

AN ANALYSIS OF NCAA DIVISION I INSTITUTION AND CONFERENCE SENIOR  
WOMAN ADMINISTRATORS' SELF-PERCEPTION AND CAREER INTENTIONS

Jessica M. Rippey

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill  
2015

Approved by:

Barbara Osborne

Erienne Weight

Beth Miller

© 2015  
Jessica M. Rippey  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## **ABSTRACT**

Jessica M. Rippey: An Analysis of NCAA Division I Institution and Conference Senior Woman Administrators' Self-Perception and Career Intentions  
(Under the direction of Barbara Osborne)

In 1981, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) mandated that member institutions designate the highest ranking female in the athletic department to be the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) (Bower & Hums, 2013). Based on the research indicating inconsistency in the role of the SWA (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Tiell et al., 2012) and the continuing underrepresentation of women in Athletics Director roles (Acosta and Carpenter, 2014), this study explored variables of the current landscape of the NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator, explore whether or not there are differences between NCAA DI competitive levels, and analyze differences in an SWA's desire to pursue a career as an Athletic Director based on a variety of experiential and psychological factors. This survey of over 350 NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators revealed that 61% of women with the SWA title have no desire to become an Athletic Director. Significant differences were found between the Football Bowl Subdivision and DI non-football competitive levels with regards to salary, number of mentors throughout career, and the current responsibilities of advocating issues important to both male and female student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff. The results of the study will add to literature and research examining the current state of the NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator title.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of Study.....	2
Research Questions and Null Hypotheses .....	3
Definition of Terms.....	4
Limitations .....	5
Delimitations.....	6
Assumptions.....	6
Significance of Study .....	6
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	7
History of Women Administering Intercollegiate Athletics.....	7
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.....	8
NCAA Takeover of the AIAW .....	9
Creation and Purpose of the Senior Woman Administrator .....	11
Inconsistencies in the Purpose and Practice of the SWA .....	12
SWA: Title or Role? .....	13
Lack of Decision Making and Budgeting Experience .....	14

SWA: Career Enhancer or Career Inhibitor? .....	14
Gender Discrimination in Intercollegiate Athletics .....	15
Solutions: Professional Development, Mentoring, and Diversity Training.....	17
Self-Efficacy and Athletic Director Career Intentions.....	19
Conclusion .....	20
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY .....	21
Purpose.....	21
Instrumentation .....	21
Administrative Responsibilities .....	22
Level of Mentoring Experienced .....	22
Athletic Director Career Intentions.....	22
Subjects .....	23
Survey Distribution and Collection Procedures.....	23
Data Analysis .....	23
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	25
Demographics .....	25
Demographic Characteristics, Level of Mentoring and Responsibilities of the Division I Senior Woman Administrator .....	28
SWA Demographic Characteristics, Level of Mentoring and Responsibilities between Division I Competitive Levels.....	32
SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director.....	36
SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director between Division I Competitive Levels .....	44
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	47
Summary .....	47

Research Question 1 .....	47
Research Question 2 .....	50
Research Question 3 .....	51
Research Question 4 .....	54
Future Research .....	55
APPENDIX A.....	56
Thesis Survey.....	56
APPENDIX B.....	67
Thesis Invitation Email.....	67
REFERENCES .....	69

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

1. Demographic Information of Participants .....	26
2. Characteristics and Roles of the NCAA Division I SWA .....	30
3. Level of Mentoring Experienced and Responsibilities of the NCAA DI SWA .....	31
4. Differences in Demographic Characteristics and Responsibilities by Division I Competitive Level.....	33
5. SWA Desire to Become Athletic Director .....	36
6. Demographic Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director.....	37
7. Mentoring Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director .....	39
8. Responsibility Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director ...	41
9. Significant Demographic Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by DI Competitive Level .....	44
10. Significant Responsibility Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by DI Competitive Level .....	45
11. SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by DI Competitive Level.....	46

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### **Introduction**

Since Title IX of the Education Amendments was passed in 1972, there has been a steady decline in the number of female head coaches and athletic directors in intercollegiate athletics (Lopiano, 2014). When Title IX was originally enacted, females administered over 90% of women's college athletic programs, whereas today only 22.3% of intercollegiate athletic directors are female (Bower & Hums, 2013; Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). This is an ironic outcome since the intended purpose of Title IX was to ensure gender equity for those working or attending an educational institution receiving Federal financial assistance (20 U.S.C. § 1681).

In 1981, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) began offering championships for women's athletics and member institutions were required to designate a female in the athletic department to be the Primary Woman Administrator (PWA), now designated as the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) (Bower & Hums, 2013; Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Tiell, Dixon, & Lin, 2012). This designation was intended to be a major advancement in the professional development of women in intercollegiate athletics (Schneider, Stier, Henry, & Wilding, 2010). As time as continued, the roles, tasks and responsibilities of the senior woman administrators have evolved with the hopes of allowing for greater involvement in intercollegiate athletic decision-making, supervision, and governance



(Tiell et al., 2012). However, despite these intentions, there continues to be inconsistency in the SWA title and its implementation at both the conference and institutional level (Hoffman, 2010).

### **Purpose of Study**

Based on the research indicating inconsistency in the role of the SWA at the national, conference, and institutional levels (Grappenddorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Tiell et al., 2012) and the continuing underrepresentation of women in athletics director roles (Acosta and Carpenter, 2014), this study will explore variables that could explain the self-perceptions regarding the SWA title in addition to an SWA's desire to pursue a career as an Athletic Director. Experiential and psychological factors related to these perceptions and intentions will then be compared between the NCAA DI competitive levels of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and the Division I non-football division to determine if there are any significant differences. With this information, NCAA DI institutional athletic departments and conference offices can better determine whether the current model is allowing female administrators professional development opportunities appropriate for their career goals or whether the NCAA should provide greater clarity in defining the SWA role for member institutions to assure more consistent experiences.

Several studies have been conducted to examine the role of the Senior Woman Administrator, but a competitive level comparison has not been done to determine if there are any significant differences in how each area delegate's roles and responsibilities to the Senior Woman Administrator or if there are significant differences in the career intentions of those women serving as SWAs. The goal of this study is to extend the existing body of research on the SWA by adding a new dimension by comparing Senior Woman Administrators between Division I competitive levels. This study seeks to address a new angle and find an additional way

to analyze the role of the SWA with the hopes to continually grow the existing research. In addition, this study hopes to assist with the continuous process of trying to provide meaningful definition and accountability to the relatively vague title of the Senior Woman Administrator. Specifically, the purpose of this study will be to examine if there are significant differences between NCAA Division I competitive levels of FBS, FCS, and Division I non-football with regards to the SWA's level of administrative responsibility and program oversight, levels of mentoring experienced, and their long-term career intentions and aspirations.

### **Research Questions and Null Hypotheses**

RQ1: What does the landscape of the Division I Senior Woman Administrator look like with regards to demographic characteristics, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities?

- Level of mentoring experienced
- Level of current responsibilities
- Level of education completed
- Number of years of full time work in collegiate athletics
- Number of years in current position
- Current income
- Attendance at professional development events in the past three years
- Number of professional and/or career development opportunities throughout administrative career

RQ2: Do demographic characteristics, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities differ based on NCAA Division I competitive level?

RQ3: Do the following variables significantly explain an SWA's career intention of becoming an Athletic Director?

- Age
- Children
- Household size
- Level of education completed
- Number of full years working in collegiate athletics
- Current income
- Number of professional/career development opportunities attended
- Level of mentoring experienced
- Level of current responsibilities

RQ4: If there are variables that significantly explain variance in career intentions of becoming an Athletic Director, are these variables significantly different based on affiliation with a specific Division I competitive level?

### **Definition of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are operationally defined as follows:

- NCAA – the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is a voluntary organization through which many colleges and universities govern their athletics programs.
- Division I – The NCAA subdivision consisting of nearly 350 active members
- Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) – The designated highest ranking female in each NCAA athletic department or member conference

- Competitive Level – The association of the institution with competition in the Football Bowl Subdivision, the Football Championship Subdivision, or Division I non-football
- Athletic Director career intentions – the desire of the subject to pursue an Athletic Director position in their career
- Administrative self-efficacy – “People’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). For the purposes of this study, administrative self-efficacy will be the SWA’s judgment in the confidence of her ability to organize and execute courses of administrative tasks effectively.
- Mentor – “An experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides support, direction and feedback regarding career plans and interpersonal development. A mentor is someone who is in a position of power, who looks out for you, gives you advice and/or brings your accomplishments to the attention of other people who have power in the company” (Fagenson, 1992, p.53).
- Level of education completed – the highest degree awarded to the subject (e.g. High School/GED, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, PhD/Doctoral)
- SWA’s current income – the total amount of annual income the SWA received from being employed as an SWA (e.g. salary, car stipend). The total amount the subject would report on their income taxes as income before withholdings.
- Professional or career development opportunities – conference attended, leadership seminars, serving on committees, and continuing education classes taken.

## **Limitations**

1. This study is limited to current Senior Woman Administrators at NCAA Division I universities with published email addresses.
2. There is the possibility for a non-response bias, depending on the response rate, because of the nature of a voluntary study.

### **Delimitations**

1. This study is delimited to full time employed NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators in the 2014-2015 academic year and therefore results may not be generalized to SWAs in NCAA Divisions II or III.

### **Assumptions**

1. The completion of this study is voluntary for all subjects.
2. All subjects who complete this study will answer the questions honestly and completely.

### **Significance of Study**

This study is relevant in today's landscape of intercollegiate athletics because it adds to an established body of knowledge on the SWA with the intent of gaining new insight through a unique angle of analysis. Although the role of the SWA has been studied, research findings have caused little change or clarity to improve women's experiences with this title. This study aims to add to that research base by providing additional information about the SWA from a Division I competitive level analysis. This research has the intention of providing NCAA member institutions and conferences additional research to continue to evolve the role of the SWA to fit its originally established purposes and determine if more defined roles and responsibilities need to be established to best serve and advance the women who serve in this role.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **History of Women Administering Intercollegiate Athletics**

The origins of female administration in intercollegiate sport began with female physical education teachers controlling all aspects of women's sport participation (Smith, 2011). Although women were playing sport in a collegiate setting, true competition in women's athletics was fairly minimal primarily because the female physical educators who were in charge did not want women's sports to fall into the commercialized or professionalized aspects of male sports, which was governed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (Smith, 2011). In the early 1960s, the NCAA began to show a greater interest in women's intercollegiate athletics, which caused concern with the female physical educators who believed in a firm foundation of sport being an integral part of the greater educational mission and did not want female sports to end up like the male sports model (Wu, 1999). To combat this potential loss of power, the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) was formed in 1966 as a component of the NCAA and the increased pressure for a competitive atmosphere culminated with the CIAW hosting national championships in several female sports the following year (Wu, 1999).

Women had no interest in being a component of the male-driven NCAA, so the CIAW passed a resolution that proposed a new, institutional membership organization for female athletics to be called the "Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women" (AIAW), which

officially replaced the CIAW as an independent organization in 1972 (Wu, 1999). The AIAW allowed women to continue to govern organized female sport competition without the threat of the commercialized male sports model. The AIAW conducted its operations with a clear vision and mission of a student-centered, education-oriented model and used this to guide the creation and execution of their championships procedures, eligibility rules, and legislative and governance structure (Hult, 1989). The governance structure of the AIAW included a “paid executive director, an elected executive committee and an executive board including nine regionally elected representatives (all women)” (Hult, 1989). When the AIAW began, there were 206 charter member institutions and it grew to a maximum of 971 member institutions (Hult, 1989). At its peak, the AIAW sponsored 41 championships across three divisions in 19 different sports (Wushanley, 2004). Throughout its tenure, the AIAW faced two significant conflicts, which ultimately led to its demise: one struggle was because of Title IX and the other was a battle with the NCAA.

