

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

2010

Women's Perception of the Role and Influence of Mentoring on Decisions to Pursue Doctoral Degrees in Sport Management

Melissa A. Noland



THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

WOMEN'S PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF MENTORING ON
DECISIONS TO PURSUE DOCTORAL DEGREES IN SPORT MANAGEMENT

By

MELISSA A. NOLAND

A Dissertation submitted to the
Department of Sport and Recreation Management
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Summer Semester, 2010

The members of the committee approve the dissertation of Melissa A. Noland defended on April 9, 2010.

Michael Mondello
Committee Chair

Susan Losh
University Representative

Andy Rudd
Committee Member

Robert Schwartz
Committee Member

Approved:

Jeffery James, Chairperson, Department of Sport and Recreation Management

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

God Almighty has brought me;
The love of family has supported me;
The joy of friendship has uplifted me;
And with the guidance given by the Holy Spirit,
I have arrived!

First and foremost, I must acknowledge God, for without Him none of this would have been possible, but with Him ALL things are possible. I would like to thank my parents, Ms. Cheryl Terrell and Mr. Leroy Noland, for without them, there is no ME. Thanks to my stepfather, Mr. Roger White who has always loved me like I was his own. To my mentor and friend, Dr. Joseph P. Ramsey-WE did it! I am eternally grateful to you for never giving up on me, even though we know I can be stubborn at times. If it were not for you, I never would have pursued my PhD at all. Who would have thought that the little tomboy from Soul City Projects...?! To the love of my life, my fiancé, Dr. Albert Chester II, I want you to know that without you, I never would have been able to finish. When I felt like quitting, watching you persevere through the pharmacy program and overcome so many obstacles was immense motivation.

I would also like to thank my committee members, my chairperson, Dr. Michael Mondello, Dr. Susan Losh, Dr. Andy Rudd, and Dr. Robert Schwartz. I know I wasn't the easiest to work with (but I pray I wasn't the most difficult either!), but with your PATIENCE and guidance, we finally got it done. I would also like to thank my former professors Dr. E. Newton Jackson, who brought me into the program at FSU, Dr. Jerome Quarterman, and Dr. Aubrey Kent.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge and thank family and friends that have supported and uplifted me throughout this amazing journey called life: Dr. Joanne Terrell, Dr. Michael Henry, Mr. & Mrs. Albert Chester, Mr. & Mrs. Vincent Taylor, Mrs. Nicole Brown, Ms. Angela Thomas, Mrs. Marcina Williams, and the entire Noland Family!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	Introduction.....	1
	Statement of the Problem.....	6
	Purpose of the Study	10
	Research Design.....	16
	Research Questions	17
	Significance and Implications.....	18
	Assumptions.....	21
	Limitations	21
	Delimitations.....	21
	Definitions of Terms	21
II.	Review of Literature.....	23
	The Role of Mentoring.....	23
	Mentoring in Youth.....	25
	Mentoring within Organizations	30
	Mentoring within Higher Education	37
	Mentoring in Physical Education Pedagogy	43
	Mentoring in Sport Management.....	50
	Chapter Summary	51

III.	Methodology	53
	Research Questions	53
	Qualitative Research	53
	Phenomenology.....	55
	Interview Protocol.....	59
	Data Collection	60
	Chapter Summary	61
IV.	Data Analysis.....	62
	Trustworthiness.....	62
	Role of the Researcher	63
	Participants.....	64
	Findings.....	76
	Major Themes	77
	Research Question 1	85
	Research Question 2	87
	Research Question 3	91
	Research Question 4	93
	Research Question 5	95
	Summary	97
V.	Implications.....	101
	Recommendations.....	103
	Concluding Remarks.....	104

APPENDICES	107
A: Interview Consent Form	107
B: Demographic Questionnaire.....	110
C: Coding Sheet Sample	112
D: Microsoft® OneNote PDF	132
E: Theme/Category Sample	134
References.....	146
Biographical Sketch.....	175

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to ascertain what role, if any, mentoring played in female sport management faculty's decision to pursue doctoral degrees and to investigate and identify factors related to successful transition through the doctoral program. A qualitative, descriptive-interpretive approach utilizing a cross case analysis of current female faculty in sport management was utilized in order to discover participants' subjective views regarding a specific experience or experiences in an effort to provide unique, relevant data (Anda, 2002). This methodology allowed for a greater understanding of the participants and their experiences, and permitted respondents to examine these factors from their own perspectives. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with eight participants dichotomized by race-four White and four Black Assistant Professors teaching in undergraduate and graduate programs at various types of Carnegie classified institutions.

