiry: individual reasons for mentoring others, organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate mentoring, protégé characteristics which attract mentors, and the outcomes associated with mentoring others.

Procedures

In this study, you will be asked to participate in three in-depth interviews lasting approximately 90-minutes. The first interview will ask you to narrate your personal life history relative to the mentoring relationship. The second interview will include bringing the narrative to the present, by focusing on specific details of your experience as a mentor. Finally, the third interview will ask you to reflect on the meaning of your experiences. You will be one of approximately five subjects participating in the study. Your participation in the study will be three 90-minutes interviews over the course of a three month period. The interviews will take place in your office at a designated time convenient for you.

Potential Risks

There are no foreseeable risks.

Benefits

The possible benefits of this study include learning reasons why its important to mentor others, factors which inhibit or facilitate mentoring, characteristics which attract mentors, and the outcomes associated with mentoring others. The information collected may not benefit you directly. The information learned in this study may be helpful to others.

Confidentiality

Although absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, confidentiality will be protected to the extent permitted by law. The study sponsor, the Human Studies Committees, or other appropriate agencies may inspect your research records. Should the data collected in this research study be published, your identity will not be revealed.
Date Written 6-04-03

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty or losing benefit to which you are otherwise entitled.

Research Subject's Rights and Contact Persons

You acknowledge that all your present questions have been answered in language you can understand and all future questions will be treated in the same manner. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Glenna G. Bower at (812)461-5269.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the Human Studies Committees office (502)852-5188. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as a research subject, in confidence, with a member of the committees. These are independent committees composed of members of the University community, staff of the institutions, as well as lay members of the community not connected with these institutions. The Committee has reviewed this study.

Consent

You have discussed the above information and hereby consent to voluntarily participate in this study. You have been given a copy of the consent.

_____   _____
Signature of Subject   Date Signed

_____   _____
Signature of Investigator   Date Signed

Date Written 6-04-03

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Preliminary Information for Interviewer
- Explain to interviewee that this information is confidential and all responses will remain anonymous.
- Explain that information will only be presented in aggregate form.
- Explain that only those individuals working on this project (Glenna G. Bower, Mary A. Hums, John Keedy) will have access to this information.
- Maintain as much eye contact as possible with the interview. Smile often. Use non-verbals (e.g., nodding) to encourage and draw-out responses from the interviewee.
- Thank interviewee at beginning and end of interview.

Part I: Demographic Information

(Note to interviewer: If candidate hesitates before answering these questions, simply explain that these are for record-keeping purposes only and will not be used to identify responses. If further resistance is encountered, skip those items that are considered offensive.)

Gender: M F (Interviewer: Circle the appropriate response)

What is your age?

What is your race? African-American Asian American
(Interviewer: Circle one)

Hispanic Native American

White Other (Specify: _____)

What is the highest level of education you have obtained? (Interviewer: Circle one)

High School Some College Two-Year (Associate) Degree

Four Year Degree Some Graduate School Other (Specify: _____)

What is your current job title?

How long have you worked in this job? Years: _____ Months: _____

How long have you worked for this organization? Years : _____ Months: _____

How long have you worked in Campus Recreation? Years: _____ Months:_____

242

INTERVIEW ONE

Interview One: Focused on Life History as a Protégé

Note to interviewer: Please recite the following before proceeding with this section:

"Before we talk about your role as a mentor. I'd like to gather some of your experiences as a protégé. The next few questions will focus on your experience as a protégé."

