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ABSTRACT

Mentoring for Women in Intercollegiate Athletic Administration

by

Laura Lynn Stephey

Dr. James Busser, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Recreation & Sport Management
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Members of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators were surveyed about their mentoring relationships with both male and female mentors. Their preferences and actual received functions were assessed to see if their expectations differed from their actual experiences, as well as the functions, barriers and outcomes experienced with respect to the gender of the mentor. The results of the t-test for the expectations and the actual experiences revealed that six of nine functions were significantly different, with the actual functions provided falling short of preferences. The results of the MANOVAs demonstrated that there was no significant difference in the gender of the mentor and the functions provided, or the barriers and outcomes experienced, and the gender of the mentor.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The current state of women holding top positions in intercollegiate athletics in both coaching and administration is far from equitable. Carpenter and Acosta (2006) found in their 29 year update survey that the numbers of women in leadership positions, such as head coach or administrator in intercollegiate athletics, is increasing at a much slower rate than the opportunities for female student athletes. Women serving as the head coach of women’s teams were at the lowest percentage ever recorded. Only 42.4% of the head coaches of women’s teams across all NCAA divisions and sports were women. When Title IX was first enacted in 1972, over 90% of women’s teams had a woman as the head coach. More men than women have received new coaching positions created by the addition of women’s sports at universities. Administrators also did not fare well, with the “absolute number of female athletic directors remaining static” (Carpenter & Acosta, 2006, p. 2). Across NCAA divisions, women comprise only 18.6% of the athletic director positions that oversee women’s programs. In 1972, that number was over 90%. This sharp decline of women in athletic administration positions is alarming.

The vast majority of athletic directors in intercollegiate athletics are male. There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon. Studies have investigated the competencies, skills and activities necessary for success as an athletic director, and have
discovered that men and women possess different abilities (Judd, 1995; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002).

The absence of women in senior management leadership roles is nothing new. Historically, women have lagged behind men in moving up the organizational hierarchy into positions of power. Oakley (2000) presents several reasons that may be factors in women being left behind when it comes to promotions in corporate America. She suggests that women are being passed over for promotions due to corporate practices, and behavioral and cultural reasons. It is interesting to note that she observes that most corporate women are in support roles, rather than professional roles, making the path to the highest positions even longer. She also points out that women as a whole receive less training, lower compensation, and fewer promotions than men. All of these factors contribute to the lack of women in senior management.

Oakley (2000) suggests that women are excluded from management positions because of the existence of the good old boy network. She believes that men wish to further their exclusivity by keeping women and rival men in lower positions. These themes are parallel within intercollegiate athletics as well. Very few women hold the highest or second highest position within athletic departments. As more young women seek higher university athletics positions, they must figure out ways to prove themselves and get beyond the stereotypes. Previous studies suggest that one way to help women to advance into athletic director positions is to build a network of women helping women, or a ‘good old girls network’ (Whisenant et al. 2002). The importance of networking is wholly apparent, and it would be prudent for women seeking to break through to the highest ranks of athletic administration to begin to focus on it.
One way to address the underrepresentation of women in intercollegiate athletic administration is mentoring. Women often form informal support groups with their colleagues; therefore mentoring can be beneficial at every level for aspiring administrators. Mentoring has proven to be effective in corporations and would translate well to intercollegiate athletics. The mentoring process is composed of four phases (Kram, 1983, 1985; Chao, 1997). Each phase is distinctly different, and evolves as the relationship between the mentor and the protégé progresses over time. While each stage offers unique benefits to both mentor and protégé, they all provide positive outcomes.

The functions and outcomes of the mentoring process are varied and can be categorized as psychosocial or career (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Both categories are positive, however psychosocial functions appear to be more prevalent in formal, organized mentoring, while career functions appear to be more common in informal mentoring processes. Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance of abilities, support, encouragement, counseling and friendship, while career functions include protection, visibility, sponsorship and exposure. Career functions are reported more often than psychosocial functions, however, both are integral to the mentoring relationship.

Formal mentoring is often established by the organization to help integrate new employees into the workplace. Mentors are often matched with protégés and follow a structured program of mentoring. In informal mentoring, the mentor and protégé are self-selected and follow a mutually agreed upon path of learning. The mentor has the flexibility to change the path as she sees fit after assessing the knowledge, skills and abilities of the protégé.
Overall, researchers agree that the mentor-protégé experience has positive outcomes for both the protégé and the mentor. Those individuals who are mentored experience more promotions, higher pay, and greater satisfaction with their careers than those individuals who are not mentored (Chao, 1997; Fagenson, 1989; Kram 1983; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

The benefits of the mentor-protégé relationship are not limited only to protégés. Individuals who serve as mentors also receive benefits from the mentor-protégé relationship. Mentors often feel like they have influenced the protégé in some way and trained the protégé to perform work functions that they previously performed in addition to establishing support and respect throughout the organization (Kram, 1983; Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002).

Some of the available literature has found that women are overwhelmingly in support of establishing mentoring programs or relationships (Lee & Nolan, 1998; Noe, 1988). They also found that most of those respondents “felt that mentoring was important for women to assist them in developing their careers and that some initiatives should be provided to this end” (Noe, 1988, p. 11). Most women are open to the mentor-protégé process; it’s just a matter of finding the right person to serve as a mentor for the protégé.

One way to build networks of women, as suggested by Whisenant, Pedersen and Obernour (2002), would be to form mentor-protégé relationships. According to recent research, one benefit of mentoring to the mentor is the cultivation of a group of support women as she adds protégés to her circle of associates (Kram, 1985; Ragins & Scandura,
As that reciprocal group builds, there are more women in place who are able to provide the support needed by the mentor to advance her career.

Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) put the mentoring model that they developed specifically for management in sport and physical education to the test by surveying administrators within intercollegiate athletic departments. Their research showed that those who were mentored, regardless of the gender of either the mentor or the protégé, experienced more functions and better outcomes than those who were not mentored. Overall, the individuals that participated as protégés in the mentoring process were younger, and had less experience and more promotions than those who did not have mentors (2002).

Statement of the Problem

Why is the lack of women administrators in intercollegiate athletics a cause of concern? Participation by women in intercollegiate athletics is at an all time high, and opportunities for women to participate are also increasing, yet women in top administrative positions lag behind this growth. Having women higher in the administrative structure of intercollegiate athletics would benefit young women participating in college athletics by lending them a stronger voice. Moving more women into senior staff positions would also allow women to utilize their experience and skills to make an impact in a traditionally masculine domain. Given the challenges women face in intercollegiate athletic administration and the purported benefits of mentoring to close administrative gaps, it is critical to study mentoring for women as a way to increase the number of women in the administrative structure of intercollegiate athletics. Equally
compelling is the question of the mentoring effectiveness of male and female mentors, given that men engage in networking most often while women engage in internal communication (Whisenant et al. 2002). According to Whisenant and Pederson (2004), networking is indicative of the success athletic directors. Since men engage in networking more often than women, it is to be inferred that men will enjoy more success in the position of athletic director than women.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the mentoring of women in intercollegiate athletics employment with special attention to the gender of the mentor and the female protégé. Specifically, this study was guided by four research questions:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between the functions performed by the mentor and the value of those functions to the protégé?

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the mentoring functions performed for the female protégé?

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the barriers to mentoring perceived by the female protégé?

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the outcomes experienced by the female protégé?
Definition of Terms

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA): Association of 1,024 active member four-year higher education institutions who compete in intercollegiate athletics.

Established in 1906.

Intercollegiate Athletics: Athletics held at the college level, against college teams from other higher education institutions.

NCAA Division I: The highest level of four-year intercollegiate athletic competition. Must sponsor at least seven men’s teams and seven women’s teams for competition. Division I institutions award athletic scholarships for participation and must meet minimums for awards while being under the maximum allowed by rules and regulations. Further divided based on Football power into divisions I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA.

NCAA Division II: The middle level of four-year intercollegiate athletic competition. Must sponsor at least five men’s teams and five women’s teams for competition. Student-athletes finance their education through a variety of sources.

NCAA Division III: The lowest level of four-year intercollegiate athletic competition. Must sponsor at least five men’s teams and five women’s teams for competition. Division III institutions do not award any scholarships for participation.

National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA): Association of women who hold positions within intercollegiate athletics, either previously or presently, along with those who support women in their goals within intercollegiate athletics.
Senior Staff: For the purpose of this study, is defined as those individuals in the following positions – Athletic Director, Senior Associate Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director, Assistant Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator.

Athletic Director: Individual holding the highest position within an intercollegiate athletic department. Acts as the Chief Executive Officer or custodian of the athletic program.

Senior Associate Athletic Director: Typically the second in command within an intercollegiate athletic department.

Associate Athletic Director: Second or third in command in intercollegiate athletics.

Assistant Athletic Director: Lowest position within the senior staff hierarchy in intercollegiate athletics.

Senior Woman Administrator: Designation given to the most senior woman within the intercollegiate athletic department’s senior staff. Implemented in 1981 to give women, along with the Athletic Director, a vote in the NCAA.

Line Position: Directly involved with achieving the goals of the organization.

Staff Position: Provides support to those in line positions.

Title IX: Legislation introduced in 1972 allowing for equal opportunity for participation in activities for men and women at educational institutions that receive federal funding.

Mentor: Individuals who are older, more educated, more powerful, have more experience, and have higher salaries than most individuals within an organization.