### **Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972**

Title IX of the Education Amendments was passed in 1972, which states that “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (20 U.S.C. § 1681). While women in college sport cheered for the passage of this legislation with hopes and visions of increased athletic participation and administration opportunities, it became evident that keeping women’s sport and its focus on education as a clear distinction from the established male sport model was going to be a challenging task while also trying to stay compliant with Title IX (Hult, 1989). In an ironic outcome, a legislative decision that was intended to provide equitable opportunities for women

ultimately allowed the legal system to begin to judge women's sports and equity by the male sport model (Smith, 2011; Wu, 1999).

Events began to unfold after the passage of Title IX and one of the first areas to be challenged was that of female athletic participation scholarships (Smith, 2011). The historic *Kellmeyer* (1973) case found that the AIAW must allow members to provide athletic scholarships equitable to the scholarships that male athletes were receiving, thereby beginning the movement for equality based on the male sport model (*Kellmeyer v. National Education Association*, 1973). This case opened the gates, and the AIAW became more like the male sport model in other ways, including "recruiting, transfer regulations, negotiations for commercial broadcasts rather than public broadcasts of events, [etc.]" (Smith, 2011). Eventually, this led to the loss of female physical educators' position of influence in college sport due to the changing of the women's sport philosophy model to that of the male norm (Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Smith, 2011).

### **NCAA Takeover of the AIAW**

The passage of Title IX also posed a threat to the established order of the NCAA, which feared that providing equity for women's athletics in their structured model would take away resources from the male sport programs (Hult, 1989). After years of fighting the Title IX legislation in court and a decade of debating whether to include equitable female sport participation in the NCAA structure, the NCAA adhered to the new law and began hosting championships for women's sports in all three divisions in 1981 (Smith, 2011). For one year, both the NCAA and the AIAW offered championships for women's sports which forced universities to choose between the two organizations in regards to their championship participation opportunities (Hult, 1989). The NCAA had far greater resources, resulting in the



AIAW's loss of leadership in women's intercollegiate athletics as its members left to join the NCAA and its "far-better-funded national championships" (Smith, 2011). Ultimately, the mass defection of AIAW members to the NCAA because of financial incentives caused the demise of the AIAW (Lovett & Lowry, 1995).

With the end of the AIAW and NCAA takeover, many of the former AIAW members were concerned that women would lose their power to influence collegiate athletics culture, policies, and championships for female sports (Lamar, 1994). History has shown that these women had reason to be concerned, as male athletics administrators had their own apprehensions about sponsoring women's championships and women in NCAA leadership. At the time, Edward S. Betz, chair of the NCAA Women's Intercollegiate Committee stated, "If the Association believes that we *must* [emphasis added] go into women's championships, then we will proceed to plan along those lines. [But] there has been no planning to bring women into the management of this program" (Lovett & Lowry, 1995, p. 244-245). This quote set the tone and gives insight to the lack of opportunities that women would receive in the NCAA governance structure (Lovett & Lowry, 1995).

In order to combat this negative perception and to convince more AIAW schools to officially join the NCAA, the NCAA agreed to a five year plan that "assured women a maximum of 16% representation on the NCAA council, and from 18-24% membership on other important committees" (Hult, 1989, p. 256). At the time of the NCAA takeover, the AIAW had around 1,300 women in leadership positions; however, under the new NCAA plan, less than 350 women were guaranteed a leadership role and only one or two would have actual decision-making authority (Hult, 1989). When Title IX was enacted in 1972, over 90% of women's college sport programs were administered by a female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014), but by the 1979-1980

academic year, over 80% of college sport programs had merged men's and women's athletics into one department and 90% of those merged departments had male leaders (Uhlir, 1987).

A study done by Yiamouyiannis and Osborne (2012) examined female representation in the governance structure of the NCAA and found that “the higher the level of importance in the governance structure, the lower the percentage of women involved in leadership roles” (p. 9). In 2012, at the time of the study, they found that there were only three women, or 15.8%, serving on the NCAA executive committee, which is the most powerful governing entity within the current structure of the NCAA (Yiamouyiannis & Osborne, 2012). Findings also showed that women are under-represented on committees that determine eligibility and sport playing rules, but, in contrast, women are over-represented on committees that deal with sportsmanship, scholarships, and minority/special interests (Yiamouyiannis & Osborne, 2012). Overall, this study found that women are underrepresented in almost two-thirds of councils, cabinets, and committees of Division I governance and that women represent only 23.5% of the leadership at the NCAA national office executive level, displaying the lack of female representation when there is any kind of powerful decision-making authority (Yiamouyiannis & Osborne, 2012). Conversely, the areas where women are equally or over-represented are those in which are labor-intensive “housekeeping” positions (Yiamouyiannis & Osborne, 2012). These discoveries are consistent with conventional gender stereotypes that have been used to examine the low representation of women in athletic leadership roles (Shaw & Frisby, 2006; Sibson, 2010).

### **Creation and Purpose of the Senior Woman Administrator**

When the NCAA takeover of the AIAW resulted in women's loss of power in the governance of intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA created the position of the Primary Woman Administrator, which is now called the Senior Woman Administrator, in 1981 as a perceived

effort to give administrative opportunities and responsibilities back to women (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009). The intention of this role was to assure that women had a voice in the administration of collegiate athletics (Grappendorf et al., 2008). According to the NCAA, the SWA is the highest ranking female involved in the “management of an institution’s intercollegiate athletics program” or involved in “the conduct and policy processes of a member conference’s office” (NCAA Division I Manual, 2014, p. 18). The designation of the SWA is intended to promote female administrators’ involvement in meaningful ways in the governance of college athletics (NCAA, 2014). The NCAA states that “the SWA should be a member of the athletics department senior management team [and] she should be provided the appropriate time, resources and title to fulfill her administrative responsibilities” (NCAA, 2012, p. 2). Although the creation of the role of the SWA was seen as a major advancement for women in athletic departments (Bower & Hums, 201; Schneider et al., 2010), many inconsistencies and problems exist with the implementation of the role.

### **Inconsistencies in the Purpose and Practice of the SWA**

Research on the topic of the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA) title shows that it continues to be an inconsistent role with variation in perceptions, tasks and responsibilities (Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010). The differences between the three NCAA divisions have been well researched and documented (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Tiell, 2004; Tiell et al., 2012); however, there is little research in regards to the differences between conferences within one division. To fill the gap in the literature, this current study focuses on a Division I conference comparison of SWA’s self-perceptions and career intentions.

The NCAA defines an institutional senior woman administrator as the “the highest-ranking female involved in the management of an institution’s intercollegiate athletics program”

(NCAA Bylaw 4.02.4.1, 2014). While the women holding the SWA title can fill any job in the athletic department, the NCAA states that she “should be a member of the athletics department senior management team” (NCAA, 2012, p. 2). Although the SWA position was created by the NCAA with meaningful intentions of advancing women in athletic departments by providing them with access and a voice in the decision making of collegiate athletics (NCAA, 2012; Schneider et al., 2010), it has become clear that there are serious flaws in the implementation of the role (Grappendorf et al., 2008). Many of those working in collegiate athletics, including coaches, administrators, athletic directors, and even some women designated as SWA are often uncertain as to the actual purpose and function of the Senior Woman Administrator (Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009). These flaws and inconsistencies can stem from three main categories: the fact that the SWA is a title and not an actual position; the lack of decision-making and budget experiences gained from this role; and whether or not the SWA role is seen as a career enhancer or a career inhibitor (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Quarterman et al., 2006; Tiell et al., 2012)

### **SWA: Title or Role?**

The biggest challenge with the title of the SWA is just that – it is a title and not an actual position in the athletic department (Hoffman, 2010). Because the NCAA does not dictate that member institutions have a position solely for the SWA, only that the highest-ranking female in the department be given the title, many institutions give the title without affording any kind of additional power or decision-making authority (Grappendorf et al., 2008). In 2004, Tiell studied the self-perception of the role of the SWA and found that SWAs perceived their position to not only be just a title with no real responsibilities, but also found that SWAs felt they had little to no involvement with the administrative duties of the athletic department. Furthermore, some

research has suggested that with the implementation of the SWA role, many women who hold this title are only seen as SWAs and not seen for their contributions as assistant, associate, or senior associate athletic directors (Hoffman, 2010).

### **Lack of Decision Making and Budgeting Experience**

A second challenge with the role of the SWA is that women in this role often do not gain decision-making, financial, and/or budgeting experience, which have been deemed as imperative skills for the advancement to senior level positions within the athletic department (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Quarterman et al., 2006). In 2012, Tiell et al. actually found that fundraising and budget management were “the least reported roles for SWAs across [all] divisions” (p. 263). Moreover, a study done in 2009 found that 61% of SWAs did not feel as though they had final decision-making authority on budgetary issues (Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009). This data suggests that SWAs need specific training in the areas of development, budgeting, and definitive decision-making in order to advance their careers to the senior level positions within the athletic department (Tiell et al., 2012).

### **SWA: Career Enhancer or Career Inhibitor?**

A final challenge with this title is whether or not it is a career enhancer or a career inhibitor (Hoffman, 2010). Research indicates there is no consensus answer to this question. On one hand, women holding the SWA title serve on additional conference and NCAA committees, therefore providing them with added networking opportunities with the possibility for job advancement. On the other hand, many of the women with this title serve in lower administrative or even coaching roles and never have the opportunity to develop fundraising, budgeting, and/or decision-making skills (Bower & Hums, 2013). Another way to look at this dilemma is to note that the SWA role allows a few women to advance into the senior management team, though the

role simultaneously limits the advancement of a large quantity of women to upper-level administrative positions (Hoffman, 2010).

Research has also found that the women who do make it to higher levels of athletic administration (i.e. assistant or associate athletic directors) are usually in the support areas such as academic advising, compliance, or life skills (Whisenant et al., 2002). Although women often do advance to leadership roles in the caretaking units, they can usually only progress as far as associate or senior associate athletic directors through this path, therefore furthering the notion that SWA might be a terminal title rather than one that promotes advancement (Hoffman, 2010).

An interesting paradox was found in 2009 when Hatfield and Hatfield found that SWAs, for the most part, indicated that they believed their primary functions while serving in the role of SWA should include being “an advocate for women’s athletics, gender equity, and serving as a role model” (p. 1). While these are noble goals, it further supports the question as to whether this role is a terminal position, because none of these functions cross over into administrative strategies such as budgeting and decision-making (Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009). This blurry line of wanting to advocate for women and female sports, while also being taken seriously as an effective athletic administrator is a difficult balancing act for women in the SWA role (Hoffman, 2010).

### **Gender Discrimination in Intercollegiate Athletics**

In order to understand where the inconsistencies in the SWA experience stem from, it is imperative to have a thorough understanding of the historical and present day gender-role stereotyping and discrimination in college athletics. Many studies have researched various aspects of this topic and a multitude of theoretical frameworks have been applied to comprehend the data. Tiell, Dixon, and Lin, for example, applied role congruity theory towards this concept,

which indicates that females, in general, are expected by society to perform more “communal or feminine roles such as nurturing or mentoring, while males are expected to perform more masculine or agentic roles such as allocating resources or administering discipline” (2012, p. 248). Others have applied the theoretical framework of hegemonic masculinity, in which studies have indicated “men are rewarded at a greater rate with employment and promotion... than women” (Wright et al., 2011, p. 46). It has been cautioned that hegemonic masculinity will be commonplace in college athletics until women are seen as equals to men and given the opportunity to earn equal hiring and retention opportunities (Pedersen & Whisenant, 2005).

Research has suggested that gender roles begin to develop at an early age and males are encouraged, even expected, to be dominant, competitive, and self-reliant, whereas females are expected to be dependent, submissive, and emotional (Minor, 2001). Within this context, masculine traits are valued in the sport industry, both in participation and administration, thereby preserving male dominance (Whisenant, et al., 2002). Females are given limited access to sport because, in general, sport affirms male dominance and control via an emphasis on masculinity and its associated traits (Wright et al., 2011). Furthermore, humans are, in general, attracted to other people who are similar to them; therefore, people in hiring positions are instinctively attracted to candidates who resemble themselves, or the current members of the organization (Schein, 2001). With sports organizations being no exception to this theme, it becomes extremely difficult for women and minorities to penetrate the mold of a white, male-dominated field. While this is not a new concept, nor is it exclusive to sport organizations, these barriers have limited women in their advancement into senior level positions within an athletics department (Fink, 2008).