1. During your career, has there ever been an individual who has taken a personal interest in you and who has guided, sponsored, or otherwise had a positive significant influence on your professional career development? In other words, have you ever had a mentor? How many have you had?
2. Let's focus on your most recent mentor for a moment. Who initiated the mentoring relationship? Where did you meet? How regularly did you meet with your mentor? What was the setting? How long did you meet?
3. How regularly did you meet with your mentor? Where did you meet? How long did you meet?
4. What was the mentoring style used by the mentor?
5. What type of influence or benefit did the mentor have on your professional development?
6. What type of influence or benefit did the mentor have on your personal life?
7. Were there any disadvantages to being involved in this relationship?
8. Did your experience as a protégé influence your decision to become a mentor? How?
9. Did your experience as a protégé help you prepare for the role of mentor? How?
10. What did you do to prepare yourself for serving as a mentor?
   (Note to interviewer: Give examples, such as organizational training programs, workshops, advice, experience as a protégé, etc.)

Question Matrix

Purpose	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
1								x		x
2										
3										
4					x	x	x		x	
Life History	x	x	x	x						

Purpose
1. What are the individual reasons for mentoring others within Campus Recreation?

2. What are the organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate mentoring within within Campus Recreation?
3. What are the protégé characteristics which attract mentors within Campus Recreation?
4. What are the outcomes associated with mentoring others within Campus Recreation?

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW TWO

Preliminary Information for Interviewer
- Explain to interviewee that this information is confidential and all responses will remain anonymous.
- Explain that information will only be presented in aggregate form.
- Explain that only those individuals working on this project (Glenna G. Bower, Mary A. Hums, John Keedy) will have access to this information.
- Maintain as much eye contact as possible with the interview. Smile often. Use non-verbals (e.g., nodding) to encourage and draw-out responses from the interviewee.
- Thank interviewee at beginning and end of interview.

Interview Two: Details of Experience of Being a Mentor

Note to interviewer: Please recite the following before proceeding with this section:

"Now I'd like to ask several questions that focus on your experience as a mentor."

1. How many protégés have you mentored? How many protégés are you currently mentoring right now?
   (Note to interviewer: Ask for the duration of the relationship for each of the protégés mentioned).

2. Please describe the reasons why you have served as a mentor to others.
   (Note to interviewer: Probe for motivational factors, for example, wanting to pass on knowledge to others, wanting to leave a legacy in organization, wanting to increase your visibility, wanting to help others, etc.)

3. Of the reasons you just listed, rank order the five most important.
   (Note to interviewer: Simply place the number by the reason outlined above.)

4. What do you perceive are advantages to serving as a mentor? That is, how do you believe mentors benefit from mentoring others?

5. What do you perceive are the disadvantages to serving as a mentor? That is, how do you believe mentors experience negative consequences by mentoring others?

6. What negative consequences have you personally realized as a result of serving as a mentor? *(Note to interviewer: Follow-up with specific example, such as damage to your reputation, hindering your work, demotion).*

7. What are some of the organizational factors that serve to facilitate your ability to mentor others?

8. What are some of the organizational factors that inhibit or constrain your ability to mentor others?

9. What characteristics do you think the ideal mentor should possess?

Interview Two Continued: The Details on Perceptions of a Protégé
Note to interviewer: Please recite the following before proceeding with this section:

"Now I'd like to ask several questions focusing on your perceptions of the protégé."
10. Think about the mentoring relationships you had with your protégés. In general, describe how this relationship was initiated. Did the protégé first approach you? Did you perceive that the protégé needed help?

11. What factors attracted you to the individual that you mentored?

12. What characteristics do you think make-up the ideal protégé?

13. Would you consider mentoring a junior employee who had low performance/who was struggling? Why or why not?

14. Would you rather mentor a high performing or a low performing junior employee? Why?

Question Matrix

Purpose	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14
1		x	x						x					
2							x	x						
3										x	x	x	x	x
4				x	x	x								
Life History	x													

Purpose
1. What are the individual reasons for mentoring others within Campus Recreation?
2. What are the organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate mentoring within within Campus Recreation?
3. What are the protégé characteristics which attract mentors within Campus Recreation?
4. What are the outcomes associated with mentoring others within Campus Recreation?