Protégé: Individuals who are younger and have less experience than their mentors, and who display a need for power and a potential for advancement and managerial effectiveness.
Mentoring Relationship: A working relationship where mentors and protégés who have common professional interests, shared knowledge, skills and abilities come together in a mutually beneficial way.

Formal Mentoring: Mentoring facilitated by a group or organization, providing a structure or framework for the mentoring relationship. Typically, mentors and protégés are matched up by others within the organization.

Informal Mentoring: Mentoring that is not facilitated, but is usually spontaneous. Mentors and protégés typically come together through social networks.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to effectively present a solution to the problem of a lack of women in intercollegiate athletic administration, it is instructive to examine the history of women in executive positions within corporations for possible parallels to this study. Several researchers (Oakley, 2000; Powell & Mainiero, 1992) have studied the roles played by women in corporate settings as well as the reasons for the lack of women in senior management. One area upon which the studies have focused is the lack of women in line positions, which are historically viewed as a critical path to executive positions. Both Powell and Mainiero and Oakley found that women are often placed in staff positions, providing support to the line positions, rather than directly into the line positions themselves. This lengthens the time it takes for women to move into executive positions. Oakley found that women are often overlooked for promotions into key line positions, and they do not receive adequate feedback about their work performance. They may also be inadequately trained, which hinders their movement into higher positions.

Women in Corporate Settings

Powell and Mainiero (1992) found that when women are promoted, their promotions are not always vital to the well-being of the company, and therefore do not come with any real power or increased responsibility. In addition, they found several
reasons why women do not move into executive positions as often as men. These reasons are organizational, personal and cultural in nature. They found that in addition to organizational reasons (i.e. lack of training, promotional practices) personal reasons also play a role. A further finding was that both women with and without families faced personal obstacles in moving up the corporate ladder. Women with families face the demands associated with raising children, while women who are childless face the demands of planning for families while working. The issue of family is more problematic for women than it is for men because women are traditionally perceived as the main caretaker in a family, making it a struggle for them if they feel that they must choose either family or career.

Oakley (2000) found several cultural reasons, in addition to the corporate reasons, for the lack of women in executive positions. Culturally, in the United States, women are unfortunately often stereotyped as the weaker, fairer sex. This puts women in a double-bind, where they must learn to straddle a fine line between being perceived as a pushover or a dominator. Women find this difficult because they are culturally expected to be quiet and reserved, while men are expected to have a dominant presence in the workplace. This stereotype, along with several others, hinders the upward mobility of women in corporate America. Tokenism and the good old boys' network are also detrimental to the advancement of women. Women executives are often ignored due to the lack of women colleagues in similar positions (Oakley, 2000). One woman is often seen as a token, and not as someone to be highly regarded because others may perceive that she was included at the executive level because she is a woman, not because of the leadership abilities she possesses.
The glass ceiling is a long talked about, and often anecdotal, barrier that women must overcome to get ahead in corporations. The United States Glass Ceiling Commission (1993) defined the glass ceiling the same as the reporters who originally coined the phrase in 1986 in the Wall Street Journal, – as the “invisible barrier that blocks women from advancing to senior leadership positions in organizations” (p. 1). In a study by Cotter, Hermsen, Ovadia, and Vanneman (2001), the glass ceiling is defined as “a specific type of gender or racial inequality that can be distinguished from other types of inequality” (p. 656). The term glass ceiling is not applied to women only. It can be used to describe advancement problems for any reason, including gender, race, and disability.

In a study by Auster (1993), the history and types of gender bias present in corporations are defined and discussed. Auster defines the glass ceiling or gender bias as being either overt or covert, and the areas of occurrence as either organizational or interpersonal. Overt gender bias is “obvious and easily documented” (p. 48) and covert gender bias is described as subtle and may “occur in arenas women are not privy to” (p. 48). Auster further defined an organizational area of occurrence for a bias as happening in “structure, processes, practices and procedures of an organization” (p. 48), while an interpersonal area of occurrence happens “in everyday interactions and incidences in an organization” (p. 48).

Auster (1993) found, after reviewing all of the types of these biases that hinder women’s upward movement, that in order to rid corporations of gender biases, companies must work toward changing current perceptions. Auster states that “true proactivism is about full-fledged commitment, time and change directed towards valuing, enabling, nurturing, and admiring the strengths that women bring to the organization” (p. 64). She
also suggests that corporations review their own policies and criteria when no qualified woman exists for a promotion to the highest ranks. The key to women's advancement in corporations is an understanding of the biases that exist and the ability to work around them.

As presented, women face many challenges to advancement in corporations. It is likely that research findings in corporate settings may be transferable to university athletics because women similarly comprise a small percentage of executive positions within athletics. While significant changes have been realized in corporations, the athletic profession has been slow to advance.

Women in Athletics

The lack of women in intercollegiate athletics administration is pervasive. Women have been facing an uphill battle even with the introduction of Title IX legislation in 1972. Carpenter and Acosta (2006) have been providing information on the numbers of women in select positions within intercollegiate athletics for the past 29 years. Since Title IX was passed, there has been a decline in the number of women coaching women's teams and in the number of women in senior staff positions. In 2006, Carpenter and Acosta reported that since the implementation of Title IX in 1972, only 18.6% of women's programs have been headed up by a female athletic director. Prior to Title IX, over 90% of women's programs had a female athletic director in charge. The average number of administrator positions has increased from 2.32 in 1988 to 3.44 in 2006 per school across all divisions for a 50% increase in the total number of administrators, but the percentage of women in those positions has not grown at the same
rate. During the same time, the number of women overseeing women’s athletic programs has gone from 16.1% in 1988 to 18.6% in 2006, for an increase of only 2.5%.

Thanks to Title IX, schools receiving federal funding are required to have equal opportunities in athletics for men and women, in addition to several other conditions set forth by the legislation. Because of the requirements of Title IX, the opportunities for women to participate in sports are increasing. Today more women are participating in athletics than ever before. It is important to continue to move female administrators forward as well. The lack of women in athletics, as highlighted by Carpenter and Acosta, can be attributed to a number of causes, including a lack of networking ability, a tendency to have women in more support-oriented roles, societal beliefs about women, and the continued presence of men in authoritative roles.

Similar to Oakley (2000) and Powell and Mainiero’s (1992) findings on corporations, studies have also found that women in intercollegiate athletics are often pigeon-holed into lower level positions that are more support oriented rather than leadership oriented (Carpenter & Acosta, 2006; Whisenant et al. 2002). Women in athletics were more often placed into support staff positions rather than line positions. Carpenter and Acosta found that the number of women in athletic administrative jobs is increasing, but the executive level positions are extremely difficult to break into for women.

One technique women can utilize to gain entrance into executive level positions is networking. The importance of networking for advancement in athletic organizations has been addressed in several studies (Soucie, 1994; Whisenant, 2003; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004; Whisenant et al. 2002). Each of these studies emphasizes the importance
of networking in order to enter the top administrative positions, such as athletic director. Networking is critical to one’s advancement within the field of intercollegiate athletics. The ability to network leads to promotions and movement both within an institution and intercollegiate athletics. Men have been found to be better at networking and more likely to engage in external networking than women, while women are more likely to engage in internal communication and departmental relationship building (Whisenant et al. 2002). Whisenant et al. found that networking is the managerial activity most likely to lead to an athletic director position. This finding can begin to partially explain why there are very few women in high-level positions in intercollegiate athletics.

There exists a body of literature devoted to examining the common qualities and characteristics needed for elevation into the highest ranks of intercollegiate athletic administration (Branch, 1990; Fitzgerald, Sagaria, & Nelson, 1994; Judd, 1995; Soucie, 1994; Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004; Whisenant et al. 2002). Fitzgerald et al.’s research into the career paths of athletic directors produced some interesting results. They found that for the most part, in 1994, athletic directors begin as student-athletes, then become coaches, progress into assistant/associate athletic directors, and then finally move into the highest role of athletic director.

Research in two studies (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004; Whisenant et al., 2002) indicates that it is not the individual’s background that dictates the path of a successful athletic director, but rather the ability to engage in networking activities. In Whisenant et al. (2002), they suggested that a lack of women in administrative positions could be remedied by creating a network of women in intercollegiate athletics that was devoted to advancing their careers. In a subsequent study by Whisenant and Pederson (2004), the
managerial activities of athletic directors were evaluated, and it was found that men engaged in networking more often than their female peers.

Whisenant and Pederson (2004) also found that not only did women engage in networking less often than men, they engaged mostly in internal communication, which is detrimental to career advancement in intercollegiate athletics because it is not focused on advancement through networking outside of the department. Networking, both within and outside of athletics, appears to be one of the keys to organizational advancement. Women who seek career advancement need to engage in networking more regularly and at a level consistent with that of men.

A study by Branch (1990) found that the key to success in the athletic director position was the ability to balance getting things done and helping employees to develop into better performers. Branch found that both of these things were important to becoming successful and advancement into the position of athletic director. Branch also hypothesized that individuals in subordinate positions (i.e. Associate or Assistant Athletic Directors) may view the athletic director differently because “their own upward mobility is controlled by those athletic directors” (p. 170). However, he found that the perceptions of those individuals in lower positions about leader behaviors did not have an effect on the organizational effectiveness of the athletic director.