In some athletic departments today, the SWA is viewed as the “token female” whose presence in the athletic department is to be a voice and advocate for women’s issues, but has very little power and is never fully accepted by her male colleagues (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hoffman, 2010). Research has found that many SWAs do not feel they are obtaining crucial administrative skills that would assist them in their career advancement nor did they feel empowered to make definitive decisions within their athletic departments (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Tiell, 2004). To combat this situation, the NCAA has voiced support of inclusion and the importance of diverse leadership by encouraging schools and conferences “to actively train and engage their senior woman administrators in all aspects of the organization’s operations” (NCAA, 2012, p. 6).

### **Solutions: Professional Development, Mentoring, and Diversity Training**

One way to engage senior woman administrators and encourage inclusion and diversity is to provide mentoring, support systems, and professional development opportunities for SWAs (Schneider et al., 2010). Despite the fact that only a small percentage of SWAs in 2012 claimed that they participated in a mentoring relationship even though institutional funding was available, these opportunities have been found to be helpful in changing perceptions of the SWA role in addition to upward mobility within collegiate athletics (Tiell et al., 2012). One of the first studies done to examine the perceptions of mentoring in athletic administration was conducted by Young in 1990 which found that 94% of administrators advocated that all young professionals establish a mentoring relationship. The administrators in this study indicated that the benefits they received from their own mentors included: encouragement and support; advice; an opportunity to increase their professional knowledge; guidance and direction; and constructive criticism (Young, 1990).



Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) developed a mentoring model for sport administrators and defined mentoring “as a process in which a more experienced person (i.e., the mentor) serves as a role model, provides guidance and support to a developing novice (i.e., the protégé), and sponsors that individual’s career progress” (p. 25). In 2002, Weaver and Chelladurai put their mentoring model to the test by studying athletic administrators from NCAA Division I and III institutions and found that mentored individuals were more satisfied with work than their non-mentored counterparts. Weaver and Chelladurai also found that mentored individuals had reached higher positions within their organizations at a younger age than their non-mentored counterparts (2002). Research has indicated that efforts must be made to provide networking and professional development opportunities for women from not only female administrators, but also male senior administrators who can help them gain knowledge and skills and possibly even reduce gender stereotypes (Schneider et al., 2010; Tiell et al., 2012).

Many institutions are also attempting to rectify the gender discrepancy in athletic departments by implementing diversity training into their organizations. It has been shown that including females in athletic administrative organizations is not only advantageous, but is increasingly easy to accomplish (Eagly, 2007). There is extensive research demonstrating the benefits of diversity training, which includes, but is not limited to, improved work morale, organizational effectiveness, an understanding and awareness of people different from one’s self, and a more positive attitude towards diversity (Bendick, Egan, & Lofhjelm, 2001; Brief & Barsky, 2000; Cunningham, 2008; Cunningham, 2012; Eagly, 2007; Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schaefer, 2003; Hill & Augoustinos, 2001; Kulik & Roverson, 2008; Wentling & Palma-Rivas, 1999; Wright et al., 2001). When conducting diversity training, it is important that the training be linked with the core elements of the athletic department (i.e. show how diversity is connected to the mission, strategic plan, personnel evaluations, etc.) because research has shown that when

doing this, people are more likely to implement the “knowledge, skills, and attitudes learned during the diversity training” (Cunningham, 2012, p. 400).

### **Self-Efficacy and Athletic Director Career Intentions**

While there is little to no research on the career intentions of senior woman administrators and their desire to become athletic directors, research has been done on female assistant coaches and their desire to become head coaches (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998; Sagas, Cunningham & Ashley, 2000) in addition to student-athletes’ interest in and perceptions of the coaching profession (Kamphoff & Gill, 2008). Kamphoff and Gill (2008) found that men are more likely than women to have head coaching career intentions at the Division I level and attributed at least part of the reason that females do not have head coaching intentions to the fact that female athletes may not see many female head coaches at the Division I level, and therefore may not see head coaching at this level as a realistic option for them. Many studies have found that while female assistant coaches have perceived greater advantage and opportunities to gain head coaching positions, they do not pursue head coaching jobs as frequently as men do (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002; Cunningham, Sagas & Ashley, 2003; Sagas et al., 2000). Cunningham, Doherty and Gregg (2007) conducted similar research of head coaching intentions among assistant coaches and found that men in their sample expressed a greater interest in becoming head coaches than women did.

Using this research as a basic structure in addition to the theoretical foundation established from Bandura’s (1977) social cognitive career theory measuring self-efficacy, this study will apply similar strategies to discover the career intentions and perceived self-efficacy of NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators. Cunningham et al., define coaching self-efficacy as “one’s confidence in his or her capacity to perform the coaching tasks effectively”

(2003, p. 128). This definition will be adapted to senior woman administrators and her confidence in her ability to perform the administrative tasks effectively.

## **Conclusion**

The initial decline of females from athletic administration and leadership positions following the enactment of Title IX was dramatic, but the lack of increased opportunities over the last 30 years is even more alarming. Originally seen as legislation that would advance women in sport, the opposite effect has occurred. As previously summarized, many studies have been conducted to explain and understand the decline of women in sport, provide a historical perspective of the implementation of the senior woman administrator title and the effects that have developed, and pose possible solutions to facilitate gender equity in intercollegiate athletics. This study will attempt to build on the existing literature surrounding the role of the senior woman administrator by looking at self-efficacy from a Division I conference comparison perspective and include additional career related factors (e.g., level of education, mentoring experienced, and current income) that may help to explain an SWAs intention, or lack of intention, to pursue a career as an athletics director.

Another common theme in the literature is to recommend formal mentoring programs and professional development opportunities as solutions to the lack of female leadership in intercollegiate athletics. This study will examine the viability of these solutions by measuring the number of professional development events the subjects report attending to determine if it has a significant relationship to athletic director career intentions. Using the mentor functions questionnaire (MFQ-9), this study will also measure the mentor functions the subjects' have experienced in their administrative career and examine the relationship between mentoring and athletic director career intentions (Pelligrini & Scandura, 2005).

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine if there are significant differences between NCAA Division I competitive levels (FBS, FCS, and DI non-football) with regards to the SWA's level of administrative responsibility and program oversight, levels of mentoring experienced, and their long-term career intentions and aspirations. A sample of current NCAA Division I institution and conference SWAs was utilized for this study.

#### **Instrumentation**

The data for this study was collected by email survey of 357 NCAA Division I institution and conference Senior Woman Administrators. Participants were emailed a link to an online survey questionnaire asking them to provide demographic information and to respond to various questions designed to measure the level of mentoring experienced, level of current responsibilities, and career desires to be an athletic director. SWA's with unpublished email addresses were excluded from the survey. Demographic information collected included age, conference affiliation, household size, current income level, level of education completed, whether or not they had children, and number of professional/career development opportunities throughout their administrative career (Appendix A).

In order to ensure confidentiality, the subject's name and institution information were not asked in the survey. The subjects were guaranteed that all of their answers would only be used

for the educational purposes of this study. All information received from the subjects was collected and categorized in a separate and secure data set for analysis.

### **Administrative Responsibilities**

Subjects administrative responsibilities was measured using a revised version of the Tiell (2004) instrument titled “SWA Roles, Responsibilities, & Career Path Survey”. Tiell’s original survey was created using the NCAA’s SWA Brochure “How to Strengthen Your Athletics Management Team” as a basis for the tasks and responsibilities deemed specific to the position of the SWA (Tiell, 2004). Revisions to the instrument and the subsequent final survey utilized in this study were submitted for scrutiny and validation by a panel of experts in the field of intercollegiate athletics in addition to the experts at the Odum Institute.

### **Level of Mentoring Experienced**

Level of mentoring experienced by the subjects was measured using the mentor functions questionnaire (MFQ-9) used by Pelligrini and Scandura (2005) (Appendix A). Scandura (1992) originally developed the mentor function questionnaire and Fagenson (1992) used it on a 20-item scale to confirm subjects’ response to whether they were or were not a protégé in a mentoring relationship. The Scandura (1992) scale has since been refined to a 9-item scale (MFQ-9), with three items for each dimension of mentoring: career, psychosocial, and role modeling (Pellegrini & Scandura, 2005).

### **Athletic Director Career Intentions**

The subjects’ desire/intention to become an athletic director was measured using an adapted version of that used by Cunningham et al. (2003) to measure the assistant coach subjects’ desire/intention to become a head coach. The two items for the measure of this study are “Do you have desire to become an athletic director?” and “How likely is it that you will

search and apply for an athletic director position during your career?" The first item is a "yes" or "no" question with follow-up questions depending on your answer, while the second item was measured using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (not at all) to 5 (almost certain).

## **Subjects**

The subjects of this study are senior woman administrators at NCAA Division I institutions and conferences in the 2014-2015 academic year. Only subjects with the title of "Senior Woman Administrator" were included in the study. SWAs at the division II and III level were excluded from this study.

## **Survey Distribution and Collection Procedures**

The survey questions were entered into the online survey service provider, Qualtrics, and a link was assigned for the created survey. After collecting the subjects email addresses through the college athletics database service, WINAD, emails were sent to subjects containing an overview of the purpose of the study and the link to complete the online survey (Appendix B).

## **Data Analysis**

The data was entered into the statistical program SPSS for Macintosh version 21. The information was coded by age, children, household size, level of administrative experience, number of professional development activities, level of education, number of years in collegiate athletic administration, conference affiliation, average score of mentoring functions questionnaire, average score in administrative responsibilities items and average score in athletic director intentions. Means and standard deviations were calculated for all demographic items. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used as the statistical tool to analyze the Likert scale data indicating whether the subjects generally agreed or disagreed if the SWA performed the tasks and responsibilities identified as job functions of the senior woman administrator. ANOVA was

then utilized to compare athletic director intentions with conference affiliation serving as the independent variable. A Chi-Square analysis was then run against the following factors to determine if there were any variables that were significant in an SWA's desire, or lack thereof, to become an athletic director: age, children, household size, level of education completed, number of full years working in collegiate athletics, current income, number of professional/career development opportunities throughout administrative career, level of mentoring experienced, level of administrative self-efficacy, and level of current responsibilities. Lastly, the factors found to be significant in an SWA's desire to become an athletic director were analyzed using a Chi-Square test against division I competitive levels to determine if there was any significant difference.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Demographics

The survey was taken in part or in whole by 163 NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators. Demographic information was collected at the conclusion of the survey and was completed by 157 participants. Of this, 39.5% ( $n = 62$ ) were affiliated with a Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) organization, 36.9% ( $n = 58$ ) were affiliated with a Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) organization, and 23.6% ( $n = 37$ ) were affiliated with a Division I non-football organization. The majority of participants (69.5%,  $n = 109$ ) were between the ages 36-55, with 30.6% ( $n = 48$ ) between the ages of 36-45 and 38.9% ( $n = 61$ ) between the ages 46-55. The majority of participants (83.3%,  $n = 130$ ) identified as White/Caucasian. Over half of the participants did not have children (54.1%,  $n = 85$ ). The majority of participants had a household size of one (25.3%,  $n = 39$ ) or two (39.0%,  $n = 60$ ) people. The majority of participants hold a Master's Degree (73.9%,  $n = 116$ ). Most of the participants have worked in collegiate athletics between 11-30 years, with 37.6% ( $n = 59$ ) working between 11-20 years and 31.8% ( $n = 50$ ) working between 21-30 years. In regards to the number of years worked in their current position, the majority of participants have been there between 0-5 years (42.0%,  $n = 66$ ). Over half of the participants earn a salary of \$90,000 or more (57.1%,  $n = 88$ ), with the largest subgroup earning between \$100,000-\$119,999 (18.2%,  $n = 28$ ). The majority of the participants have attended



professional developments events in the past three years (84%,  $n = 131$ ). A complete listing of respondent demographic information is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Demographic Information of Participants*