INTERVIEW THREE

Preliminary Information for Interviewer
- Explain to interviewee that this information is confidential and all responses will remain anonymous.
- Explain that information will only be presented in aggregate form.
- Explain that only those individuals working on this project (Glenna G. Bower, Mary A. Hums, John Keedy) will have access to this information.
- Maintain as much eye contact as possible with the interview. Smile often. Use non-verbals (e.g., nodding) to encourage and draw-out responses from the interviewee.
- Thank interviewee at beginning and end of interview.

Interview Three: Reflection on Meaning of the Mentoring Relationship

Note to interviewer: Please recite the following before proceeding with this section:

"Now I'd like to ask several questions that focus on your general perceptions of relationships in which you have served as a mentor."

1. Think about your most successful mentoring relationship. What were the factors that made it such a success?

2. How did this successful mentoring relationship end?

3. Have you been involved in any mentoring relationship that were not successful? If yes, please indicate why you thing the relationship was not successful. What were the factors that made it unsuccessful?

4. How did this unsuccessful mentoring relationship end?

5. Do you still keep in touch with your former protégé (s)? If yes, what is the nature of your current relationship?

6. What do you think both mentors and protégés can do to make the most out of a mentoring relationship?

Question Matrix

Purpose	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6
1						x
2						
3						x
4	x	x	x	x	x	

Purpose
1. What are the individual reasons for mentoring others within Campus Recreation?
2. What are the organizational factors which inhibit or facilitate mentoring within within Campus Recreation?
3. What are the protégé characteristics which attract mentors within Campus Recreation?
4. What are the outcomes associated with mentoring others within Campus Recreation?

CURRICULUM VITAE

GLENNA G. BOWER

Home

1813 Marbo Avenue
Evansville, IN 47714
Tel: (812) 437-1592

Office

University of Southern Indiana
Recreation and Fitness Center
8600 University Boulevard
Evansville, IN 47712
Tel: (812) 461-5269
Fax: (812) 461 – 5273
e-mail: Gbower@usi.edu

EDUCATION

PhD/ABD   In Progress   University of Louisville
Educational Leadership and Organizational
Development
Concentration: Sport Administration
ABD, Anticipated Graduation, May 2004

MA   1999   Indiana State University
Major Area: Physical Education
Concentration: Adult Fitness

BS   1995   University of Southern Indiana
Major Area: Physical Education
Minor: Psychology

PROFESSIONAL WORK EXPERIENCE

University of Louisville, Louisville, KY   **Aug 2002-Present**
    Instructor Sport Administration Program

- Instruct classes in Sport Facility Management and Organizational Behavior

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
    Assistant Director of Recreation, Fitness and Wellness   **July 2001-Present**

- Manage the operations of the University Recreation and Fitness center facility including an $827,000 fitness budget, personnel, risk management, training, marketing, pro-shop, equipment and facility maintenance contracts, insurance

- considerations, purchases, scheduling, and staff development. Assist in overseeing outdoor facilities and pool.
- Established student development opportunities for employees and interns including programs developed towards fitness consultation, exercise recommendation, orientation, management, and customer service training. Offered workshops and certifications through the Aerobics and Fitness Association of America.
- Assist in marketing and overseeing program management in 3 areas (Fitness, Wellness and Intramurals), including fitness, group exercise, informal sports, wellness, intramurals, special events, sport clubs, aquatics, and outdoor adventure programs.
- Supervise 42 employees including 1 Program Coordinator of recreation, fitness and wellness (direct responsibilities in fitness), 1 student facility manager, 10 personal trainers, 3 interns, 6 welcome greeters, 1 marketing/PR Coordinator, 18 group exercise instructors, 3 specialty instructors (yoga, tai chi, kung-fu, dance instructors). Guide Program Coordinator of recreation, fitness and wellness (direct responsibilities in intramurals) in collaborating with fitness and wellness projects.
- Assist with Employee Wellness program in providing programs and services for the university population including health fairs, seminars, incentive programs, and specialty geared towards the employee population.