Studies by both Soucie (1994) and Judd (1995) examined those characteristics and competencies necessary for success as an athletic director. Both studies found that skills in human resources, business and finance, communication and personal development were important to the success of athletic directors and their departments. Judd found that men and women ranked the top competencies differently, with women
deeming it more important to evaluate employee strengths and weaknesses, comply with personnel rules and regulations, and have excellent public speaking skills. Men, on the other hand, found it vital to actively recruit good employees (network and mentor), maintain their own personal philosophies, and keep the level of department morale high.

These differences are consistent with the findings of Whisenant and Pedersen (2004) that men engage in networking more often, while women feel the need to be strong communicators. Soucie (1994) conducted a thorough review of the managerial literature to compile a list of characteristics important to the success of leaders in sport organizations. Those characteristics were divided into several categories: power and influence, traits and skills, leadership behaviors, situational leadership, and characteristics and traits of leadership. Each of those categories contains characteristics that correspond with those competencies identified by Judd (1995).

While the research by Judd was conducted by surveying those within intercollegiate athletics, Soucie (1994) compiled a list of desirable characteristics from the available leadership literature. Soucie's list, however, is important for women to consider when looking to advance within intercollegiate athletics. He found that being able to navigate areas such as politics, interpersonal relationships, problem solving, power sharing, and understanding the demands of others, for example, were beneficial to a leader's success in sports organizations. Mentoring appears to be a plausible solution to helping women to develop these skills that may not be intuitive.
The problem of the scarcity of women in the top positions in intercollegiate athletics is a difficult one. One partial solution is the development of networking, and specifically mentoring, practices for women (Judd, 1995; Soucie, 1994; Whisenant & Pederson, 2004; Whisenant et al. 2002). These opportunities would allow women to develop some of the qualities and characteristics necessary for advancement into executive positions, as well as develop the social and professional networks that are vital to success in intercollegiate athletics.

One study that presents a clear and convincing argument for the use of mentoring is by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999). They examined mentoring in intercollegiate athletics to determine the characteristics of those individuals who were mentored versus those who were not. They found that men and women appeared to be mentored equally often, and that those who were mentored were younger, less experienced, paid more, and had more promotions than those individuals who had not been mentored. Also, those who were not in mentoring relationships perceived it to be more difficult to have a mentor than those individuals who were currently or had been previously mentored. Access to mentoring is important to promote and facilitate women's engagement in a mentoring relationship. Finally, the study showed that mentored individuals perceived that they were more accepted within their departments and their professional communities. Mentoring was deemed a positive experience that led to career advancement. Women's engagement in mentoring is crucial in order to maximize their presence within intercollegiate athletics. Developing mentoring relationships is the key to helping women advance into higher positions. The present study looks to examine the
functions provided by the mentors to see if there is a difference based on the gender of the mentor.

First, however, the origins, theory and history of mentoring in general and with regard to women and gender must be examined. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999), in their earliest study, presented a comprehensive framework to effectively examine mentoring. This review will look at mentor and protégé characteristics, compatibility, barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship, the mentoring phases, mentoring benefits and functions, organizational approaches to mentoring and the outcomes associated with the mentoring relationship.

Mentoring

In order to better understand mentoring, it is important to examine every component of the mentoring relationship. Areas to be examined include characteristics of both the mentor and the protégé, the compatibility of the mentor and protégé, barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship, the phases of the mentoring relationship, and the functions and outcomes for both the mentor and protégé.

Characteristics

When studying mentoring relationships, a look into the characteristics of both the mentors and the protégés is vital. Mentors, for the most part, are older, more educated, more powerful, have more experience, and have higher salaries (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Vincent & Seymour, 1995; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Protégés, on the other hand, are younger, have less experience, display a need for power and a potential for advancement and managerial effectiveness (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002).
Fagenson (1989) found, however, that the individuals in his study did not differ in the previously mentioned ways, but had large differences in their personality traits. Protégés tended to describe themselves “as being more feminine and more masculine than non-protégés” (p. 316) and therefore had a higher level of gender identity.

Compatibility

Compatibility between mentors and protégés is another important area to examine. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) found that two types of compatibility are important to the viability of the mentor-protégé relationship. First, mentors and protégés must have common interests and goals professionally, and second, successful relationships hinge on shared personal attributes and interests, such as work ethic and problem solving.

Barriers to Entering a Mentoring Relationship

While compatibility is essential to continuing a mentoring relationship, it is not always easy to find a mentor-protégé match-up and begin the process of entering into the relationship. There are a variety of reasons for the existence of barriers to mentoring: problems with cross-gender mentoring, lack of willing mentors, and lack of women to serve as mentors for other women (Noe, 1988; Vincent & Seymour, 1995; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). Availability of female mentors is a problem for most women seeking to enter into a mentoring relationship (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The lack of women in higher positions within an organization severely limits the access that lower level employees have to suitable mentors. There are also problems when a mentor is available, but does not reside within the same geographic
Continued and consistent interaction between mentors and protégés is important to the success of the relationship.

Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) and Noe (1988) identified access (or a lack thereof) as a barrier for individuals looking to establishing a mentor-protégé relationship. Potential protégés who do not have access to the higher ranked individuals perceived it to be more difficult to develop a mentoring relationship than those who did have access. Access to mentors has not been necessarily limited to those demonstrating the skills and characteristics necessary for success. Those individuals who did not have the skills and characteristics for success, but had connections to high ranking individuals, were also afforded the opportunity to forge mentoring relationships. In their study, Vincent and Seymour (1995) found that a lack of encouragement for mentoring within organizations was problematic. They also found, however, that mentoring must not be forced upon individuals. When forced, the mentoring process was ineffective.

Mentoring Phases

To better understand how the mentoring process works, an overview of the mentoring phases is necessary. The phases were developed by Kram (1983) and further reviewed by Chao (1997) and Russell and Adams (1997). The first stage in Kram’s model is initiation. This occurs within the first six to 12 months of the relationship when the mentor and the protégé are just getting to know each other and exploring what knowledge, skills and abilities each one has. Within this first phase, “the younger manager begins to feel cared for, supported and respected by someone who is admired and who can provide important career and psychosocial functions” (p. 615). Senior
managers tend to have “fantasies” about the abilities of their young protégés, and “the events of the first year serve to transform initial fantasies into concrete positive expectations” (p. 615) for the young managers.

The second stage is called cultivation. This stage can last from 2-5 years, depending on the nature of the relationship. The real learning, for both the mentor and the protégé, occurs at this level. This is the phase in which respect and trust are built up for both the mentor and the protégé. The senior manager comes to know what she can expect from the protégé, and then works to provide a challenging experience for the younger manager. It is also during this phase that the mentor and protégé engage in more personalized behaviors, such as friendship and counseling. Younger managers in this phase had a sense of accomplishment and challenge from the projects assigned by the mentor. Senior managers felt satisfied with their level of influence in the protégé’s career advancement (Kram, 1983). It is important to note that not all protégés were satisfied with their mentoring relationship at this phase.

The third stage is separation. This stage begins when there is nothing left to gain from further mentoring for either the mentor or the protégé. Ideally, the protégé has learned all that she can, and is ready to move on to greater independence. According to Kram (1983), the mentor and protégé grow apart, both physically and psychologically. Sometimes, this is not necessarily a positive stage. Mentors and protégés are deeply committed to each other, and separation can be anxiety-producing for both of them. It is imperative that separation occurs at an opportune time for both the mentor and the protégé to ensure a smooth transition through the separation phase.
The final stage is redefinition. This happens when the mentor and the protégé change the nature of their relationship from working to personal. This stage is often found to be very rewarding and satisfying for both individuals. Mentor and protégé have become peers at this phase of the mentor relationship. This final phase of the mentor relationship is a time where both parties can sit back and review where they were and what they have each become. It is a time for reflection.

Organizational practices may work against the establishment of mentor-protégé relationships and the advancement of those individuals who are mentored (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). In organizations with policies that favor seniority over performance for promotions to higher positions, protégés may find it difficult to advance quickly up the career ladder.

Mentoring Functions and Outcomes

Career Functions

Throughout the phases of mentoring, mentors and protégés both experience functions and benefits of the mentoring relationship process. These take the form of career functions and psychosocial functions. Several studies have looked at the career benefits and functions that are a result of the mentoring process. Those studies have found that those individuals who are mentored tend to be offered protection with respect to mistakes, visibility within the company, sponsorship (i.e., the work of the protégé is highlighted to those in high ranking positions), and exposure to as many appropriate people and situations as possible, among other things (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Chao,
Kram (1983) found that each of the functions provided by the mentor in a mentoring relationship helps to ready the protégé for navigating through the organization and advancing in the future. Lyon, Farrington and Westbrook (2004) found that in high tech fields, protégés are most interested in the career functions provided by mentors. Those career functions are viewed as having the greatest impact on the professional growth of protégés.

It has been found that protégés who experience career functions in a mentoring relationship tend to receive more promotions and have more satisfaction with respect to their careers (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Chao, 1997; Fagenson, 1989; Kram, 1983). The career benefits that were the result of mentoring functions provided by the mentor were also found to be in place for the duration of the protégé’s professional life. Chao (1997) found that the benefits outlasted the mentor-protégé relationship, were long-lasting, and carried on throughout their subsequent positions.

Psychosocial Functions

Psychosocial functions include role modeling with respect to how the mentor interacts with her peers and how she conducts herself professionally, acceptance of the protégé’s abilities, confirmation through support and encouragement, counseling with respect to both professional and personal struggles, and friendship through social interaction that allows both to know each other at a more personal level (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Chao, 1997; Kram, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Psychosocial benefits are reported less often than career benefits. Arnold and Johnson (1997) found
this to be true, perhaps due to the small amount of time that the participants in their study had to engage their mentors in their relationships.