	%	$n$
<b>Athletics Affiliation</b>		
FBS	39.5%	62
FCS	36.9%	58
DI, non-football	23.6%	37
<b>Age</b>		
26-35	13.4%	21
36-45	30.6%	48
46-55	38.9%	61
56-65	15.3%	24
66 or older	1.9%	3
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White/Caucasian	83.3%	130
Black/African American	14.7%	23
Hispanic/Latino	1.9%	3
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.6%	1
Other	0.0%	0
Choose not to answer	0.6%	1
<b>Children</b>		
Yes	45.9%	72
No	54.1%	85
<b>Household Size</b>		
1 person	25.3%	39

2 people	39.0%	60
3 people	11.7%	18
4 people	19.5%	30
5 or more people	4.5%	7

**Education**

High school diploma/GED	1.9%	3
Associates Degree/Junior College	0.0%	0
Bachelor's Degree	12.7%	20
Master's Degree	73.9%	116
Doctoral Degree	11.5%	18

**Years working full-time in collegiate athletics**

0-10	13.4%	21
11-20	37.6%	59
21-30	31.8%	50
31 +	17.2%	27

**Years worked in current position**

0-5	42.0%	66
6-10	24.2%	38
11-15	15.9%	25
16-20	7.0%	11
21+	10.8%	17

**Salary**

\$40,000 - \$49,000	3.2%	5
\$50,000 - \$59,999	6.5%	10
\$60,000 - \$69,999	9.7%	15
\$70,000 - \$79,999	13.6%	21
\$80,000 - \$89,999	9.7%	15

\$90,000 - \$99,999	12.3%	19
\$100,000 - \$119,999	18.2%	28
\$120,000 - \$139,999	12.3%	19
\$140,000 or more	14.3%	22
<b>Attended professional development events in the past three years</b>		
Yes	84.0%	131
No	16.0%	25
<b>Number of professional development events attended in the past year</b>		
0-2	71.8%	89
3-5	26.6%	33
6+	1.6%	2

---

**Demographic Characteristics, Level of Mentoring and Responsibilities of the Division I Senior Woman Administrator**

Demographic information including highest level of education completed, number of years working full-time in collegiate athletics, yearly salary, whether or not they had participated in professional development events in the past three years, and the number of professional development events they have attended in the past year. This information was gathered and analyzed to try and gain a better understanding of the overall landscape of the NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator. A complete list of all demographic aspects is shown in Table 2.

Participants were asked to list how many mentors they have had throughout their career. The majority of participants (44.9%,  $n = 71$ ) stated that they had between 3-5 mentors throughout their career. Participants were given a list of functions that a mentor-mentee relationship might have and were asked to rate how much positive influence, if any, they felt the

listed experiences had on their career. The five-point Likert scale included 1 (no positive influence, or did not experience) to 5 (Tremendous positive influence). Means and standard deviations were calculated from the results for each of the factors listed. The participants felt the most positive influence in the category “They have respected a mentor’s ability to teach others” ( $M = 4.250$ ,  $SD = 1.081$ ) and the least positive influence in the category “Mentor devoted special time and consideration to their career” ( $M = 3.560$ ,  $SD = 1.278$ ). A list of the number of mentors participants have had throughout their career is shown in Table 2. A complete list of all aspects mentioned in the survey with regards to the level of mentoring experienced, in descending order by mean, is shown in Table 3.

Participants were then asked about their current responsibilities as the Senior Woman Administrator. The vast majority of participants have program and/or sport oversight (95%,  $n=153$ ). Participants were then given a list of functions that a Senior Woman Administrator might have as a responsibility and were asked to rate their current level of involvement. The five point Likert scale included 1 (no involvement, or did not experience) to 5 (tremendous involvement). Means and standard deviations were calculated from the results for each of the factors listed. The participants felt the most involvement in the category “Involved on the Senior Management Team” ( $M = 4.75$ ,  $SD = 0.55$ ) and the category “Serve as a role model and/or resource for students, coaches, and/or administrators” ( $M = 4.74$ ,  $SD = 0.51$ ). Participants felt the least involvement in the category “Involved in fundraising” ( $M = 2.66$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ). Participants were then given the opportunity to list any additional key or time-consuming responsibilities relative to their title as Senior Woman Administrator. The highest listed responsibility was serving on committees (26%,  $n = 31$ ), internal operations (19.3%,  $n = 23$ ), and acting as the University and/or Community Liaison (17.6%,  $n = 21$ ). A complete list of additional key and/or

time-consuming responsibilities is shown in Table 2. A complete list of all aspects mentioned in the survey with regards to the level of current responsibilities, in descending order by mean, is shown in Table 3.

**Table 2**

*Characteristics and Roles of the NCAA Division I SWA*

	%	n
<b>Number of Mentors Throughout Career</b>		
0	3.8%	6
1-2	35.4%	56
3-5	44.9%	71
6+	15.8%	25
<b>Program Oversight</b>		
Yes	95.0%	153
No	5.0%	8
<b>Key and/or Time Consuming Responsibilities in Addition to Senior Woman Administrator Functions</b>		
Serve on Committees	26.0%	31
Internal Operations	19.3%	23
University/Community Liaison	17.6%	21
Title IX Coordinator	9.2%	11
Student-Athlete Programming	8.4%	10
Strategic Planning	5.9%	7
Legal/Risk Management	5.9%	7
Game Management Responsibilities	5.0%	6
Special Projects	3.4%	4
Mentoring Responsibilities	2.5%	3
External Operations	2.5%	3
Fundraising	1.7%	2
Chief of Staff	0.8%	1
Teacher/Professor	0.8%	1
Coach	0.8%	1
<b>Education Completed</b>		
High school diploma/GED	1.9%	3
Associates Degree/Junior College	0.0%	0
Bachelor's Degree	12.7%	20
Master's Degree	73.9%	116
Doctoral Degree	11.5%	18

<b>Years working full-time in collegiate athletics</b>		
0-10	13.4%	21
11-20	37.6%	59
21-30	31.8%	50
31-40	15.3%	24
41 +	1.9%	3
<b>Salary</b>		
\$40,000 - \$49,000	3.2%	5
\$50,000 - \$59,999	6.5%	10
\$60,000 - \$69,999	9.7%	15
\$70,000 - \$79,999	13.6%	21
\$80,000 - \$89,999	9.7%	15
\$90,000 - \$99,999	12.3%	19
\$100,000 - \$119,999	18.2%	28
\$120,000 - \$139,999	12.3%	19
\$140,000 or more	14.3%	22
<b>Attended professional development events in the past three years</b>		
Yes	84.0%	131
No	16.0%	25
<b>Number of professional development events attended in the past year</b>		
0-2	71.8%	89
3-5	26.6%	33
6+	1.6%	2

**Table 3**

*Level of Mentoring Experienced and Responsibilities of the NCAA Division I SWA*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Level of Mentoring Experienced</b>		
They have respected a mentor's ability to teach others	4.250	1.081
Mentor took personal interest in their career	4.170	1.034
They have admired a mentor's ability to motivate others	4.120	1.151
They have considered a mentor to be a friend	4.110	1.098
They have shared professional problems with a mentor	3.940	1.189
They have exchanged confidences with a mentor	3.860	1.255
They have modeled behavior after a mentor	3.800	1.239
Mentor helped them coordinate professional goals	3.570	1.241
Mentor devoted special time and consideration to their career	3.560	1.278

### **Current Responsibilities**

Involved on the Senior Management Team	4.75	0.55
Serve as role model and/or resource for students, coaches, and/or administrators	4.74	0.51
Accomplish goals within group structure	4.70	0.60
Advocate issues important to female student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff	4.59	0.63
Manage gender equity/Title IX issues	4.47	0.83
Involved in hiring of key department/institutional personnel	4.41	0.92
Advocate issues important to male student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff	4.41	0.84
Education on issues concerning women	4.06	1.03
Monitor the implementation of the gender equity plan	4.00	1.33
Involved in budget management	3.95	1.14
Education on issues concerning men	3.76	1.10
Advise student-athletes in successfully balancing academics and athletics	3.73	1.16
Involved in the EADA review	3.64	1.42
Involved in fundraising	2.66	1.19

---

### **SWA Demographic Characteristics, Level of Mentoring and Responsibilities between**

#### **Division I Competitive Levels**

Each of the variables discussed in the previous section was analyzed against Division I competitive level to see if there were significant differences between Senior Woman Administrators demographics, levels of mentoring, and current job responsibilities when comparing the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and Division I non-football.

For the demographic information studied, the mean result of each category was found for each of the three competitive levels and the mean differences between competitive levels was computed by running a one-way analysis of variance. “Salary” was the only category found to be significantly different among competitive levels. The mean difference for “salary” was the

largest between FBS and FCS ( $M = 6.770, SD = 2.305$ ). The mean difference for “salary” was also significant between FBS and DI non-football ( $M = 6.770, SD = 2.310$ ).

In regards to mentoring, there was no significant difference found between competitive level for each of the categories analyzed by running a one-way analysis of variance to determine the “Level of Mentoring Experienced”. There was, however, a significant difference between FBS and DI non-football in the number of mentors Senior Woman Administrators had throughout their career ( $M = 2.730, SD = 0.771$ ).

Finally, there were two categories in the “Current Responsibilities” section that were significant between FBS and DI non-football by running a one-way analysis of variance. “Advocate issues important to female student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff” was the significant category with the lowest mean difference ( $M = 4.590, SD = 0.630$ ) and “Advocate issues important to male student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff” was the significant category with the highest mean difference ( $M = 4.410, SD = 0.840$ ). No significant differences were found between FBS and FCS competitive levels.

A complete list of all aspects mentioned in the survey, organized by the three sections (demographic characteristics, mentoring, and responsibilities) with each category in descending order by mean is shown in Table 4.

**Table 4**

*Differences in Demographic Characteristics and Responsibilities by NCAA DI Competitive Level*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>FBS Mean</i>	<i>FCS Mean</i>	<i>DI non-football Mean</i>	<i>Mean Diff</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Salary*</b>	6.770	2.310	8.380	5.480	6.080	2.296	37.119	0.000
<b>Salary**</b>	6.770	2.305	8.380	5.480	6.080	2.895	37.119	0.000
<b>Education Completed</b>	3.930	0.642	4.030	3.830	3.920		1.542	0.217
<b>Years Working Full Time in Collegiate</b>	2.516	0.917	2.823	2.241	2.432	0.581	6.670	0.001



**Athletics\*\*****Number of professional development events attended in the past year**

Number of professional development events attended in the past year	1.298	0.494	1.255	1.383	1.233		1.132	0.326
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

**Attended professional development events in the past three years**

Attended professional development events in the past three years	1.160	0.368	1.150	1.170	1.160		0.068	0.935
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

**Number of Mentors Throughout Career\***

Number of Mentors Throughout Career*	2.730	0.771	2.920	2.660	2.540	0.379	3.357	0.046
--------------------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**Level of Mentoring Experienced**

They have respected a mentor's ability to teach others

They have respected a mentor's ability to teach others	4.250	1.081	4.190	4.350	4.200		0.333	0.717
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

Mentor took personal interest in their career

Mentor took personal interest in their career	4.170	1.034	4.100	4.340	4.030		1.250	0.289
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

They have admired a mentor's ability to motivate others

They have admired a mentor's ability to motivate others	4.120	1.151	4.080	4.290	3.940		1.035	0.358
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

They have considered a mentor to be a friend

They have considered a mentor to be a friend	4.110	1.098	4.160	4.200	3.890		0.983	0.377
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

They have shared professional problems with a mentor

They have shared professional problems with a mentor	3.940	1.189	3.970	3.960	3.860		0.106	0.899
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

They have exchanged confidences with a mentor

They have exchanged confidences with a mentor	3.860	1.255	3.810	3.960	3.780		0.324	0.724
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

They have modeled behavior after a mentor

They have modeled behavior after a mentor	3.800	1.239	3.770	4.020	3.500		1.960	0.144
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

Mentor helped them coordinate professional goals

Mentor helped them coordinate professional goals	3.570	1.241	3.520	3.730	3.420		0.809	0.447
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

Mentor devoted special time and consideration to their career

Mentor devoted special time and consideration to their career	3.560	1.278	3.520	3.730	3.390		0.865	0.423
---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