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
    Instructor in Physical Education Department   **Aug 1998-Present**

- Creator and instructor of Exercise Leadership course.
- Developed and instructed Organization and Administration of Physical Education, Recreation and Sport course online using blackboard.
- Instructor of Aqua and Step.

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
    Student Fitness Center Coordinator   **Mar 1997-June 2001**

- Assisted the Dean in the development of a new Campus Recreation Department through the collaboration of the fitness, wellness, and intramural staff. Guided 3 intramural staff members, 1 fitness staff member, 1 wellness staff member, 1 \ clerical staff member, 12 group exercise instructors, 2 alternative medicine (Yoga, Tai Chi) instructors, and 44 student workers during the transition. Guided staff in the development of the vision, mission, and strategic plan for the Department of Campus Recreation. Supervised all aspects of the facility including a fitness center, 2 courts, group exercise room, track, game room, lounge and pro-shop. Continued to market and implement programs fitness, group exercise, wellness, aquatics, sport clubs, special events, outdoor adventure and informal sports programming.
- Actively involved in the planning and overseeing of the grand opening of the new 4.7 million, 46,000 square foot Recreation and Fitness Center that opened on campus March 2001. Collaborated with architects on facility design including selection and specifications of space (courts, track, fitness center, group exercise room, locker rooms, offices) colors, flooring (group exercise, track and court floors), electronics (stereo and microphone system); attended construction meetings; assisted with budgeting process; reviewed blueprints.

- Supervised the start-up and opening of the off-campus University Fitness Center in March of 1997. Included start-up of budget, personnel, risk management, policies and procedures, staff training, marketing, pro-shop, equipment and facility maintenance, purchases, scheduling, and staff development. Guided staff in the development of the vision, mission, and strategic plans for the program.
- Supervised the University Fitness Center staff members including 1 full-time employee, 12 group exercise instructors, 2 alternative medicine (Yoga, Tai Chi) instructors, 36 student workers, 4 interns a semester, and 10 student workers.
- Oversaw the marketing and implementation of fitness, group exercise, wellness, aquatics, sport clubs, special events, and informal sports programming.
- Coordinator of Employee Wellness Committee by implementing and maintaining programs that educate the university population in areas where health care costs are rising. Cooperated with Human Resource Department in offering programming at health fairs, incentive programs and seminars. Guided Employee Wellness Committee in the development of the vision, mission, and strategic plan. Conducted research to establish programs reducing psychological stress among university employees.

Mead Johnson Nutritional Fitness Center (Fitness Systems), Evansville, IN
Assistant Coordinator   **1996-1997**

- Supervised 12 group exercise staff members, 2 alternative medicine (Yoga, Tai Chi) instructors, and 2 interns. Managed the operations of the group exercise program including the budget, personnel, risk management, policies and procedures, training, marketing, equipment maintenance, purchases, scheduling, and staff development.
- Taught group exercise classes of Step, High/Low Impact Aerobics, Slide, Resist-A-Ball, and Muscle Toning.
- Conducted fitness assessments, prescribed exercise recommendations, completed orientations, monitored and spotted participants in the facility.
- Organized, marketed, and implemented programs for the employees including stress and relaxation, incentive, and health enhancement seminars.

Ameritech Fitness Center (Fitness Systems), Chicago, IL
Fitness Specialist   **1995-1996**

- Developed, marketed and implemented incentive programs, health enhancement seminars and workshops for employees.
- Conducted fitness assessments, prescribed exercise recommendations, completed orientations, monitored and spotted participants in the facility.
- Taught group exercise classes of Step, Slide, High/Low Impact Aerobics, and Muscle Toning.
- Maintained resource library including recent information on topics of interest for facility employees.

General Electric Plastics Lifestyle Center (Fitness Systems), Evansville, IN
Fitness Specialist/Intern   **1994-1995**

- Conducted fitness assessments, prescribed exercise recommendations, completed orientations, monitored and spotted participants in the facility.