Kram (1983) found that the psychosocial functions provided by the mentor for the protégé helped to develop a “sense of competence, confidence and effectiveness in the managerial role” (p. 614). Chao (1997) found that protégés reported the lowest levels of both functions in the initiation phase of the mentoring relationship. This is consistent in that the initiation phase is the very first contact and interaction between the mentor and the protégé. Interestingly, Arnold and Johnson (1997) found that the amount of contact time between a mentor and a protégé was the best predictor of functions or benefits for the protégé. The more time spent in the mentoring relationship, the more abundant the benefits for the protégé.

Outcomes for Protégés

There is a positive relationship between career and psychosocial functions and outcomes (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The functions provided by mentors to protégés lead to the outcomes that protégés experience during the four phases of the mentoring process.

Outcomes of mentoring relationships are directly related to the career and psychosocial functions that mentors provide to protégés. The functions lead to outcomes such as enhanced job satisfaction, increased salary, and more promotions (Chao, 1997; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) found that outcomes for the protégé could be categorized into two types: 1) advancement outcomes, which include salary, promotion, status and power, and 2), growth outcomes, which include competence, identity and effectiveness. Advancement
outcomes are the most desirable and sought-after, however, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) asserted that it was important for individuals to be “competent, self-assured and effective” in an organization. Therefore growth was a valuable outcome that would help to justify any mentoring program.

It is interesting to note that Lyon, Farrington and Westbrook (2004) found that in the high-tech field of science and engineering, individuals do not necessarily engage in mentoring relationships for the psychosocial benefits, but rather for the career-forwarding benefits that mentoring can provide through career functions such as increased visibility, opportunities and contact with individuals at higher levels in the organization. Fagenson (1989) found that protégés are not looking to learn and grow as people, as much as they are looking for a springboard in their movement up the hierarchical ladder. Additionally, Fagenson found that protégés reported having “more advantageous career/job outcomes than individuals who were not mentored, regardless of their sex or level” (p. 316). Mentoring relationships provided a boost to those protégés fortunate enough to have found a mentor.

Outcomes for Mentors

Outcomes are not strictly limited to protégés. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999, 2002) found that mentors also experience outcomes, specifically, intrinsic satisfactions and status, respect and power. Mentors also experience increased or continued promotion due to participation in mentoring relationships (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Not only do mentors benefit within the organization. Networking opportunities outside of the organization are made as the protégé moves through her professional life. Mentors may
be able to use those professional contacts down the road to make a move up either within or outside of the organization.

Outcomes for Organizations

Organizations themselves also benefit from mentor-protégé relationships in that those individuals who are mentored may experience more job satisfaction and be less likely to leave the company. Organizations also benefit from protégés gaining experience from their mentors. Protégés are better prepared to advance within an organization, making it easier to promote from within and reduce turnover. Every player in a successful mentoring relationship experiences positive outcomes, further enforcing the importance of mentoring in business organizations.

Mentoring and Women

In addition to the barriers to mentoring previously discussed, there are many that specifically apply to women. Several studies have been conducted to investigate the effects of mentoring with regard to women (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Clawson & Kram, 1989; Fitt & Newton, 1981; Gaskill, 1991; Hurley, 1996; Noe, 1988; Ragins, 1996; Scandura & Ragins, 1993; Shapiro & Farrow, 1988; Slack, Meyers, Nelson, & Sirk, 1996; Vincent & Seymour, 1995;). In addition to the previously mentioned phases, functions, and benefits, there are several issues specifically related to women and mentoring. The barriers that women face in mentorships are similar to those they face when looking to move up the corporate ladder.

The first issue is cross-gender mentoring. This is the most difficult mentor-protégé relationship to sustain, due to the problem of perceptions of an improper
relationship from those on the outside of the mentoring relationship. Cross-gender mentoring relationships carry with them speculation from outsiders about the nature of the relationship (Clawson & Kram, 1989; Hurley, 1996; Noe, 1988; Vincent & Seymour, 1995; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Because of this, men can be hesitant to mentor young women, thus reducing the number of mentoring opportunities available to women. According to Noe (1988), most male mentors prefer to have male protégés to avoid any appearance of impropriety. Unfortunately, there are a limited number of women available to serve as mentors for other women, and as a result, women turn to men for guidance. The existence of cross-gender stereotypes may prohibit women from entering into mentoring relationships, and hold them back from entering into the highest ranks.

Tokenism is also problematic for those seeking to be mentored. An individual becomes a token when her presence is unusual or has been historically excluded from another group (Noe, 1988). For example, a woman may be perceived as having less expertise and knowledge than the other executives in the organization because she is the only member of her ethnic or gender group represented at the highest level. Female protégés are aware of tokenism in the workplace, and may be cautious when deciding whether or not to engage in mentoring. Due to the lack of women in prominent positions within organizations, any woman welcomed into the upper ranks as a protégé runs the risk of being seen as the token female.

Stereotype issues are also problematic to the formation of mentoring relationships (Noe, 1988; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). Stereotypes about select groups of people, particularly women and minorities, have been barriers for individuals seeking a mentoring relationship. Noe (1988) found that women were often
perceived as unable to effectively fulfill managerial duties, and therefore were overlooked as protégés for mentoring relationships. Weaver and Chelladurai found that not only were women passed over because of stereotypes, but minorities often were as well. Women have been historically seen as the weaker sex, lacking the ability to be effective managers. Unfortunately, even as women have moved up through organizational ranks, the stereotypes still persist and hinder further growth and promotion into the top positions.

Mentoring in Intercollegiate Athletics

To date, only two studies have examined mentoring in intercollegiate athletics (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002). In their first study, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) examined the mentoring process and applied to management in sport and physical education. The study provides both the rationale for the present study and the basis for the review of the literature. Weaver and Chelladurai took several components of mentoring, including mentor and protégé characteristics, compatibility, barriers, mentoring phases, functions, organizational practices and outcomes, and arranged them into a model depicting how the mentoring process works. The model represents the flow of the mentoring relationship, and also shows how intervening variables, such as barriers and organizational practices, affect the mentoring process. The study examined the components of the mentor-protégé relationship and established the model used in the subsequent study on mentoring in intercollegiate athletics.

Weaver and Chelladurai’s (2002) study on mentoring in intercollegiate athletics examined the factors involved in successful mentoring of intercollegiate athletic
administrators to see how they differ across the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) divisions and are influenced by the gender of the protégé. In that study, they found that there was equal access to mentoring for both men and women in intercollegiate athletics, however, there was no mention of the genders of the mentors in relation to that of the protégés. The current study looks to expand on Weaver and Chelladurai’s (2002) study by examining the effect of the gender of the mentor on the outcomes experienced by the protégés.

Originally, the authors theorized that men would be mentored more often than women based on previous research. The inconsistency in the findings was attributed to the fact that research was conducted within intercollegiate athletics, where there is a “growing recognition and acceptance of women” and “higher-level administrators are taking steps to promote women” (p. 110). Mentoring, according to the current study, is an equal-opportunity for both men and women in intercollegiate athletics. Because it appears to be available equally to men and women, it is imperative that women capitalize on the opportunity. Mentoring should be an important tool in advancing the careers of women in intercollegiate athletics. While men and women have equal opportunity to be mentored, it is unknown if women turn to men or women more often for mentoring relationships.

The findings of the study reinforced the research on mentoring – that those individuals who were mentored were younger, more successful and received more promotions with less experience than those who did not experience a mentoring relationship. Individuals who were not mentored, including women, were also found to perceive more barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship with an administrator.
Summary of the Literature

Weaver and Chelladurai’s (1999, 2002) work presents a compelling argument for the establishment of mentoring relationships in intercollegiate athletics as a way to help women move up in the administrative hierarchy. After careful review of the available research on women in corporate America, mentoring, both general and as it relates to women and gender, athletic directors and mentoring in intercollegiate athletics, the need for the present study is apparent. There are very few women in the highest ranks of intercollegiate athletics, possibly forcing young women in the field to increasingly turn to men for mentoring and guidance as they move through the ranks in college athletics. It is uncertain as to whether or not this is a positive or negative, given that men and women administrators seem to bring a different skill set to their positions (Whisenaunt et al. 2002).

The lack of women in executive positions within corporations translates over to intercollegiate athletics well. As previously stated, women are often passed over for promotions for a variety of reasons, including personal reasons such as balancing work and family life, cultural reasons that include being included as the token female in a male-dominated area, and organizational, where women were not given the chance to engage in further training to gain the expertise that would allow them to move up the corporate ladder.

The difference in managerial styles of men and women in athletics may also contribute to the lack of women at the senior staff level in intercollegiate athletic departments. Men are more often engaged in networking, while women spend their time communicating internally and passing on information (Whisenaunt & Pedersen, 2004). Further, they found that networking was one of the most important managerial activities...
that an athletic director could engage in to be successful, rather than relying on their background.

The studies by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999, 2002) lay the foundation for this study on women and mentoring in intercollegiate athletics. Their findings point to the necessity of mentoring in intercollegiate athletics, and the current study works to expand the study to investigate the relationship between the mentor’s gender and the functions provided by the mentor, the mentor’s gender and the barriers to mentoring perceived by the protégé, and the mentor’s gender and the outcomes experienced by the protégé.