**Program Oversight****Current Responsibilities**

Involved on the Senior

Involved on the Senior	4.750	0.554	4.760	4.690	4.810		0.565	0.569
------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--	-------	-------

Management Team								
Serve as role model and/or resource for students, coaches, and/or administrators	4.740	0.508	4.730	4.740	4.760		0.044	0.957
Accomplish goals within group structure	4.700	0.595	4.790	4.540	4.780		3.129	0.047
Advocate issues important to female student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff*	4.590	0.630	4.740	4.550	4.410	0.337	3.615	0.029
Manage gender equity/Title IX issues	4.470	0.830	4.660	4.400	4.270		2.969	0.054
Involved in hiring of key department/institutional personnel	4.410	0.920	4.400	4.380	4.490		0.159	0.854
Advocate issues important to male student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff*	4.410	0.840	4.610	4.340	4.190	0.424	3.358	0.037
Education on issues concerning women	4.060	1.030	4.270	3.910	3.920		2.311	0.103
Monitor the implementation of the gender equity plan	4.000	1.330	4.110	3.910	3.950		0.373	0.689
Involved in budget management	3.950	1.142	4.160	3.780	3.860		1.857	0.160
Education on issues concerning men	3.760	1.104	4.030	3.620	3.540		3.160	0.045
Advise student-athletes in successfully balancing academics and athletics	3.730	1.162	3.550	3.760	4.000		1.790	0.170
Involved in the EADA review	3.640	1.424	3.650	3.550	3.760		0.234	0.792
Involved in fundraising	2.660	1.191	2.740	2.550	2.700		0.407	0.666

\*p<.05 for FBS and DI non-football

\*\*p<.05 for FBS and FCS

## SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director

Participants were asked whether or not they had any desire to become an Athletic Director. The majority of participants (%=61,  $n = 96$ ) indicated that they had no intention of becoming an athletic director. A complete list of responses can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5**

<i>SWA Desire to Become Athletic Director</i>		
	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>
<b>Desire to Become AD</b>		
Yes	39.0%	61
No	61.0%	96

A Chi-Square analysis was then run against the following factors to determine if there were any variables that were significant in an SWA's desire, or lack thereof, to become an athletic director: age, children, household size, level of education completed, number of full years working in collegiate athletics, current income, number of professional/career development opportunities throughout administrative career, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities.

For the demographic section, the age range of 56-65 was found to be significant with the majority of women in this age range having no desire to become an athletic director (%=84,  $n = 21$ ). When looking at household size, when there was only one person living in the house (i.e. the SWA), there was a significant difference in career intentions with the majority of women having no desire to become an athletic director (%=73.7,  $n = 28$ ). Conversely, findings of this study showed that when there was 5 (five) or more people in the household, there was a significant difference in career intentions with the majority of women having a desire to become an athletic director (%=85.7,  $n = 6$ ). It is important to note that the sample size was the smallest for the sub-

category of “five or more people in the household” ( $n = 7$ ). The final significant difference in career intentions was found in those women who have been working full-time in collegiate athletics for 31 or more years, with the majority of these women having no desire to become an athletic director ( $\% = 88, n = 22$ ). A complete list of all demographic aspects mentioned is shown in Table 6.

**Table 6**

*Demographic Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director*

	<i>% Category Wants to Become an AD</i>	<i>N Wants to Become an AD</i>	<i>% Category Does Not Want to Become an AD</i>	<i>N Does Not Want to Become an AD</i>	<i>Adj. Residual</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Age</b>						0.018
26-35	52.4%	11	47.6%	10	1.3	
36-45	51.1%	24	48.9%	23	1.9	
46-55	37.9%	22	62.1%	36	0.3	
56-65*	16.0%	4	84.0%	21	2.6	
66 or older	0.0%	0	100.0%	3	1.4	
<b>Children</b>						0.684
Yes	40.8%	29	59.2%	42	0.4	
No	37.6%	32	62.4%	53	0.4	
<b>Household Size</b>						0.041
1 person*	26.3%	10	73.7%	28	2.0	
2 people	43.3%	26	56.7%	34	0.7	
3 people	33.3%	6	66.7%	12	0.6	
4 people	44.8%	13	55.2%	16	0.6	
5 or more people*	85.7%	6	14.3%	1	2.5	
<b>Education</b>						0.456
High school diploma/GED	33.3%	1	66.7%	2	0.2	
Associates Degree/Junior						
College	0.0%	0	0.0%	0		
Bachelor's Degree	31.6%	6	68.4%	13	0.7	
Master's Degree	37.9%	44	62.1%	72	0.5	
Doctoral Degree	55.6%	10	44.4%	8	1.5	

<b>Years working full-time in collegiate athletics</b>						0.023
0-10	47.6%	10	52.4%	11	0.9	
11-20	45.8%	27	54.2%	32	1.3	
21-30	41.2%	21	58.5%	30	0.4	
31 or more years*	12.0%	3	88.0%	22	3.0	
<b>Years worked in current position</b>						0.192
0-5	50.0%	33	50.0%	33	2.4	
6-10	31.6%	12	68.4%	26	1.1	
11-15	26.1%	6	73.9%	17	1.4	
16-20	33.3%	4	66.7%	8	0.4	
21 or more years	35.3%	6	64.7%	11	0.3	
<b>Salary</b>						0.949
\$40,000 - \$49,000	40.0%	2	60.0%	3	0.1	
\$50,000 - \$59,999	40.0%	4	60.0%	6	0.1	
\$60,000 - \$69,999	26.7%	4	73.3%	11	1.0	
\$70,000 - \$79,999	33.3%	7	66.7%	14	0.5	
\$80,000 - \$89,999	53.3%	8	46.7%	7	1.2	
\$90,000 - \$99,999	36.8%	7	63.2%	12	0.2	
\$100,000 - \$119,999	39.3%	11	60.7%	17	0.1	
\$120,000 - \$139,999	36.8%	7	63.2%	12	0.2	
\$140,000 or more	42.9%	9	57.1%	12	0.4	
<b>Attended professional development events in the past three years</b>						0.411
Yes	40.8%	53	59.2%	77	0.8	
No	32.0%	8	68.0%	17	0.8	
<b>Number of professional development events attended in the past year</b>						0.113
0-2	41.6%	37	58.4%	52	0.2	
3-5	39.4%	13	60.6%	20	0.2	
6+	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.3	

\*p<.05

For the level of mentoring experienced, no significant differences were found in any of the mentoring categories with a Senior Woman Administrator's desire to become an Athletic

Director. A chi-square analysis was run and the complete list of all mentoring categories can be seen below in Table 7, with the percentage and numbers of participants who indicated their level of mentoring experienced (1=N/A, No Positive Influence, 5=Tremendous Positive Influence) and their desire to become an athletic director. The table is organized by descending p-value.

**Table 7**

*Mentoring Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director*

	1 %	1 N	2 %	2 N	3 %	3 N	4 %	4 N	5 %	5 N	p
<b>Level of Mentoring Experienced</b>											
They have shared professional problems with a mentor											0.851
Yes AD	5.0%	3	5.0%	3	15.0%	9	35.0%	21	40.0%	24	
No AD	7.4%	7	7.4%	7	16.0%	15	27.7%	26	41.5%	39	
Mentor devoted special time and consideration to their career											0.719
Yes AD	8.3%	5	10.0%	6	26.7%	16	26.7%	16	28.3%	17	
No AD	8.5%	8	13.8%	13	25.5%	24	18.1%	17	34.0%	32	
Mentor helped them coordinate professional goals											0.628
Yes AD	10.0%	6	6.7%	4	20.0%	12	30.0%	18	33.3%	20	
No AD	9.6%	9	8.5%	8	28.7%	27	29.8%	28	23.4%	22	
They have											0.59

considered a mentor to be a friend												
Yes AD	5.1%	3	6.8%	4	15.3%	9	32.2%	19	40.7%	24		
No AD	4.3%	4	3.2%	3	12.8%	12	26.6%	25	53.2%	50		
They have exchanged confidences with a mentor												0.582
Yes AD	5.0%	3	8.3%	5	20.0%	12	30.0%	18	36.7%	22		
No AD	10.6%	10	7.4%	7	13.8%	13	25.5%	24	42.6%	40		
They have modeled behavior after a mentor												0.443
Yes AD	6.7%	4	5.0%	3	21.7%	13	35.0%	21	31.7%	19		
No AD	8.5%	8	8.5%	8	18.1%	17	23.4%	22	41.5%	39		
They have admired a mentor's ability to motivate others												0.422
Yes AD	5.0%	3	6.7%	4	10.0%	6	28.3%	17	50.0%	30		
No AD	6.4%	6	2.1%	2	17.0%	16	23.3%	21	52.1%	49		
Mentor took personal interest in their career												0.394
Yes AD	5.0%	3	1.7%	1	13.3%	8	38.3%	23	41.7%	25		
No AD	4.3%	4	4.3%	4	18.1%	17	24.5%	23	48.9%	46		
They have respected a mentor's ability to teach others												0.332
Yes AD	3.3%	2	5.0%	3	15.0%	9	26.7%	16	50.0%	30		
No AD	5.4%	5	1.1%	1	13.0%	12	18.5%	17	62.0%	57		

Lastly, for the level of current responsibilities, significant differences were found in the level of involvement in fundraising at the  $p < .01$  level. It is worth noting that the category “education on issues concerning women” was approaching significant ( $p = .046$ ), however the adjusted residual was 1.90 thereby not qualifying as significant. A chi-square analysis was run and the complete list of all mentoring categories can be seen below in Table 8, with the percentage and numbers of participants who indicated their level of mentoring experienced (1=N/A, No Involvement, 5=Tremendous Involvement) and their desire to become an athletic director. The table is organized by descending p-value.

**Table 8**

*Responsibility Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director*

	1 %	1 N	2 %	2 N	3 %	3 N	4 %	4 N	5 %	5 N	p
<b>Current Responsibilities</b>											
Accomplish goals within group structure											0.517
Yes AD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.3%	2	16.4%	10	80.3%	49	
No AD	1.1%	1	0.0%	0	4.2%	4	24.2%	23	70.5%	67	
Manage gender equity/Title IX issues											0.503
Yes AD	0.0%	0	3.3%	2	6.6%	4	18.0%	11	72.1%	44	
No AD	1.1%	1	2.1%	2	12.6%	12	23.2%	22	61.1%	58	
Advocate issues important to female student-											0.477



athletes, coaches, and/or staff												
Yes AD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.3%	2	24.6%	15	72.1%	44		
No AD	0.0%	0	1.0%	1	7.3%	7	29.2%	28	62.5%	60		
Education on issues concerning men												0.344
Yes AD	4.9%	3	4.9%	3	13.1%	8	47.5%	29	29.5%	18		
No AD	6.3%	6	8.3%	8	24.0%	23	35.4%	34	26.0%	25		
Involved in the EADA review												0.303
Yes AD	11.5%	7	3.3%	2	14.8%	9	29.5%	18	41.0%	25		
No AD	15.6%	15	11.5%	11	15.6%	15	20.8%	20	36.5%	35		
Serve as role model and/or resource for students, coaches, and/or adminis- trators												0.278
Yes AD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	14.8%	9	83.6%	51		
No AD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.2%	4	22.9%	22	72.9%	70		
Advise student- athletes in successfully balancing aca- demics and athletics												0.267
Yes AD	1.6%	1	14.8%	9	18.0%	11	29.5%	18	36.1%	22		
No AD	6.3%	6	8.3%	8	28.1%	27	25.0%	24	32.3%	31		
Involved in budget management												0.245
Yes AD	3.3%	2	3.3%	2	16.4%	10	27.9%	17	49.2%	30		
No AD	4.2%	4	13.5%	13	17.7%	17	27.1%	26	37.5%	36		

Involved in hiring of key department/institutional personnel											0.244
Yes AD	1.6%	1	0.0%	0	4.9%	3	23.0%	14	70.5%	43	
No AD	3.1%	3	4.2%	4	8.3%	8	29.2%	28	55.2%	53	
Advocate issues important to male student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff											0.241
Yes AD	0.0%	0	1.6%	1	1.6%	1	34.4%	21	62.3%	38	
No AD	2.1%	2	4.2%	4	8.3%	8	31.3%	30	54.2%	52	
Monitor the implementation of the gender equity plan											0.238
Yes AD	6.6%	4	1.6%	1	14.8%	9	19.7%	12	57.4%	35	
No AD	12.5%	12	7.3%	7	8.3%	8	21.9%	21	50.0%	48	
Involved on the Senior Management Team											0.112
Yes AD	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13.1%	8	86.9%	53	
No AD	0.0%	0	1.3%	2	4.2%	4	20.8%	20	72.9%	70	
Education on issues concerning women											0.046*
Yes AD	5.0%	3	1.7%	1	10.0%	6	38.3%	23	45.0%	27	
No AD	1.0%	1	8.3%	8	21.9%	21	27.1%	26	41.7%	40	
Adjusted Residual					1.9						
Involved in fundraising											.004**
Yes AD	6.6%	4	26.2%	16	32.8%	20	19.7%	12	14.8%	9	

No AD	26.0%	25	29.2%	28	31.3%	30	7.3%	7	6.3%	6
Adjusted Residual	3.1						2.3		1.8	

\*p<.05

\*\*p<.01

### SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director between Division I Competitive

#### Levels

The demographic factors found to be significant in an SWA's desire to become an athletic director were analyzed using a Chi-Square test against division I competitive levels to determine if there was any significant difference. A significant difference was found between FBS and FCS Senior Woman Administrator's and their desire to become an athletic director. There was a significant p value at the .05 level for number of years working full-time in collegiate athletics ( $p = .034$ ) and the adjusted residual was 2.5. A complete list of all aspects mentioned is shown in Table 9.