Seven major themes and six major personality traits and characteristics developed from verbatim transcriptions of the interviews. The seven themes included athletic involvement, career in athletics, career aspirations, pedagogy decision, influence of mentor, mentor roles, and context of mentoring. The six personality traits/characteristics related to success were athletic involvement, career in athletics, parental support, single with no dependents, competitive/confident, and vigilance/determination.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

White males are going to be the most important factor in helping us change the system. This is because white males own the most important component to success-access. Mentoring and networking are invaluable tools to gaining access.

Charlotte Westerhaus, 2007

Historically, sport has always been associated with males and masculinity (Kane, 1989). As most sport scholars know, the world of sport is and has always been perceived as a ‘man thing’. Since the inception of the first recorded sporting event, males, more specifically White males, have been the participants, officials, and spectators (Guttman, 1978). Part of sport’s financial growth can be tied to its increased popularity among the public. Receipts from spectator sport events in the United States for 2002 were over \$1.5 billion dollars (Soonhwan & Chun, 2002). Sport is a multi-billion dollar industry and has become a dominant and defining force in the lives of millions of people globally (Kurtzman, 2005). Due to its tremendous growth, the sport industry has become an increasingly attractive field as a place of employment rendering it extremely competitive. With this immense thrust in the sport industry, a growing need for individuals in the creation and dissemination of knowledge and problem solving within the broadly defined sport industry has also emerged. This is where the sport management pedagogy dynamic comes into play. Sport management pedagogy is for those individuals that are acquiring their doctoral degrees in order to teach in colleges and universities, carry out research, and consult with numerous types of sport entities (Sport Management Education Online Journal, 2008).

The fact that contemporary societies value the pedagogical enterprise in sport and physical activity (as evidenced by the predominance of undergraduate and graduate sport management programs that have surfaced in numerous colleges and universities in North America) reveals that the educational enterprises of sport are socially significant sites (Schempp, 2005). As Ziegler (2007) conjectured “sport has become recognized

unquestionably as one of humankind's fundamental social institutions" (p.297). While evidence points to sport being a socially significant site in relation to racial and gender inclusion issues, research in the area has proven otherwise. According to Moore, Parkhouse, and Konrad (2001), in the sport industry, male-dominated leadership within the sport industry has created a gender-segmented work structure that places the majority of female employees in low paying jobs with minimum advancement potential.

While the male-dominated phenomenon has been evident in other areas such as business and higher education; many endeavors have been undertaken in an effort to minimize this paucity in gender representativeness. According to research in other social science fields such as business, higher education, and youth studies, mentoring has proven to be an invaluable solution to this problem (Agogino, 2007; Anda, 2001; Casto, et al., 2005; Chao et al., 1992; Dodds, 2005; Ensher et al., 2002; Ensher et al., 2001; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Kram, 1985; Terrion, et al., 2008). There has been a proliferation of literature, both research-based and popular, on the concept of mentoring in educational settings and business.

Mentoring is defined as:

A dynamic, reciprocal relationship in a work environment between an advanced career incumbent (mentor) and a beginner (protégé) aimed at promoting the career development of both. For the protégé, the object of mentoring is the achievement of an identity transformation, a movement from the status of understudy to that of self-directing colleague. For the mentor, the relationship is a vehicle for achieving midlife 'generativity' [or passing along a legacy] (Healy & Welchert, 1990, p. 17).

Additionally, mentoring is seen as a personal relationship between a more sophisticated mentor and a less advanced protégé. The mentor has achieved personal or professional success and is willing and able to share covert and overt practices that have assisted him or her in becoming successful (Kalbfleish, 2002). Mentoring relationships are particularly important in the early stages of a career or during a critical turning point. Mentors manifest for protégés someone who has accomplished goals to which they aspire, offering encouragement and support (Searby & Tripses, 2006). This is done by

providing the protégé with knowledge, advice, challenge, counsel, and support in the protégé's pursuit of becoming a full member of a particular profession (Johnson, 2002).