With more women possibly turning towards men for help in navigating the complex world of intercollegiate athletics, it is important to assess both the outcomes experienced by female protégés with female mentors and female protégés with male mentors.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study examined the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the following benefits and pitfalls provided to the female protégé – mentoring functions, barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship, and the outcomes experienced. The purpose of this study was to investigate mentoring of women in intercollegiate athletics with special attention to the gender of the mentor and the female protégé.

National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators

In order to effectively examine mentors and protégés in intercollegiate athletics, a convenience sample was taken from the members of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA). NACWAA is comprised of women from all levels of intercollegiate athletics and across National Collegiate Athletic Association divisions, including women at the conference level. The women in the group are both current and former athletic administrators. Currently, the membership is over 1,500 women.

Selection of Subjects

Each NACWAA member received the weekly NACWAA electronic newsletter with an invitation to participate in a study on mentoring in intercollegiate athletics that
included the link to the survey. Participants in this study were comprised of 143 members of NACWAA (females = 143).

Description of Instrument

Questionnaire

The 80-item survey instrument used in this study was developed for an earlier study by Weaver and Chelladurai (2002). Their instrument was designed to include questions regarding basic demographics, along with Ragins and McFarlin’s (1990) Mentor Role Instrument (MRI), the Ragins and Cotton (1991) Perceived Barriers Scale (PBS), and an outcomes measure developed specifically for this study (see Appendix). In addition to the measures and scales used above, a definition of a mentor and a protégé was provided.

Mentor Role Instrument (MRI)

The MRI developed by Ragins and McFarlin (1990) assessed protégés’ perceptions of their mentors’ ability to carry out both the psychosocial and career functions of mentoring. The scale used by Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) consisted of 3 items for each function with a 7-point Likert response format ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). Weaver and Chelladurai reported an internal consistency ranging from .69 to .85 for males and .67 to .83 for females. The internal consistency in the present study for mentor functions for both mentor genders ranged from .455 to .869 for preferred mentor functions, and .704 to .945 for actual mentor functions performed.
Perceived Barriers Scale (PBS)

Ragins and Cotton (1991) developed the PBS to assess the perceived barriers to entering mentoring relationships. Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) examined access to mentors, fear of initiating a relationship, willingness of mentors, approval of others and misinterpretation of approach. The scale consisted of various numbers of items (2 to 4) for each area, with a 7-point Likert response format ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 7 (strongly disagree). Weaver and Chelladurai reported an internal consistency of .76 to .94 for males and .81 to .92 for females. The internal consistency in the present study for barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship for both mentor genders ranged from .780 to .895.

Outcomes Measure

The outcomes measure was developed specifically for this study and drawn from the existing body of literature (Chao, 1997; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999, 2002). The internal consistency in the present study for outcomes from mentoring relationships for both mentor genders ranged from .804 to .823.

Method of Data Collection

All correspondence was sent via electronic newsletter to the members of NACWAA. The electronic newsletter was chosen as the method of correspondence due to the increasing reliance on electronic communications by universities and athletic departments. All members of NACWAA provide their email address upon application for membership and receive weekly email updates from the organization. Therefore, a link placed in the weekly electronic newsletter was the chosen form of communication,
and data collection was made via a third-party data collection website. The survey was uploaded and hosted by Survey Monkey, an online company that provides a service for a modest monthly fee.

Procedure

An item containing an invitation to participate was included in the weekly NACWAA electronic newsletter, with a follow-up reminder placed in the same weekly electronic newsletter during each of the three weeks that follow the initial invitation, for a total of four weeks. A link to the 80-item survey was included, and once participants arrived at the survey site, they were greeted with a participant letter describing the study and how it worked. It was expected that the survey would take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

In addition to the weekly newsletter item, a special email was sent from the NACWAA Executive Director to graduates of the NACWAA/HERS Institute for Administrative Advancement. The program has been in existence for 13 years, and has a large alumni base. The same link that was in the newsletter was also included in the email.

The questionnaire, as previously described, included basic demographic information along with specifics designed to assess the benefits received by protégés. The entering of the study into the Survey Monkey format was done by the author. Responses to the 7-point Likert scale for each question were recorded via “radio button” and eventually tabulated in SPSS for evaluation. All participants were directed to answer the demographics questions and the first section about what they would like to get from a mentoring relationship, along with the barriers that they may have experienced initiating
and obtaining a mentoring relationship. Their response to a question about having had a mentor dictated whether or not they move forward in the survey. Participants without mentors were directed to a page thanking them for their participation, while those with a mentor were asked to complete two more sections. Upon completion, they also saw the same thank you screen.

Data Analysis

All data collected was tabulated into Excel by Survey Monkey, imported into SPSS, and then analyzed by the researchers. Several multivariate analysis of variance tests (MANOVA) were run, plus an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a post hoc t-test for research question one. A between-subjects design, which had one independent variable (IV) with two levels, was used in this study. The IV was gender, and the levels were male and female. The dependent variables are functions, barriers and outcomes respectively.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the study, organized by the description of the sample, examination of the measurement scales, and each of the four research questions presented in the introduction. The demographic data will be presented first, followed by the research questions and findings associated with each one.

Description of the Sample

An analysis of the demographics revealed that 149 of 196 respondents reported either currently or formerly having a mentor. Although the differences were not significant, the women with male mentors were younger, had less time in their current positions, had less total experience, made slightly less money, had slightly more promotions and approximately the same education level.

The sample was collected over a six week period. After the initial invitation to participate in the survey and five subsequent follow-up reminders, there were no longer any individuals completing the survey. As a result, the data collection period was concluded. The final sample consisted of 196 members of NACWAA. This represents a response rate of 13%. Descriptive statistics were used to gain an understanding of the demographic nature of the sample. It was found that 149 of 196 respondents (female = 196) reported either currently or formerly having a mentor. The average woman both
with and without a mentor had been promoted at least once in her career, made an average $57,000 annually, was 38 years old, and had an intercollegiate athletics career for 13 years. Nearly 88% of the women surveyed hold a master’s degree or higher, yet only 15.2% of the women were at the first or highest hierarchical level of their organization. Over 20% of the respondents came from NCAA Division I-A, 13.8% from Division I-AA, 4.8% from Division I-AAA, 14.5% from Division II, 35.2% from division III, 1.4% from the NJCAA, 4.1% from a conference office, and 5.5% from the NCAA office. Most of the women who responded had a female mentor (female = 94, male = 48, no response = 7). It is interesting to note, that in the present study, the women with male mentors were younger, had less time in their current positions, had less total experience, made slightly less money, had the same number of promotions and about the same education level (see Table 1).

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between the functions performed by the mentor and the value of those functions to the protégé?

The mentor functions consisted of nine subscales, with the number of items in each subscale ranging from two to three items. Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability of each subscale. For the preferences of the functions desired by protégés, the reliabilities range from .455 to .869 for preferred mentor functions, and the reliability of the actual functions received by protégés ranged from .704 to .945. The reliabilities for the preferred mentor functions were somewhat low, with some falling below the .700 mark of acceptability. The reliabilities for the actual functions were found to be
acceptable, with each over the .700 mark. The mean scores indicate that the top three preferred mentor functions for women were friendship, coaching and role modeling, while the least preferred were protection, sponsorship and exposure. The mean scores indicate that the top three actual functions provided were acceptance, friendship and role modeling, while the lowest were protection, exposure and sponsorship.

Table 1

Demographic Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and source</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>37.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>38.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in Current Position (Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>5.2693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>5.7103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience (Years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>13.0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>14.0248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary (Dollars)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>$60,497.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>$61,241.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (Number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Level)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Mentor</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Mentor</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where 1 = Bachelors, 2 = Masters, 3 = Doctoral
Further analysis of the means revealed that with regard to preferred mentoring functions, the women ranked friendship the most preferred and protection the least. The women rated the actual functions received from their mentors, and expressed their strongest agreement for the function of acceptance, and their weakest for protection.

A dependent t-test was used to compare the protégé preferences for mentor functions with the actual performance of the mentor on those functions. The t-test revealed that there were no significant differences between what the protégés desired and what they received for sponsorship (p = .984), protection (p = .756) and role modeling (p = .535). The remaining six functions, including coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship, counseling and acceptance, showed a significant difference in the dependent t-test (see Table 2). The protégés reported that their mentors provided lower levels of the functions of coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship and counseling than that for which the protégés had expressed a preference (see Table 3). The only exception was acceptance of the protégé by the mentor. The women surveyed indicated a higher rate of acceptance than they indicated they preferred in a mentoring relationship.

It is interesting to note that the protégés indicated that the actual levels of the functions of coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship and counseling all came back at a lower rate than the preferences (see Table 3). The only exception was acceptance of the protégé by the mentor. The women surveyed indicated a lower preference for acceptance than they actually received from the mentor.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the mentoring functions performed for the female protégé?
The mentor functions consisted of nine subscales, with the number of items in each subscale ranging from two to three items. The mean scores indicate that the top three reported functions provided by both men and women to protégés were acceptance, friendship and role modeling, while the lowest rated functions were protection, exposure and sponsorship.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the effects of gender on the actual mentoring functions experienced by the protégé. The results of the MANOVA found no differences between the gender of the mentor and the functions received by the protégé. It is interesting to note that a non-significant difference was seen in the univariate tests for the perceived functions received from male and female mentors for sponsorship, coaching, protection, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship, role modeling and counseling. The univariate tests also revealed a significant difference for the function of acceptance (see Table 4). The results show that protégés with male mentors ranked their acceptance by the mentor higher than those with female mentors. The difference in the function of friendship was interesting (p = .066), but not significant. A visual inspection of the means suggests that protégés with male mentors more strongly agreed that their mentor had provided sponsorship, coaching, exposure, friendship, role modeling, counseling and acceptance than those with female mentors.