**Table 9**

*Significant Demographic Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by NCAA DI Competitive Level*

	% FBS	N FBS	Adj. Res.	% FCS	N FCS	Adj. Res.	% DI, non-FB	N DI, non-FB	Adj Res	p
<b>Age</b>										0.106
26-35	23.8%	5	1.6	61.9%	13	2.5	14.3%	3	1.0	
36-45	38.3%	18	0.2	31.9%	15	0.9	29.8%	14	1.3	
46-55	35.6%	21	0.8	37.3%	22	0	27.1%	16	0.9	
56-65	60.0%	15	2.3	28.0%	7	1.1	12.0%	3	1.5	
66 or older	66.7%	2	1.0	33.3%	1	0.1	0.0%	0	1.0	
<b>Household Size</b>										0.361
1 person	52.6%	20	2.0	26.3%	10	1.6	21.1%	8	0.4	
2 people	33.3%	20	1.2	41.7%	25	0.9	25.0%	15	0.3	
3 people	33.3%	6	0.5	33.3%	6	0.4	33.3%	6	1.0	
4 people	43.3%	13	0.5	36.7%	11	0.1	20.0%	6	0.5	
5 or more people	14.3%	1	1.4	71.4%	5	1.9	14.3%	1	0.6	

<b>Years working full-time in collegiate athletics</b>										
0-10	14.3%	3	2.5	61.9%	13	2.5	23.8%	5	0.0	0.034*
11-20	33.9%	20	1.1	40.7%	24	0.8	25.4%	15	0.4	
21-30	46.2%	24	1.2	28.8%	15	1.5	25.0%	13	0.3	
31 or more years	60.0%	15	2.3	24.0%	6	1.5	16.0%	4	1.0	
<b>Years worked in current position</b>										
0-5	33.3%	22	1.3	39.4%	26	0.5	27.3%	48.6%	18	0.9
6-10	36.8%	14	0.4	44.7%	17	1.1	18.4%	18.9%	7	0.9
11-15	45.8%	11	0.7	33.3%	8	0.4	20.8%	13.5%	5	0.3
16-20	50.0%	6	0.8	25.0%	3	0.9	25.0%	8.1%	3	0.1
21 or more years	52.9%	9	1.2	23.5%	4	1.2	23.5%	10.8%	4	0.0

\*p<.05

The responsibility factors found to be significant in an SWA's desire to become an athletic director (involvement in fundraising) was analyzed using a Chi-Square test against division I competitive levels to determine if there was any significant difference. No significant differences were found between FBS, FCS, and DI non-football Senior Woman Administrator's and their desire to become an athletic director. A complete list of all aspects is shown in Table 10.

**Table 10**

*Significant Responsibility Variables in SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by NCAA Division I Competitive Level*

	1 %	1 N	2 %	2 N	3 %	3 N	4 %	4 N	5 %	5 N	p
<b>Current Responsibilities</b>											
Involvement in fundraising											0.775
FBS	16.1%	10	27.4%	17	30.6%	19	17.7%	11	8.1%	5	
FCS	20.7%	12	29.3%	17	34.5%	20	5.2%	3	10.3%	6	
DI non-football	18.9%	7	27.0%	10	29.7%	11	13.5%	5	10.8%	4	

Finally, a chi-square analysis was run to simply see if there was any significant difference in NCAA Division I competitive level for those SWA's that do have a desire to become and Athletic Director and those that do not. No significant difference was found in desire to become an AD between the three competitive levels. A complete list of all aspects can be seen in Table 11.

**Table 11**

*SWA Career Intentions to Become an Athletic Director by DI Competitive Level*

	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>% DI,</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>FBS</i>	<i>FBS</i>	<i>FCS</i>	<i>FCS</i>	<i>non-</i>	<i>DI,</i>	
					<i>FB</i>	<i>non-</i>	
					<i>FB</i>	<i>FB</i>	
<b>Desire to become an AD</b>							0.621
Yes	34.4%	21	39.3%	24	26.2%	16	
No	42.1%	40	35.8%	34	22.1%	21	

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

#### Summary

The information from the results of the two one-way ANOVAs and the two Chi-Square's helped to explain what the current landscape of the Division I Senior Woman Administrator looks like in addition to their intentions of becoming an Athletic Director. The purpose of this study was to determine if there are significant differences between NCAA Division I competitive levels (FBS, FCS, and DI non-football) with regards to the SWA's level of administrative responsibility and program oversight, levels of mentoring experienced, and their long-term career intentions and aspirations.

#### Research Question I

*What does the landscape of the Division I Senior Woman Administrator look like with regards to demographic characteristics, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities?*

The intent of this question was to gain a better understanding of what the current NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator looks like. There was a relatively close number of respondents from each competitive level, with FBS making up 39.5% of respondents ( $n = 62$ ), FCS at 36.9% ( $n = 58$ ), and DI non-football rounding off at 23.6% ( $n = 37$ ). The study found that the majority of NCAA Division I SWA's are between the ages of 36-55 (69.5%,  $n = 109$ ), white/Caucasian (83.3%,  $n = 130$ ), and hold a master's degree (73.9%,  $n = 116$ ). Interestingly, there was a relatively even split between whether or not the participant had children, with 45.9%

of respondents having children ( $n = 72$ ) and 54.1% of respondents not having any children ( $n = 85$ ). Despite this information, the majority of respondents only have one or two people living in the household (64.3%,  $n = 99$ ), which indicates that some of the participants who have children no longer have them living in their household. Salary was another demographic item analyzed and found that the largest percentage of SWA's made \$100,000-\$119,000 ( $\% = 18.2$ ,  $n = 28$ ). The majority of SWA's have worked full time in collegiate athletics between 11-30 years ( $\% = 69.4$ ,  $n = 109$ ) with 42% of the respondents having worked in their current position between 0-5 years ( $n = 66$ ). Finally, attendance at professional development events was explored and 84.0% of the participants ( $n = 131$ ) indicated that they do attend professional development events, with 71.8% of respondents ( $n = 89$ ) having attended 0-2 events within the past year.

Beyond demographic characteristics, this study looked at the level of mentoring the current NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator has experienced in her career. 44.9% of respondents ( $n = 71$ ) indicated that they had between 3-5 mentors throughout their career. When analyzing the level of mentoring experienced, participants were given a list of nine areas in which a mentor/mentee relationship might encompass. For each of the nine areas, participants were asked how much positive influence, if any, they felt those areas had on their career using a five-point Likert scale (1=N/A., no positive influence; 5=Tremendous Positive Influence). Participants indicated that they felt the most positive influence in their careers with regards to the following areas: respecting a mentor's ability to teach others ( $M = 4.250$ ,  $SD = 1.081$ ), a mentor taking a personal interest in their career ( $M = 4.170$ ,  $SD = 1.034$ ), and admiring a mentor's ability to motivate others ( $M = 4.120$ ,  $SD = 1.151$ ). It is interesting to note that even the lowest scored category (having a mentor devote special time and consideration to their career) still received a mean of 3.560 with a standard deviation of 1.278. This is important to analyze

because research has shown that mentoring relationships include benefits such as encouragement and support, advice, guidance and direction, and constructive criticism (Young, 1990) in addition to finding that mentored individuals reach higher positions in their organizations and feel more satisfied with their work (Weaver and Chelladurai, 2002). It is promising to see that the majority of participants had at least one mentor ( $\% = 96.2, n = 152$ ), because only a small percentage of SWAs felt that they participated in a mentoring relationship in 2012 (Tiell et al.). In recent years, national organizations, such as NACWAA, have started formal mentoring programs and the concept of mentoring has gained attention throughout the landscape of intercollegiate athletics. These results indicate that mentoring initiatives such as these are having a positive effect among Senior Woman Administrators at the Division I level.

Lastly, this study also looked at the current responsibilities of the NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrator. Participants were asked if they had program or sport oversight and the overwhelming majority ( $\% = 95, n = 153$ ) said they have program oversight. The participants were then given a list of fourteen areas of responsibility found to be common among those with the title of Senior Woman Administrator (Tiell, 2004), and were asked to identify their level of involvement in each area using a five-point Likert scale (1=N/A, no involvement; 5=Tremendous Involvement). Of each of the areas given, participants felt the most involved in the following three categories: involvement on the senior management team ( $M = 4.75, SD = 0.55$ ), serving as a role model and/or resource for students, coaches, and/or administrators ( $M = 4.74, SD = 0.51$ ), and accomplishing goals within the group structure ( $M = 4.70, SD = 0.60$ ). Participants of this study felt the least involved in fundraising ( $M = 2.66, SD = 1.19$ ). This is important to note because research has found that fundraising and budgeting experience is critical for advancement to senior level positions within an athletic department (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield &



Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Quarterman et al., 2006). This finding is not unusual, however. In 2012, Tiell et al. found that fundraising and budget management were “the least reported roles for SWAs across [all] divisions” (p. 263), which is a similar finding to the current study. This indicates that in the past three years, little change has occurred in providing Senior Woman Administrators opportunities to gain fundraising experience. The survey then allowed for participants to fill in any additional time-consuming roles that they have which were not included in those already listed. 26.0% of respondents ( $n = 31$ ) noted that they serve on committees, 19.3% of respondents ( $n = 23$ ) indicated that they have key roles in the internal operations of their organization, and 17.6% of participants ( $n = 21$ ) said that they act as the University and/or Community Liaison.

## **Research Question 2**

*Do demographic characteristics, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities differ based on NCAA Division I competitive level?*

For each of the demographic items analyzed (education completed, years working full-time in collegiate athletics, salary, and number of professional development events attended), salary was the only factor that had a significant difference between the three Division I competitive levels. The mean difference in salary between FBS and FCS was the largest, equaling 2.895 with a p-value  $<.001$ . The mean difference in salary between FBS and DI non-football was also significant, equaling 2.296 with a p-value  $<.001$ . This factor might be slightly deceiving, however, because there were a lot of subcategories for “salary”. There might have been too many to properly analyze. Nonetheless, it is important to note the significance found.

With regards to mentoring, there was a significant difference found between the number of mentors SWA’s had in the Football Bowl Subdivision ( $M = 2.920$ ) and the Division I non-

football subdivision ( $M = 2.540$ ). Significant at the  $p < .05$  level, the mean difference between the two was 0.379. This is interesting to note that Senior Woman Administrators at the FBS level had more mentors than those at the DI non-football level. Further research would be needed to deduct the reason for this; however, it might be possible that mentoring programs are more advanced at the FBS level. Despite the significant difference in the number of mentors between each level, when looking at the Mentoring Functions Questionnaire used for the level of mentoring experienced, no significant difference was found. This is interesting to note that although DI non-football SWA's might have had significantly fewer mentors, those women still found similar benefits and outcomes of the mentoring relationships in which they were engaged.