- Taught group exercise classes of Step, Slide, High/Low Impact Aerobics, and Muscle Toning.
- Developed, marketed and implemented incentive programs, health enhancement seminars and workshops for employees.

Burdette Park, Evansville, IN
   Sports Camp Counselor   1994

- Oversaw and assisted children ages 8-14 in a variety of recreation activities including basketball, soccer, hiking, putt putt golf, and fishing.
- Assisted in teaching swimming lessons. Held Water Safety Instructor Aid Certification.
- Developed and coordinated basketball camps and assisted with the development of the soccer camps.

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
   Gymnastics Instructor   1994

- Taught proper gymnastic techniques for children age 5-11.

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
   Basketball Camp Counselor
      1994

- Assisted with summer camp for girls ages 11-18.
- Coached and mentored league teams.
- Refereed league games.
- Demonstrated and taught proper basketball skills.

University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN
   Physical Activities Center Facility Supervisor   1993-1994

- Supervised the Physical Activities Center including 3 courts, an aquatics center, and weight room.
- Distributed and maintained recreation equipment for students and employees.

SCHOLARLY & ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES

Publications

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (In Press). Women working in the administration of campus recreation. *NIRSA Recreational Sports Journal.*

Research In-Progress

Factors Influencing the Willingness to Mentor Females in Campus Recreation - Qualitative
The Ethical Decisions of Directors Within Campus Recreation - Quantitative

Academic Presentations

Hums, M. A., & Bower, G. G. (2002). *Comparison of women working in professional sport and women working in campus recreation administration.* Presented at the Annual Conference of North American Society for Sport Management, Canmore, Alberta, Canada.

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (April, 2002). *Women working in the administration of campus recreation.* Presented at the annual conference of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA), San Antonio, Texas.

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (April, 2002). *What's new in research?* Presented at the Annual conference of the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Bower, G. G., & Hess, C. (November, 2001). *Partner step workshop.* Indiana Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Indianapolis, IN.

Bower, G.G., (November, 1996). *Resist-a-ball workshop.* Presented at the annual conference of the Indiana Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance Evansville, IN.

Professional Presentations

What have I gotten myself into? (2001, September 22) Invited Panelist for Doctoral Class. University of Louisville. Louisville, KY.

Where do I go from here? (2001, February 26). Invited Career Panelist. University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN, February 26, 2001.

Wellness for college and life. (2000, October 27). Invited Presenter. University of Southern Indiana. Evansville, IN.

How institutions affect stress levels. (2000, August 12). Invited Presenter. University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN.

The development of a strategic plan: How can we accomplish our goals? (1999, November). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Stress management at work. (1999, October 21). University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN. *Career opportunities within exercise science and physical education.* (1998, February, 22). Career Panel. University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN.

Healthy eating. (1997, October 10). University of Southern Indiana Secretaries Association Monthly Seminar, Evansville, IN.

Career opportunities within exercise science and physical education. (1997, February 19). University of Southern Indiana, Evansville, IN.

Laughter as an antidote to stress. (1996, September 2). Visiting Nurses Association, Evansville, IN.

Corporate Presentations (Invited Presenter)

Understanding stress. (1996, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

Thinking differently. (1996, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

Stress management at work. (1996, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

Time management. (1995, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

Type A and type B behavior. (1995, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

Relaxation techniques. (1995, July). Mead Johnson Nutritional, Evansville, IN.