Protection and challenging assignments were shown to be the opposite, with those protégés with female mentors reporting stronger agreement for their mentors providing those two functions than those with male mentors (see Table 5). The means for the functions are generally very high, with all but one falling on the strongly agree end of the scale.
Table 2

Paired Differences Between Protégé Preferences for Mentor Functions and Actual Mentor Performance of Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>0.00243</td>
<td>1.37466</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>-0.54167</td>
<td>1.17234</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-5.388*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>-0.03650</td>
<td>1.37180</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Assignments</td>
<td>-0.43532</td>
<td>1.27388</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-3.969*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>-0.36591</td>
<td>1.31737</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.203**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>-0.36957</td>
<td>1.09388</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-3.969*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td>-0.06835</td>
<td>1.29548</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>-0.25912</td>
<td>1.10154</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2.753**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>0.38849</td>
<td>1.02689</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.460*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01. **p < .001
Table 3

Paired Samples Statistics for Protégé Preferences for Mentor Functions and Actual Mentor Performance of Functions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>2.8200</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.07254</td>
<td>0.09163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.8175</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.23403</td>
<td>0.10543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.7623</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.62051</td>
<td>0.05321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.3039</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.09204</td>
<td>0.09364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>3.9684</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.43707</td>
<td>0.12278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>4.0049</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.63948</td>
<td>0.14007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.8657</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.91504</td>
<td>0.07905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.3010</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.46976</td>
<td>0.12697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>2.5163</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.03432</td>
<td>0.08969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.8822</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.42972</td>
<td>0.12397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.2826</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.62899</td>
<td>0.05354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1.6522</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.98395</td>
<td>0.08376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.8022</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.91013</td>
<td>0.07720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1.8705</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.10391</td>
<td>0.09363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.9416</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.89127</td>
<td>0.07615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2.2007</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.28832</td>
<td>0.11007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>1.8921</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.89637</td>
<td>0.07603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1.5036</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.76966</td>
<td>0.06528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where 1 is strongly agree and 7 is strongly disagree
Table 4

**Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Mentor Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sponsorship</th>
<th>Coaching</th>
<th>Protection</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Counseling</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>3.427</td>
<td>2.561</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>5.660*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Multivariate F ratios were generated from Wilks' Lambda.

*p < .05
Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the barriers to mentoring perceived by the female protégé?

The barriers consisted of five subscales, with the number of items in each subscale ranging from two to three items. The mean scores indicate that the top three barriers reported by women entering into mentoring relationships with both male and female mentors were access, willingness and fear.

A MANOVA revealed no significant differences between the barriers experienced by the protégé and the gender of the mentor (see Table 6). Respondents reported access to mentors as their greatest barrier to obtaining a mentoring relationship, followed by willingness of the mentor, fear of initiating relationships, approval of others and misinterpretation of the relationship (see Table 7). The means for both mentor genders for each subscale indicate that barriers did not play a significant role in the protégés mentoring relationships.

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the outcomes experienced by the female protégé?

A MANOVA revealed no significant difference found in the outcomes experienced by the protégés with male mentors and those with female mentors (see Table 8). The outcome of increased status and power is interesting to note from the univariate tests, but not significant (p = .073). While non-significant, the individuals with male mentors agreed more strongly that their mentors had contributed to their growth (see Table 9).
Table 5

Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Mentor Functions by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sponsorship M</th>
<th>Sponsorship SD</th>
<th>Coaching M</th>
<th>Coaching SD</th>
<th>Protection M</th>
<th>Protection SD</th>
<th>Challenging Assignments M</th>
<th>Challenging Assignments SD</th>
<th>Exposure M</th>
<th>Exposure SD</th>
<th>Friendship M</th>
<th>Friendship SD</th>
<th>Role Modeling M</th>
<th>Role Modeling SD</th>
<th>Counseling M</th>
<th>Counseling SD</th>
<th>Acceptance M</th>
<th>Acceptance SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>4.325</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>2.381</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.843</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>2.387</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>2.349</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>2.316</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>0.871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Willingness</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>Misinterpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Multivariate F ratios were generated from Wilks' Lambda.

Table 7

Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Barriers By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Access M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Willingness M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Approval M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Fear M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Misinterpretation M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>4.861</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>5.640</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>4.988</td>
<td>1.316</td>
<td>5.988</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>2.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Multivariate F ratios were generated from Wilks' Lambda.*

Table 9

Effects of Mentor Gender on Perceived Outcomes by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Advancement M</th>
<th>Advancement SD</th>
<th>Growth M</th>
<th>Growth SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.8222</td>
<td>1.42783</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>0.98367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.1264</td>
<td>1.40355</td>
<td>2.3297</td>
<td>1.10169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents most strongly agreed that their mentor had contributed to the growth outcome of effectiveness in the workplace, and most weakly agreed with the advancement outcome of status and power in the workplace.

This chapter presented the results of the study for each research question presented in the introduction. The researchers found there to be significant differences between protégé preferences for mentor functions and the actual performance of the mentor on those functions for six of nine subscales. It was also found that that gender of the mentor overall was not associated with any significant differences in the functions received by the protégés, the barriers to initiating and obtaining a mentoring relationship, or outcomes experienced by the protégé. The next chapter will examine the findings further and offer insight into reasons behind the results.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare protégés’ preferred mentor functions with the actual functions received from mentors, and assessed the effect of the gender of the mentor on actual functions, barriers and outcomes. A comparison of the preferred and the actual functions performed by mentors revealed that the protégés’ preferences for the functions of coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship and counseling were higher than what was actually provided by the mentor. This suggests that the satisfaction levels of the protégés, with regard to their overall mentoring experience, would increase if the mentors were able to meet or exceed their expectations in providing coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship and counseling.

Results for preferred functions compared with actual functions produced results consistent with what the researcher expected to find. Six of nine subscales (coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship, counseling and acceptance) were significantly different, and five of those revealed that the protégé preferences for mentor functions were higher than the actual performance of the mentor on those functions. The means on the actual mentoring functions performed indicated that the protégés were having meaningful and valuable experiences, even though their preferences were higher what they were actually receiving.
Respondents generally indicated strong agreement that the mentors were providing the mentor functions. Despite this, there appeared to be a disconnect between what protégés valued and what they should be seeking based on the existing research. Career functions are important to advancing in intercollegiate athletics, but the results of the current study suggest that these women were valuing the psychosocial functions more than the career functions. Sponsorship was one of the lowest rated functions, and is related to networking, which is vital to advancement in intercollegiate athletics (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004).

The reported actual acceptance of protégés by mentors was rated higher than preferred, indicating that the actual exceeded the expected. This may be due to informal mentoring relationships, which come together by choice. Mentors and protégés would likely not continue a relationship where the mentor was not accepting of the protégé. Sponsorship, protection and role modeling revealed no significant different between what was preferred and what was actually received from mentors.

Although non-significant, it was found that the actual functions performed by the female mentors were not rated as high as those performed by male mentors. This may be due to a lack of overall management of women in intercollegiate athletic administration (Carpenter & Acosta, 2006). It may also be due to a lack of overall experience as a mentor. Women may also believe that men provide a better mentor experience. The current findings would indicate the opposite, as more women reported having a female mentor than a male mentor.

The results for the reported actual functions provided by mentors revealed that mentoring relationships were valuable to protégés, but the gender of the mentor did not
make a significant difference in the functions received. The only significant difference was in acceptance, which was higher for male mentors than for female mentors. The present study did not address the underlying factors that may influence the acceptance of protégés by mentors. It was an important finding that the gender of the mentor generally does not impact the functions received by the protégé, since the existing literature does not address the effect of the gender of the mentor on the functions, barriers or outcomes of mentoring relationships. This is significant for women who can turn equally to both male and female mentors and not experience any kind of detriment from their decision. Acceptance was also found to be the highest preferred function, followed by friendship, role modeling, counseling, coaching, challenging assignments, sponsorship, exposure and protection.

The findings also indicated that the strongest preference for mentor functions were those that were psychosocial in nature. Previous research (Arnold & Johnson, 1997; Chao, 1997; Kram, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999) found that psychosocial benefits were reported less often than career benefits. This is not the case in the present study. Lyon, Farrington and Westbrook (2004) found that interest in career functions was higher for individuals in high tech fields. Intercollegiate athletics is not high tech, and that may be the reason that the female protégés in the current study reported the psychosocial functions with higher preference. These women may also lack knowledge of the types of functions that are necessary for success in intercollegiate athletics, and therefore do not value those functions as much as those that are psychosocial in nature.

An examination of the barriers to obtaining a mentoring relationship found that access, willingness, approval, fear and misinterpretation were not perceived to be barriers
for the women surveyed in the study, with the mean falling below the midpoint. These women also reported that they did not experience difficulty in obtaining a mentoring relationship because of their gender. Most women also found that they did not experience any disapproval from either their immediate supervisors or co-workers, nor did they cite the inability to be noticed as a problem in obtaining a mentoring relationship.