Finally, when looking at the level of current responsibilities, a significant difference was found among the FBS and DI non-football levels for the following categories: advocating issues important to female student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff (mean difference = 0.337,  $p = 0.029$ ) and advocating issues important to male student-athletes, coaches, and/or staff (mean difference = 0.424,  $p = 0.037$ ). In both of these two factors, the Football Bowl Subdivision SWA's felt more involved than those at the DI non-football level.

### **Research Question 3**

*Do the following variables significantly explain an SWA's career intention of becoming an Athletic Director: age, children, household size, level of education completed, number of full years working in collegiate athletics, current income, number of professional/career development opportunities attended, level of mentoring experienced, and level of current responsibilities.*

Participants of this study were asked whether or not they had a desire to become an athletic director. The majority of participants indicated that they have no desire to pursue a career

as an Athletic Director ( $\% = 61.0, n = 96$ ), while a substantial minority indicated that they did have a desire to become an AD ( $\% = 39.0, n = 61$ ). A chi-square analysis was then run against the following demographic variables: age, children, household size, level of education completed, number of full years working in collegiate athletics, current income, and number of professional/career development opportunities throughout administrative career, in addition to the level of mentoring experienced and the level of current responsibilities to determine if there were any factors that were significant in an SWA's desire, or lack thereof, to become an athletic director.

For the demographics section, the categories found to be significant included the 56-65 age range in which a significant number of women in this age group indicated that they did not have a desire to become an athletic director ( $\% = 84.0, n = 21$ ). This finding is not extremely surprising, because this age group is likely nearing retirement and would presumably have fewer career advancing intentions.

Another demographic category found to be significant was household numbers, indicating that households with only one person significantly indicating that they have no desire to become an athletic director ( $\% = 73.7, n = 28$ ) whereas households with five or more people significantly indicated that they did have a desire to become an athletic director ( $\% = 85.7, n = 6$ ). One question to consider with regards to this finding might be the influence of already having had children versus planning on having children in one's thought processes with whether or not they want to become an athletic director. This being said, however, the category of whether or not an SWA had children was not found to be statistically significant among those with and without desire to pursue a career as an Athletic Director. Lastly, it is important to note that while the demographic factor of a household size of five or more people was statistically significant,

there was a small number of participants who fit in this specific category which could affect significance ( $n = 7$ ).

The final demographic category found to be statistically significant was participants who had been working full-time in collegiate athletics for 31 or more years, wherein 88% of participants indicated having no desire to become an athletic director ( $n = 22$ ). This finding is not extremely surprising for the same reasons as the age category. Presumably, women who have been working full-time in collegiate athletics for over 31 years would be approaching retirement age and not likely looking to pursue advancements in their careers.

Next, the categories for level of mentoring experienced were run against one's desire (or lack thereof) to become an Athletic Director using a chi-square analysis. No significant differences were found in any of the mentoring categories and a participant's response as to whether or not she had a desire to become an Athletic Director. This finding indicates that the degree to which one is mentored does not have a direct effect with one's desire to become an athletic director.

Finally, the categories for level of current responsibilities were run against one's desire to become an Athletic Director using a chi-square analysis. The category for involvement in education on issues concerning women had a significant p-value ( $p = .046$ ), however the adjusted residual was 1.9, just slightly shy of significance but important to note. The category of involvement in fundraising was significant at the  $p < .01$  level in an SWA's desire to pursue an Athletic Director position ( $p = .004$ ). For this category, participants with no interest in pursuing a career as an Athletic Director were significant if they indicated they had no fundraising experience (adjusted residual = 3.1). Also, participants who do have a desire to become an athletic director were significant if they experienced large involvement in fundraising (adjusted

residual = 2.3). It is also important to note that those participants who have a desire to become an athletic director and experienced tremendous involvement in fundraising was approaching significance, but just slightly shy (adjusted residual = 1.8). This finding supports the research that fundraising experience is critical to one's advancement to the highest levels of the athletic department (Grappendorf et al., 2008; Hatfield & Hatfield, 2009; Hoffman, 2010; Quarterman et al., 2006).

#### **Research Question 4**

*If there are variables that significantly explain variance in career intentions of becoming an Athletic Director, are these variables significantly different based on affiliation with a specific Division I competitive level?*

Of the demographic categories found to be significant in an SWA's desire to pursue a career as an athletic director, only years working full-time in collegiate athletics was found to be statistically different when looking at NCAA Division I competitive level ( $p = .034$ ). For this category, there were significantly more participants who have worked full-time in intercollegiate athletics between 0-10 years at the FCS level than at the FBS level (adjusted residual = 2.5) with a difference in desire to become an athletic director.

The responsibility factor found to be significant in an SWA's desire to become an athletic director (involvement in fundraising) was analyzed using a chi-square test against Division I competitive levels and no significant difference was found.

Finally, a chi-square analysis was run to simply see if there was a difference in NCAA Division I competitive level in those Senior Woman Administrators with and without a desire to become an Athletic Director. No significant difference was found.

#### **Future Research**

The topic of the Senior Woman Administrator continues to allow for future research studies to be conducted to fully understand the role as it is currently being applied and to determine how it should be addressed moving forward. One area this study could be expanded would be to extend the analysis to NCAA Division II and Division III Senior Woman Administrators. This analysis would be helpful in gaining a better understanding of the overall landscape of the NCAA Senior Woman Administrator and could pose interesting results in a Division-wide comparison.

This study could also be expanded to ask more self-perception questions to see if current Senior Woman Administrator's feel that their role as SWA is valuable, if they feel they are gaining the experiences and opportunities desired for their career plans, and if they feel the role is serving the beneficial purpose towards the advancement of women as it was originally intended. This could provide interesting qualitative data to truly hear from the current population that serves in that role.

Another potential future study could ask current Senior Woman Administrator's about changes they would like to see in the role and how the NCAA, the conference, and their individual institutions administer the title. It would be interesting to see the qualitative analysis done on this study and to see recommendations given from current Senior Woman Administrators. This could be extremely valuable in continuing to analyze the role and it's level of effectiveness.

## Appendix A

### Thesis Survey

#### Introduction

For purposes of anonymity, please refrain from indicating your name or the name of your institution. Please be assured your individual results and the comments therein will remain confidential.

#### Senior Woman Administrator Job Functions

This section focuses on job functions intercollegiate senior woman administrators may perform and asks your specific level of current involvement.

1. For each statement, identify your level of involvement by using the following scale:  
1 – N/A, No involvement/Did Not Experience; 2 – Small involvement; 3 – Moderate involvement; 4 – Large involvement; 5 – Tremendous involvement

1. I am involved on the Senior Management Team.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I work within the group structure to accomplish goals.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I strategize ways to manage gender equity and Title IX issues.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I advocate issues important to female student-athletes, coaches and/or staff.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I advocate issues important to male student-athletes, coaches and/or staff.	1	2	3	4	5

6. I educate individuals on issues concerning women.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I educate individuals on issues concerning men.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I serve as a role model and/or resource for students, coaches, administrators and others.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I advise student-athletes in successfully balancing academics and athletics.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am involved in the review the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I monitor the implementation of the gender equity plan.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am involved in budget management.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I am involved in Fund-Raising.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I am involved in the recruitment and hiring of key department and/or institutional personnel.	1	2	3	4	5

2. Do you have sports and/or programs oversight? Yes No

2 a. (if yes) What programs (check all that apply)?

Baseball

Academic Support

Men's Basketball

Athletic Communications

Women's Basketball

Business Operations

Men's Cross Country

Compliance

Women's Cross Country

Computer Services

Men's Fencing

Equipment

Women's Fencing

Facilities



Field Hockey	Human Resources
Football	Marketing & Promotions
Men's Golf	New Media
Women's Golf	Event Management/Operations
Gymnastics	Sports Medicine
Men's Lacrosse	Strength & Conditioning
Women's Lacrosse	Student-Athlete Development
Rowing	Ticket Office
Men's Soccer	Other (please specify)
Women's Soccer	
Softball	
Men's Swimming and Diving	
Women's Swimming and Diving	
Men's Tennis	
Women's Tennis	
Men's Track and Field	
Women's Track and Field	
Volleyball	
Wrestling	

3. Do you have other key and/or time-consuming responsibilities relative to your title as Senior Woman Administrator?

Yes No

3.a. If yes, please explain

**The next section focuses on mentoring. Mentoring is defined “as a process in which a more experienced person serves as a role model, provides guidance and support to a developing novice, and sponsors that novice in his/her career progress”.**

1. How many mentors have you had throughout your career?

- i. 0
- ii. 1-2
- iii. 3-5
- iv. 6+

2. Please think of the people you consider to be your most influential mentors (no more than three) and list their gender and their employment title at the time of their mentorship

2. a. How were these mentorships formed? (check all that apply)

Worked with the mentor

Met the mentor at a conference or other professional development setting

Introduced to the mentor from a mutual connection

They became a mentor through a structured mentoring program

Other, please specify

3. How much positive influence, if any, do you feel the following experiences have had on your career?

1 – N/A Did Not Experiences, No positive influence; 2 – Small positive influence; 3 – Moderate positive influence; 4 – Large positive influence; 5 – Tremendous positive influence

1. A mentor has taken a personal interest in my career	1	2	3	4	5
2. A mentor has helped me coordinate professional goals	1	2	3	4	5
3. A mentor has devoted special time and consideration to my career	1	2	3	4	5
4. I have shared professional problems with a mentor	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have exchanged confidences with a mentor	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have considered a mentor to be a friend	1	2	3	4	5
7. I try to model my behavior after a mentor	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have admired a mentor's ability to motivate others	1	2	3	4	5
9. I have respected a mentor's ability to teach others	1	2	3	4	5

**The next section relates to career intentions.**

1. Do you have desire to become an athletic director? Yes No

1 a. (if yes) How many years have you had the desire to become an athletic director?

1 b. (if no) Have you ever had any desire to become an athletic director? Yes No

1. b. a. (if yes) For how many years did you have a desire to become an athletic director?

1. b. b. (if yes) How old were you when you stopped having the desire to become an athletic director?

1. b. c. (if yes) Why did you lose your desire to become an athletic director?

2. How likely is it that you will apply for an athletic director position at the intercollegiate level during your career?

1 - Not at all likely; 2 - Only a little likely; 3 – Somewhat likely; 4 – Very Likely; 5 – Almost Certain

2. a. Please explain this likelihood.

**The final section asks questions that will allow the researcher to better understand the demographics of the participants in this study:**

1. What athletics group is your institution/conference a member of (please select one)?
  - a. Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)
  - b. Football Championship Subdivision (FCS)
  - c. DI non-football
  - d. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your age?
3. Which of the following describe you? Check all that apply.
  - a. White/Caucasian
  - b. Black/African American
  - c. Hispanic/Latino
  - d. Asian/Pacific Islander
  - e. Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you have children (biological, step, or adopted)? Yes No
  - 3.a (if yes) Please list the ages of all your children
  3. b. (if yes) How many of these children are financially dependent on you?
4. Is there anyone else (excluding children) who is financially dependent on you?
  4. a. (if yes) How many people?
  4. b. (if yes) What are their relations to you?
5. Do you have a spouse or significant other/partner that resides with you? Yes No

- a. (if yes) Is your spouse or significant other employed outside the home? Yes No
  - b. (if yes) Approximately how many hours per week does your spouse/significant other work outside of the home? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
- a. Of these people, how many are financially dependent on you? \_\_\_\_\_
7. What is the highest level of education you have completed (please select one)?
- a. High school diploma/GED
  - b. Associates Degree/Junior College
  - c. Bachelor's Degree
  - d. Master's Degree
  - e. Doctoral Degree
    - i. What degree(s) do you have?
      - 1. Ph.D
      - 2. D.Ed.
      - 3. J.D.
      - 4. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is the total Number of years you have worked Full Time? Please round to nearest full year. If none, enter zero.
9. What is the total number of years you have worked in Collegiate Athletics? Please round to nearest full year.
10. What is the total number of years you have worked in your current position? Please round to nearest full year.
11. In which unit(s) is your employment title (please select all that apply)?