The term “mentor” originated in Greek mythology when it appeared in *The Odyssey* by Homer (1878). Mentor was an Ithacan noble and was a counselor to his friend Ulysses. Mentor was given the responsibility of caring, educating, and protecting Ulysses's son, Telemachus, when he left to fight the Trojan War. Mentor was described as providing both wise and sensitive counsel to the son in order to groom him to become king (Russell & Adams, 1997). Traditionally, mentoring practices in Western Europe and the US served to keep dominant white males in power; as an activity it has privileged few and excluded many (Searby & Tripses, 2006). Mentoring has been associated with power, privilege, and social stratification (Gardiner, Enomoto, & Grogan, 2000 as cited by Searby & Tripses, 2006). The historical roots of mentoring are also illustrated in Sophocles' words “The reasonable thing is to learn from those who can teach” and in records from the Renaissance period indicating that mentoring was the commonly accepted method of educating young people (Wickman, 1997). A mentor provides a protégé with knowledge, advice, challenge, counsel, and support in the protégé's pursuit of becoming a full member of a particular profession (Johnson, 2002). Ultimately, a mentor enhances an individual's growth and advancement (Kram, 1983).

Mentors have long been thought to play an important role in development and access. Mentoring can either maintain or break the status quo. Previous studies have found that protégés advance more quickly professionally (Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000), achieve higher incomes (Whitely, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1991, 1992), and overall have more desirable professional outcomes than those not mentored (Bahniuk & Dobos, 1989; Bower, 2007; Dodds, 2005; Hill, Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Riley & Wrench, 1985).

In order to understand why a mentor is so important, one must first understand the characterization of a mentor. Webster's Dictionary defines a mentor as a wise and faithful counselor or monitor (Crampton & Mishra, 1999). Bronfenbrenner defines mentoring as “a one-to-one relationship between a pair of unrelated individuals, usually of different ages and is developmental in nature...a mentor is an older, more experienced person who seeks to develop the character and competence of a younger person (as cited by Thompson & Kelley-Vance, 2001). Researchers in organizational settings often

describe a mentor as “a senior, experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides support, direction, and feedback to the younger employee regarding career plans and interpersonal development” (Noe, 1988, p. 458).

These roles include teacher, guide, counselor, motivator, coach, advisor, role model, sponsor, referral agent, and door opener. As a teacher, a mentor needs to teach the skills and knowledge required to perform his/her position successfully (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995). When guiding, one should help develop professional interests and set realistic career goals. As the old adage goes, "If you don't know where you are going, you won't know how to get there." He or she also helps to clarify developmental needs and performance objectives, teaches skills, reinforces effective behavior, recommends areas of improvement and introduces the protégé to the goals and objectives of an organization (Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995). The role of counselor requires the mentor to establish a lasting and open relationship. In order to create a trusting relationship, the mentor needs to stress confidentiality and show respect; the mentor identifies the skills, interests and values of the protégé, discusses and evaluates possible options and assists in planning strategies to achieve objectives (Chao, 1997; Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). The mentor also works to develop an action plan that outlines what knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed to reach career goals. A motivator is needed to encourage and inspire a person. Coaching involves feedback. A mentor needs to give different kinds of feedback as the situation demands: positive feedback to reinforce behaviors and constructive feedback to change behaviors; both types of feedback are critical to professional growth. Feedback should be frequent, specific, and based on direct observation (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995).

Mentors are responsible for establishing an environment for open interaction, encourage two-way exchange of information, listen actively to the protégé, plan uninterrupted time with the protégé, and act as a sounding board for ideas and concerns (Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995). They should also provide both formal and informal information and recommend professional development opportunities and strategies to help protégés identify and overcome potential obstacles (Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995). As a role model, the mentor should be a living example of the values, ethics, and professional practices of the field or area of interest (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995). Most will,

observe and emulate the mentor's behavior. A sponsor creates opportunities - opportunities that may not otherwise be made available. These opportunities can relate directly to the job or indirectly to the overall professional development. As a referral agent, the level of sponsor is heightened. As a referral agent, a mentor may recommend or assist one in promotional opportunities, and arrange for involvement in highly visible activities (Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995). A mentor also assists with helping establish a network of contacts within the field or area of interest, as well as outside the field. As a door opener, the mentor facilitates professional access; the mentor identifies resources and finds educational and employment options (Geiger-DuMond & Boyle, 1995; Stone, 1999); they also provide intuitive and informal knowledge about the organization or profession and connect the individual with "the right people" who have either the power or knowledge to further enhance learning or performance (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995).