The results of the barriers questions showed that none of the barriers reported by protégés with male versus female mentors were significantly different. The barriers were equal-opportunity with respect to the gender of the mentor, and were generally rated very low. This indicates that women did not experience barriers to a mentoring relationship. Access to mentors is the most often experienced barrier for the women in the study, which may be due to the lack of women in higher positions in intercollegiate athletics (Carpenter & Acosta, 2006). Willingness was the next most experienced barrier, which may relate to the busy schedules that senior staff in intercollegiate athletics maintain. Mentors may not be able or willing to enter into a mentoring relationship due to a lack of time to devote to the process. Surprisingly, misinterpretation was cited as the lowest rated barrier for women entering into mentoring relationships. Those protégés with male mentors ranked it slightly higher than those with female mentors, but overall it was found to be the lowest rated barrier to entering into mentoring relationships.

Finally, with regard to outcomes, most women believed that their mentoring relationships resulted in positive outcomes. The highest rated outcome was effectiveness in the workplace, and was closely followed by competence in the workplace. The lowest rated outcome was increased status and power within the organization. The women in
the study reported higher agreement with growth outcomes than with advancement outcomes, demonstrating that their mentoring relationships may be more effective in helping them to grow personally than advancing professionally. This particular group of women appears to be highly motivated, and mentoring from a man or a woman may not make that large of a difference in the number of promotions received, average salary and length of career.

The results for the outcomes subscale questions showed that the women surveyed had a higher agreement that they had grown (competence, identity, and effectiveness) than advanced (salary, promotion, status, and power) as a result of their mentoring relationship. These women appear, from the results, to have received outcomes that are more personal in nature than those that are external in nature. This may relate to women and their likeliness to engage in internal communication and departmental relationship building (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002).

Implications for Professional Practice

Educating individuals, and especially women, on the types of managerial activities that will be important to their success as intercollegiate athletic administrators is imperative. The current study shows that women were more often engaged in mentoring functions that are psychosocial in nature, rather than career. The women reported that the top three actual functions they received were acceptance, friendship and role modeling, all of which are psychosocial functions. The bottom three actual functions they reported receiving were all career functions – protection, exposure and sponsorship.
The desired functions were not much different, with two of the top three representing the psychosocial functions of friendship and role modeling. Only one career function was rated highly, and that was coaching. The least preferred functions were protection, sponsorship and exposure. It appears as though educating women on what they need for success is necessary, as the women in this study prefer psychosocial functions to career functions. Psychosocial functions do not provide the skills and connections necessary to move up through administrative levels of intercollegiate athletics.

Previous research (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004) has indicated that networking is vital to success in intercollegiate athletic administration. Studies have also indicated that women are more likely to engage in internal communication than networking (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004), which suggests that women may not be getting what they professionally need out of their career development programs, including their mentoring relationships. The responses of the women in the present study indicate that they both prefer and actually receive more psychosocial functions than career functions. While friendship is important to psychosocial growth, it does not appear to help women advance in their careers. Networking allows individuals to expand their circle of professional contacts, which may lead to jobs, promotions and recommendations in the future.

Sponsorship is another career function that is related to networking. Sponsorship occurs when the mentor promotes and highlights the protégés work (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). It is an important tool for women in mentoring relationships, as it allows the mentor to in essence show off the abilities and skills that the protégé possesses.
to others who have power and authority. It may directly lead to promotions and advancement as well.

Exposure is yet another important career function that should be sought out by women in mentoring relationships. Mentors are able to facilitate contact with other senior administrators in intercollegiate athletics, which allows the protégés to develop relationships with those who hold authority and may be able to help the protégé move up either within or outside of the organization (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Providing women with challenging assignments is the function where mentors are able to develop their protégés by giving them tasks that require them to use and hone their analytic and managerial skills (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The end result is that the protégé is able to use her skills to develop a project that will allow them to showcase their skills and abilities.

Finally, the outcomes that were experienced by the women in this study were more growth than advancement in nature. The women indicated that their mentors had contributed mostly to their personal growth than their advancement in their career. While it is important to grow personally, professional advancement is vital to moving up within intercollegiate athletic administration. Women would be wise to utilize career functions to obtain advancement outcomes.

A sample mentoring program implemented in intercollegiate athletics might consist of the following elements. First, an educational component, for both mentors and protégés, is crucial. Education about what types of functions and outcomes lead to advancement and career growth is vital. From the current study, it can be inferred that women do not understand what functions are important to the growth of their careers. It
would also be prudent to educate mentors on those functions as well, as they may understand themselves what is important for advancement and what is important for personal growth. McCauley (2007) also suggests that mentors should be informed of their responsibilities and given advice on how to provide guidance and direction to their protégés.

After education, the program would begin. Pairing mentors is probably best left to mutual consent, rather than assigned by administrators. The program would provide suggested activities that fall under the functions of sponsorship, exposure and challenging assignments, since they are all closely related to networking, which is in turn related to success in intercollegiate athletic administration. Establishing ground rules and expectations is an important part of the mentoring process as well (McCauley, 2008; Parise & Forret, 2007). Setting up rules will allow both mentor and protégé to voice their expectations, and provide a framework to guide the mentoring relationship (Parise & Forret, 2007).

The final aspect of a mentoring program would be an evaluation of the program. Continuous feedback during the mentoring relationship would help to ensure that the experience is beneficial to both parties (Ralph, 2004). McCauley (2008) also suggests monitoring mentoring relationships and adjusting the program as necessary based on the feedback provided by both the mentor and the protégé. A survey like the one used in this study would be important to use to assess the success of the program and the individuals during the relationship, and at the end. Feedback from the survey, plus open ended questions, would be useful in making changes to create a more effective mentoring program. Information from each subsequent year would provide information as to the
effectiveness of the program, as would following up with participants as they move up and on with their careers.

The present study revealed a need for education for both mentors and protégés on the functions and outcomes that are related to success in intercollegiate athletic administration. Education, plus evaluation of program effectiveness will help to improve mentoring relationships for all women.

Limitations of the Study

This study had several limitations. The sample, response rate and various measurement issues will limit the generalizability of the study. Each of these areas can be approved upon in future studies. The sample was the first limitation due to the fact that it was a convenience sample taken from the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators. The group may not capture every woman in intercollegiate athletic administration, therefore the study is not representative of women in all settings. The response rate of 13% also limits the present study in that it was unable to capture a majority of the women, and also adds to the problem of generalizability.

The study was also limited by various measurement issues, including reliabilities for the preferred mentoring functions. It is unknown what may have caused the low reliabilities for the preferred mentoring functions of coaching, role modeling, and counseling. The reliabilities for the actual mentoring functions were all within the acceptable range of greater than .700, making the low reliabilities even more puzzling.
The lack of barriers for the sample was also problematic. The women in the study were all in mentoring relationships, so they did not perceive any barriers. Women who are unable to obtain mentoring relationships would likely report the barriers they actually received, while the women in the current study were able to obtain mentoring relationships, and therefore did not perceive any barriers. The outcome measure was developed specifically for this study and may not have adequately captured all aspects as noted in the literature.

This list of limitations can be used as a guide for future studies. With careful consideration of each limitation, the results of further studies will be much improved.

Recommendations for Future Studies

Future studies on mentoring in intercollegiate athletics would benefit from looking at the gender of both mentors and protégés to see how functions, barriers and outcomes differ with respect to the gender of protégés. The current study only surveyed female protégés, but it would have been interesting to look at male protégés to see what effects (if any) gender had on their reported mentoring functions, barriers and outcomes.

Another suggestion for future studies would be to examine the protégé’s level of satisfaction with regard to the functions and outcomes provided by the mentor. The current study brought to light a discrepancy between the functions that protégés prefer their mentors to perform, and the strength to which they agreed that they had actually received. It is also worth asking in future studies about the overall perception of the value of the mentoring relationship provided by men and women.
Future studies may also look at differences between NCAA divisions. The majority of the respondents were from Division III, and it would be interesting to see how the divisions compare with regard to mentoring relationships. Each division of the NCAA is unique, and the duties of women working within them vary greatly.

Finally, it would be interesting to conduct in-depth qualitative interviews with women in the survey to assess what underlying issues may be contributing to the results. Future research would benefit from gaining an understanding of the personal experiences of women involved in mentoring relationships, and examining how these experiences have influenced the mentoring relationship. This would allow researchers to ask why the women appear to value psychosocial functions and growth outcomes over functions and outcomes that directly relate to the activities important to advancement in intercollegiate athletics.

Conclusion

The present study was the first to explore mentoring for women in intercollegiate athletics. The study examined four research questions regarding the relationship between functions performed and the value of the functions, the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the functions performed, the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the barriers perceived, and the relationship between the gender of the mentor and the outcomes experienced. Overall, it was found that the difference between preferred and actual functions is significant in six of nine functions, while gender does not significantly impact any of the functions, barriers or outcomes.
The significant difference found for coaching, challenging assignments, exposure, friendship, counseling and acceptance shows that expectations by protégés are high, but mentors do not quite meet them. This may be due to inexperience of mentors in engaging in mentoring relationships or just overall lack of experience.

Gender did not prove to be a significant factor in functions, barriers or outcomes for protégés. The same relative functions, barriers and outcomes were experienced by those with male and those with female mentors. This is great news, because of the lack of women in higher positions within intercollegiate athletics. The present study shows that young women looking to enter into mentoring relationships to help to advance their careers and move up in the hierarchy will have success with men just as often as they do with women, provided that they are educated in the activities that lead to success in intercollegiate athletics.
APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Demographic Information

Please answer each of the following questions by clicking the appropriate term or filling in the blank. Proceed as directed.