- a. Administration
- b. Academic Support
- c. Athletic Communications
- d. Business Office
- e. Compliance
- f. Computer/IT Services
- g. Equipment
- h. Facilities
- i. Human Resources
- j. Marketing & Promotions
- k. New Media
- l. Operations/Event Management
- m. Sports Medicine
- n. Strength & Conditioning
- o. Student-Athlete Development
- p. Ticket Office
- q. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

12. What is your total annual salary from your current position?

- a. Less than \$40,000
- b. \$40,000 - \$49,999
- c. \$50,000 - \$59,999
- d. \$60,000 - \$69,999
- e. \$70,000 - \$79,999

- f. \$80,000 - \$89,999
- g. \$90,000 – \$99,999
- h. \$100,000 - \$119,999
- i. \$120,000 - \$139,999
- j. \$140,000 or more

13. In the past **three** years, have you attended any professional development events Yes No

a. (if yes) What types of professional development events have you attended in the past **three** years? (check all that apply)

i. National conferences

1. What organization(s) sponsored the national conference(s) you attended?

- a. NCAA
- b. NACDA
- c. NACWAA
- d. NACMA
- e. NAADD
- f. CoSIDA
- g. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Regional conferences

1. What organization(s) sponsored the regional conference(s) you attended?

- a. NCAA
- b. NACDA

- c. NACWAA
- d. NACMA
- e. NAADD
- f. CoSIDA
- g. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Seminars

iv. Academic classes

v. Clinics

vi. Other (write in)

vii. I have not attended any professional development events in the past three years.

b. How many professional development events (above) have you attended in the past year? \_\_\_\_\_

14. What, if any, professional organizations do you currently belong to?

- a. NACDA
- b. NACWAA
- c. NACMA
- d. NAADD
- e. CoSIDA
- f. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
- g. I do not belong to any professional organizations

15. Do you currently serve on any NCAA committee? Yes No



## **Closing Thoughts**

If you have any additional thoughts regarding the role of an SWA, please record them below.

When you are finished, click the >> button to submit your survey.

## **Appendix B**

### Thesis Invitation Email

Hello,

My name is Jessica Rippey and I am a Sport Administration graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I am currently working on my master's thesis project and am attempting to gain a better understanding of the self-efficacy and career intentions of NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators.

I realize that this is a busy time of year, but if you could spare 7-10 (seven-ten) minutes of your time to complete this online questionnaire about your experience in intercollegiate athletics and your role as the senior woman administrator at the Division I level it would be greatly appreciated. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential at all times. Should this study be published or presented only aggregate data will be reported.

**Please click here to access the**

**survey:** [https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_6XSGaLn8tNafLGI](https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6XSGaLn8tNafLGI)

By clicking the survey link you are consenting to take part in the research study. You may skip any question, or part of any question, that you do not wish to answer, for any reason. If you have any questions or concerns during the study, please feel free to contact me at any time by phone (828-551-4341) or email ([jrippy@unc.edu](mailto:jrippy@unc.edu)). Furthermore, you may also contact my advisor,

Barbara Osborne ([sportlaw@unc.edu](mailto:sportlaw@unc.edu)) or the UNC Institutional Review Board (IRB) (919-966-3113 or [irb\\_questions@unc.edu](mailto:irb_questions@unc.edu)) if you have questions or concerns about your rights as research subjects.

In order to make this worth your time, I will be happy to provide you with a summary of my results at the conclusion of the research, however, to protect your confidentiality and anonymity, you will not be able to request this while completing the online survey. If you would like a copy of the results, please email me at [jrippy@unc.edu](mailto:jrippy@unc.edu).

Best of luck with the 2015 spring semester and all of your professional endeavors! Thank you so much for your time and assistance.

**Please click here to access the**

**survey:** [https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\\_6XSGaLn8tNafLGI](https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6XSGaLn8tNafLGI)

Sincerely,

**Jessica Rippey**

UNC Athletics Event Management Graduate Assistant

MA, Sport Administration Candidate 2015

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

[jrippy@live.unc.edu](mailto:jrippy@live.unc.edu)

(c) 828-551-4341

## REFERENCES

- 20 U.S.C. § 1681. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic.
- Acosta, V. R., & Carpenter, L. J. (2014). Women in Intercollegiate Sport. A Longitudinal, National Study, Thirty Seven Year Update. 1977-2014. Unpublished manuscript. Retrieved from www.acostacarpenter.ORG
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84 (2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bendick, M., Jr., Egan, M.L., & Lofhjelm, S.M. (2001). Workforce diversity training: From anti-discrimination compliance to organizational development. *Human Resource Planning*, 24(2), 10-25.
- Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2013). The impact of Title IX on career opportunities in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal Of Intercollegiate Sport*, 6(2), 213-230.
- Brief, A.P., & Barsky, A. (2000). Establishing a climate for diversity: The inhibition of prejudiced reactions in the workplace. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 19, 91-12
- Cunningham, G. (2008). Commitment to diversity and its influence on athletic department outcomes. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports*, 1, 176-201.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2012). Diversity Training in Intercollegiate Athletics. *Journal Of Sport Management*, 26(5), 391-403.
- Cunningham, G., Doherty, A. J., & Gregg, M. J. (2007). Using social cognitive theory to understand head coaching intentions among assistant coaches of women's teams. *Sex Roles*, 56, 365-372.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2002). The differential effects of human capital for male and female Division I basketball coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73, 489-495.
- Cunningham, G., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F. B. (2003). Coaching Self-efficacy, Desire to Become a Head Coach, and Occupational Turnover Intent: Gender Differences Between NCAA Assistant Coaches of Women's Teams. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 34, 125-137.
- Eagly, A. H. (2007). Female leadership advantage and disadvantage: Resolving the

- contradictions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 1-12.
- Everhart, C. B., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender Differences in Preferences for Coaching as an Occupation: The Role of Self-Efficacy, Valence, and Perceived Barriers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69 (2), 188-200.
- Fagenson, E. (1992). Mentoring – Who needs it? A comparison of proteges' and nonproteges' needs for power, achievement, affiliation, and autonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48-60.
- Falla, J. (1981). *NCAA, the voice of college sports: A diamond anniversary history, 1906-1981* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Mission, KS: NCAA.
- Fern Kellmeyer, et al. v. National Education Association, et al.*, U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida, no. 73, 21 Civ NCR, January 17, 1973.
- Fink, J. S. (2008). Gender and sex diversity in sport organizations. *Sex Roles*, 58, 146-147
- Finkel, M.J., Storaasli, R.D., Bandele, A., & Schaefer, V. (2003). Diversity training in graduate school: An exploratory evaluation of the Safe Zone project. *Professional Psychology, Research and Practice*, 34, 555-561.
- Grappendorf, H., Pent, A., Burton, L., & Henderson, A. (2008). Gender role stereotyping: A qualitative analysis of senior woman administrators' perceptions regarding financial decision making. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 1, 26-45.
- Hatfield, L. C., & Hatfield, L. M. (2009). The perceived role of Senior Women Administrators in NCAA division I institutions. *The Sport Journal*, 12(4).
- Hill, M.E., & Augoustinos, M. (2001). Stereotype change and prejudice reduction: Short- and long-term evaluation of a cross-cultural awareness programme. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 11, 243-262.
- Hoffman, J. (2010). The Dilemma of the Senior Woman Administrator Role in Intercollegiate Athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 53-75.
- Hult, J.S. (1989). Women's struggle for governance in U.S. amateur athletics. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 24, 249-261.
- Kampoff, C., & Gill, D. (2008). Collegiate Athletes' Perceptions of the Coaching Profession. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(1), 55-72.
- Kulik, C.T., & Roberson, L. (2008). Common goals and golden opportunities: Evaluations of diversity education in academic and organizational settings. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7, 309-331.

- Lamar, L. M. (1994). To be an equitist or not: A view of Title IX. *The Sports Lawyers Journal*, 1(1), 237-278.
- Lopiano, D. A. (2014). It's Time for the NCAA and Other Educational Sport Governance Organizations to Get Serious about Gender Equity. *JOPERD: The Journal Of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 85(2), 6-7.
- Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. D. (1995). Women and the NCAA: Not Separate-Not Equal. *Journal Of Sport Management*, 9(3), 244-248.
- Minor, R. (2001). *Scared straight: Why it's so hard to accept gay people and why it's so hard to be human*. Lithia Springs, Georgia: New Leaf Distributing Co Inc.
- NCAA (2012). Senior Woman Administrator: Understanding the designation and her role on your senior management team. [Brochure]. Retrieved from [http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/SWA\\_Brochure\\_11\\_2011\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/SWA_Brochure_11_2011_FINAL.pdf)
- NCAA (2014). *Senior Woman Administrator*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/inclusion/senior-woman-administrator>
- NCAA Division I Manual (2014).
- Pedersen, P. M., & Whisenant, W. A. (2005). Successful when given the opportunity: Investigating gender representation and success rates of interscholastic athletic directors. *Physical Educator*, 62(4), 178-186.
- Pellegrini, E.K., & Scandura, T.A. (2005) Construct Equivalence across groups: An unexplored issue in mentoring research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 65(2), 323-335.
- Quarterman, J., Dupreé, A. D., & Willis, K. (2006). Challenges Confronting Female Intercollegiate Athletic Directors of NCAA Member Institutions by Division. *College Student Journal*, 40(3), 528-545.
- Sagas, M., Cunningham, G. B., & Ashley, F. B. (2000). Examining the women's coaching deficit through the perspective of assistant coaches. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 267-282.
- Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 169-174.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A Global Look at Psychological Barriers to Women's Progress in Management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675-688
- Schneider, R. C., Stier Jr., W. F., Henry, T. J., & Wilding, G. E. (2010). Senior Women Administrators' Perceptions of Factors Leading to Discrimination of Women in

- Intercollegiate Athletic Departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 16-34.
- Shaw, S. & Frisby, W. (2006). Can gender equity be more equitable? Promoting an alternative frame for sport management research, education, and practice. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 347-375.
- Sibson, R. (2010). "I was banging my head against a brick wall": Exclusionary power and the gendering of sport organizations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24, 379-399.
- Smith, R. (2011). Title IX and governmental reform in women's athletics. In *Pay for play a history of big-time college athletic reform* (pp. 141-150). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Tiell, B. (2004). Career paths, roles, and tasks of Senior Woman Administrators in intercollegiate athletics. *Doctoral Dissertation*, United States Sports Academy, Daphne, AL.
- Tiell, B. S., Dixon, M. A., & Lin, Y. (2012). Roles and tasks of the senior woman administrator in role congruity theory perspective: A longitudinal progress report. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 5, 247-268.
- Uhlir, G. (1987). Athletics and the university: The post-woman's era. *Academe*, 73(4), 25-29.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, 51, 24-38.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Mentoring in Intercollegiate Athletic Administration. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 96-116.
- Wentling, R.M., & Palma-Rivas, N. (1999). Components of effective diversity training programmes. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 3, 215-226
- Whisenant, W. A., Pedersen, P. M., & Obenour, W. L. (2002). Success and gender: Determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 47 (9/10), 485-491.
- Wright, C., Eagleman, A. N., & Pedersen, P. M. (2011). Examining Leadership in Intercollegiate Athletics: A Content Analysis of NCAA Division I Athletic Directors. *Choregia*, 7(2), 35-52.
- Wu, Y. (1999). Early NCAA attempts at the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics, 1968-1973. *Journal of Sport History*, 26(3), 585-601.
- Wushanley, Y. (2004). *Playing nice and losing: The struggle for control of women's intercollegiate athletics 1960-2000*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Yiamouyiannis, A. & Osborne, B. (2012). Addressing gender inequities in collegiate sport: Examining female leadership representation within NCAA sport governance. *SAGE Open*, 1-13.

Young, D. (1990). Mentoring and Networking: Perceptions by Athletic Administrators. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 71-79.