GRANT AND FUNDING ACTIVITIES

2003	Indiana Campus Sexual Assault Prevention Project	$ 2000.00
2003	Great American Smokeout	$14,500.00
2002	Frisbee Golf Matching Golf	$ 3203.75
2002	Great American Smokeout	$17,500.00
2002	Study Abroad Scholarship - Greece	$ 250.00
2001	NIRSA Research Grant	$ 1808.00
2001	Student Affairs Grant Guest Speaker	$ 2500.00
2001	NCAA Grant Guest Speaker	$ 500.00
2001	Disability Awareness Day, Amy Verst	$ 500.00
2000	Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) program expenses	$ 2000.00
1999	Student Affairs Rape Aggression Defense Grant	$ 1753.00
	Total Funding Received	**$46,514.75**

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Professional Committees,

Indiana Recreational Sports Association Chair, 2003 to Present, Student Scholarship Committee
Member, 2003 to Present, Standards Committee
Chair, 2001-2002 Annual IRSA Conference Committee

University Committees, University of Southern Indiana, 1997 – present

Division of Student Affairs   Member, Recreation and Fitness Center Design Committee
Member, Improve at USI Committee
Member, Freshman Orientation Programming Committee

254

Member, Traditional Programming Grant
Committee
Chair, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003 RFC Program
Coordinator (Fitness) Search
Member, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003 RFC Program
Coordinator (Intramurals) Committee
Member, 2001 Advisory Residence Life Search
Committee
Member, 2001 Advisory Student Life Search
Committee
Member, Annual Employee Wellness Fair
Committee
Chair, Pro-Shop Supplement Committee

Division of Business Affairs   Coordinator, Employee Wellness Committee

Media Interviews, University of Southern Indiana, 1997 – present

Radio interviews, WSWI, on future programming of the Recreation and Fitness Center, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002.
TV interview, RTV 251, on The Future Expansion of the Recreation and Fitness Center, April 2001.
TV interview, RTV 251, during the Grand Opening of the Recreation and Fitness Center, March 2001.
TV interview, RTV 251, on The Building and Opening Plans for the Opening of the Recreation and Fitness Center, November 2000.
TV interview, RTV 251, on The Future Direction of the University Fitness Center, April 1999.
TV interview, RTV 251, on The Opportunities for Students and Employees at the University Fitness Center, November 1998.

Community Service

National Dance Exercise Instructors Training Association (NDEITA) workshop host provider, Evansville, IN, scheduled fro April 2004 in collaboration with the University of Southern Indiana Physical Education Department.
Aerobics and Fitness Association of America (AFAA) workshop host provider, Evansville, IN, 1999 to present
Numerous Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) classes, Evansville, IN, 1998 to present.
Numerous University of Southern Indiana Intern Coop Fairs, 1997 to present.
Volunteer American Red Cross CPR, First Aid, and AED instructor, 1996 – present.
Basic self-defense instructor for Raintree Girl Scouts summer camp, Evansville, IN, 2001.
Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) classes, Hanover, IN, 2000.
Invited Guest. March of Dimes Walk America "warm-up" kickoff instructor, 1995.
Developed children's summer camp, Chicago, IL, 1995.

Community Fund-raisers

Captain of the University of Southern Indiana American Heart Association Walk, 2000
Captain of the University of Southern Indiana YMCA Corporate Challenge, 1998, 1999, 2000
Captain of the University of Southern Indiana Walk America Team, 1998.

Captain of the Mead Johnson Nutritional March of Dimes Team, 1997
Co-Captain of Mead Johnson Nutritional YMCA Corporate Challenge, 1996 and 1997
Co-Captain of the Mead Johnson Nutritional March of Dimes Team, 1996

CERTIFICATIONS

American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) Health and Fitness Instructor
American Council on Exercise (ACE) Personal Trainer
American Council on Exercise (ACE) Group Exercise Instructor
American Council on Exercise (ACE) Continuing Education Faculty Instructor
Aerobics and Fitness Association of America (AFAA) Group Exercise Instructor
Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) Instructor
American Red Cross CPR/First Aid/AED Instructor
American Institute for Preventive Medicine (AIPM) "Weight No More" Instructor
American Institute for Preventive Medicine (AIPM) trained "Stress Management" Instructor

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM)
American Council on Exercise (ACE)
Aerobics and Fitness Association of American (AFAA)
North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM)
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAPHERD)
(NASPE)
National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA)
Indiana Intramural Recreational Sports Association (IRSA)