Part 1, Section A

1. Gender?
2. Age?
3. Years in present position?
4. Total years experience in intercollegiate athletics (excluding athletic participation)?
5. Salary, in dollars, rounded to the nearest hundred
6. How many promotions have you received during your career in intercollegiate athletics?
7. Highest level of education? Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, Doctoral degree, other (explain)
8. Title of your position
9. At what hierarchical level within the athletic department is your administrative position located? Assuming that the first or highest level in your organizational
hierarchy is the position of the Athletic Director, where does your position fall?

Athletic Director, Second level, Third level, Fourth level

10. In total, how many hierarchical administrative levels are in your athletic department?

11. What athletic association does your institution belong to? NCAA (specify division), NAIA, Other

Part 1, Section B

Please use the following definition of mentor when answering the following questions.

Mentor: A mentor is an individual of high status, experience and knowledge within your field who is committed to helping a less experienced person’s (protégé’s) career mobility.

1. Do you or did you have a mentor?

If you answered yes to the above question, please complete part 2 only.

If you answered no to the above question, please complete parts 2, 3 and 4.

Part 2 – Section for All Subjects

Instructions: Following are some statements about what you would prefer from a mentor. Assuming that you are going to have a mentor, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Use the following definition of mentor when assessing the following statements.

Mentor: A mentor is an individual of high status, experience and knowledge within your field who is committed to helping a less experienced person’s (protégé’s) career mobility.
Scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly    Strongly
Agree       Disagree

(Functions)

If I were to have a mentor, I would prefer my mentor to:

1. help me attain desirable positions (SPONSOR)
2. suggest specific strategies for achieving career aspirations (COACH)
3. “run interference” for me in the organization (PROTECT)
4. provide me with challenging assignments (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)
5. help me be more visible in the organization (EXPOSURE)
6. be someone I could confide in (FRIENDSHIP)
7. serve as a role model for me (ROLE MODEL)
8. guide my personal development (COUNSEL)
9. accept me as a competent professional (ACCEPTANCE)
10. use his/her influence in the organization for my benefit (SPONSOR)
11. give me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization (COACH)
12. shield me from damaging contact with important people in the organization (PROTECT)
13. assign me tasks that push me into developing new skills (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)
14. create opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization (EXPOSURE)

15. provide support and encouragement (FRIENDSHIP)

16. represent who I want to be (ROLE MODEL)

17. serve as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself (COUNSEL)

18. think highly of me (ACCEPTANCE)

19. use his/her influence to support my advancement in the organization (SPONSOR)

20. help me learn about other parts of the organization (COACH)

21. protect me from those who are out to get me (PROTECT)

22. give me tasks that require me to learn new skills (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)

23. bring my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization (EXPOSURE)

24. be someone I could trust (FRIENDSHIP)

(Barriers)

I had difficulty obtaining a mentoring relationship because:

1. Potential mentors were unwilling to develop a relationship with me (WILLINGNESS)

2. of a lack of opportunity to meet potential mentors (ACCESS)

3. potential mentors were unwilling to develop a relationship with me because of my gender (WILLINGNESS)

4. of the lack of opportunity to develop relationships with potential mentors (ACCESS)
5. my immediate supervisor disapproved when I entered a mentoring relationship (APPROVAL)

6. potential mentors were unwilling to develop a relationship with me because of their gender (WILLINGNESS)

7. of a shortage of potential mentors (ACCESS)

8. potential mentors lacked the time to develop a mentoring relationship with me (WILLINGNESS)

9. my co-workers disapproved when I entered a mentoring relationship (APPROVAL)

10. potential mentors didn’t notice me (WILLINGNESS)

I had difficulty initiating a relationship with a mentor because:

1. I was uncomfortable taking an assertive role in approaching a potential mentor (FEAR)

2. my immediate supervisor disapproved my initiating a mentoring relationship (APPROVAL)

3. I was afraid of being rejected by a potential mentor (FEAR)

4. such an approach might have been misinterpreted as a sexual advance by a potential mentor (MISINTERPRETATION)

5. I was afraid a potential mentor may be “put off” by my approach (FEAR)

6. there was a lack of access to potential mentors (ACCESS)

7. I believed that it was up to the mentor to make the first move (FEAR)

8. my co-workers disapproved of my initiating a mentoring relationship (APPROVAL)
9. such an approach might have been seen as a sexual advance by others in the organization (MISINTERPRETATION)

Part 3, Section for Subjects with Mentors Only (Functions)

Instructions: Following are some statements that can be made about a mentor. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number that most reflects the benefits of your mentoring relationship. Use the following definition of mentor when assessing the following statements.

Mentor: A mentor is an individual of high status, experience and knowledge within your field who is committed to helping a less experienced person’s (protégé’s) career mobility.

Scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly Agree  Strongly Disagree

Demographic Information:

1. The gender of my mentor was?

My mentor:

1. Helps (helped) me attain desirable positions (SPONSOR)

2. Suggests (suggested) specific strategies for achieving career aspirations (COACH)

3. “Runs (ran) interference” for me in the organization (PROTECT)
4. Provides (provided) me with challenging assignments (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)

5. Helps (helped) me be more visible in the organization (EXPOSURE)

6. Is (was) someone I can (could) confide in (FRIENDSHIP)

7. Serves (served) as a role model for me (ROLE MODELING)

8. Guides (guided) my personal development (COUNSEL)

9. Accepts (accepted) me as a competent professional (ACCEPT)

10. Uses (used) his/her influence in the organization for my benefit (SPONSOR)

11. Gives (gave) me advice on how to attain recognition in the organization (COACH)

12. Shields (shielded) me from damaging contact with important people in the organization (PROTECT)

13. Assigns (assigned) me tasks that push (pushed) me into developing new skills (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)

14. Creates (created) opportunities for me to impress important people in the organization (EXPOSURE)

15. Provides (provided) support and encouragement (FRIENDSHIP)

16. Represents (represented) who I want (wanted) to be (ROLE MODELING)

17. Serves (served) as a sounding board for me to develop and understand myself (COUNSEL)

18. Thinks (thought) highly of me (ACCEPTANCE)

19. Uses (used) his/her influence to support my advancement in the organization (SPONSOR)
20. Helps (helped) me learn about other parts of the organization (COACH)

21. Protects (protected) me from those who are (were) out to get me (PROTECT)

22. Gives (gave) me tasks that require (required) me to learn new skills (CHALLENGING ASSIGNMENTS)

23. Brings (brought) my accomplishments to the attention of important people in the organization (EXPOSURE)

24. Is (was) someone I can (could) trust (FRIENDSHIP)

25. Is (was) someone I identify (identified) with (ROLE MODELING)

26. Guides (guided) my professional development (COUNSEL)

27. Sees (saw) me as being competent (ACCEPTANCE)

Part 4, Section for Subjects with Mentors Only (Outcomes)

Instructions: Following are some statements that can be made about your mentoring relationship. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by circling the appropriate number. Use the following definition of mentoring relationship when assessing the following statements.

Mentoring Relationship: A working relationship where mentors and protégés who have common professional interests, shared knowledge, skills and abilities come together in a mutually beneficial way.

Scale:

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Strongly Agree Strongly Disagree
To what extent do you feel that your mentoring relationship

1. Assisted you in receiving promotions? (ADVANCEMENT)
2. Increased your status and power within the organization? (ADVANCEMENT)
3. Increased your status and power outside of the organization? (ADVANCEMENT)
4. Helped you to receive increases in salary? (ADVANCEMENT)
5. Affected your competence in the workplace? (GROWTH)
6. Affected your personal identity in the workplace? (GROWTH)
7. Affected your effectiveness in the workplace? (GROWTH)
8. Increased your acceptance in the workplace? (GROWTH)
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT

UNLV Department of Tourism and Convention

TITLE OF STUDY: Mentoring for Women in Intercollegiate Athletics

INVESTIGATOR(S): Dr. James A. Busser and Laura L. Stephey

CONTACT PHONE NUMBER: 702-895-0942

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate mentoring of women in Intercollegiate Athletics employment with special attention to the gender of the mentor and the female protégé.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because you are a member of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators (NACWAA). Your answers will provide valuable information to educators to understand how the gender of the mentor affects the functions and outcomes for protégés in a mentoring relationship.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to fill out a survey about your mentoring experiences in Intercollegiate Athletic administration. The study will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Benefits of Participation
There may not be direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, by participating in this study, you may contribute valuable information to young women in Intercollegiate Athletics looking to advance their careers. This study will also further research on mentoring in general.

Risks of Participation
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study has only minimal risks. You will be asked to provide demographic information, and answer survey questions regarding your experience in mentoring in Intercollegiate Athletics. You will complete the survey only if you consent. You may leave the survey at any time.
Cost/Compensation
The study will take 15 minutes of your time and does not offer any compensation. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas may not provide compensation or free medical care for an unanticipated injury sustained as a result of participating in this research study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact the principal investigator, Dr. James A. Busser at 702-895-0942 or the student investigator, Laura L. Stephey at 310-913-0414. For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 702-895-2794.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility in Beam Hall for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

Participant Consent:
I have read the above information and agree to participate in this study. I am at least 18 years of age. A copy of this form has been given to me.
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