It is important to understand these described roles are not synonymous with mentoring and these roles are interwoven functions. A mentor may adopt many or only a few of these roles. Kram (1985) noted that these functions are divided into two primary domains: career and psychosocial. Career functions include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, provision of challenging assignments, and transmission of applied professional ethics (Kram, 1985). These functions are typically focused on career development and include aspects of the mentorship that enhance "learning the ropes" and preparing for advancement (Johnson, 2002). Psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship/mutuality (Kram, 1985).

In summary, mentoring has generally been perceived as a positive relationship that enhances the lives of protégés (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Fontaine (1998) alludes to the powerful, life-changing potential of mentoring "when knowledge and emotion are transformed into sustained action" (p. 29). Murdaugh (1998) emphasizes that "we do not grow in a vacuum; the caring, mentoring, and support from others form our career trajectories as well as our professional and personal experiences" (p. 65). Ultimately, a mentor enhances an individual's growth and advancement (Kram 1983; 1985). Mentoring allows a protégé to discern personal and vocational dreams, endorses it as realistic, and offers an environment that is conducive to facilitating the dream (Johnson,

2002). Previous studies have found that those that are involved with a mentor advance more quickly professionally; achieve higher incomes, and overall have more desirable professional outcomes than those not mentored (Bahniuk & Dobos, 1989; Bower, 2007; Dodds, 2005; Hill, Ragins, & Cotton, 1999; Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000; Riley & Wrench, 1985; Whitely, et al., 1991).

Statement of the Problem

While attending school, conferences, symposiums, and other activities related to the sport management field, there is a noticeable discrepancy in the percentage of males to females. There are very few women at any of these functions and it is a subject that is raised often. More specifically, White males outnumber every other member group as well as females. Where are all the women and minorities in sport management? This question is so important because of the value a diverse assemblage brings to any forum. Different ethnicities and genders equate various perspectives and viewpoints. An organization encouraging dissimilar employees to interact and work together can benefit from increased productivity. Additionally, there is a synergistic effect produced by people with a broad range of backgrounds interacting in positive and creative ways (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2008; Sodano & Baler, 1993). These differences can include but are not limited to race, gender, educational background, and socioeconomic background.

A major reason for limited access in numerous fields such as sport, business, and within academia is the ‘good ol boy network’ (a system of social networking and perceptions which reinforces traditional power structures alleged to exist prevalently among certain communities and social strata) which is present and has existed for centuries. Women and minorities traditionally struggle to gain access and entry into educational administration positions. Reasons for this include lack of networking, few positive role models, and inadequate sponsorship and mentoring among women (Searby & Tripses, 2006), causing many women to remain out of the loop in career development (Rhode, 2003). While some scholars see the concept of the “good ‘ol boy network as a form of overt racism or sexism (King, 2005; Searby & Tripses, 2006), others disagree (Cose, 1993; Stern, 2005). In this trend, it is simply that a person is going to recommend or hire someone they know or someone a friend recommends or knows (Stern, 2005).

People find comfort and trust in likeness; therefore, one has a tendency to seek the company of those most similar to them (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2008). This phenomenon is also very common in mentoring, which is a key component to access.

Previous research has suggested that more males are involved in mentoring than females and that male mentors prefer male protégés (Arrendondo, 2001; Kalbfleisch, 2000; Rayle, et al., 2006). This means if most mentors are males and males prefer to mentor other males, then there will be a deficit of available mentors for females. Additionally, history has demonstrated that individuals find it difficult to share power and rarely do it voluntarily (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2008); therefore, because the White male has historically dominated in the sport management discipline, then the people they recommend or hire will typically also be White males. According to Ellis Cose (1993), “People do not have to be racist [or sexist]-or have any malicious intent-in order to make decisions that unfairly harm members of another race [or gender], they simply have to do what comes naturally” (p. 4).

In 1940, former Harvard University President, James Bryant Conant, outlined his vision of an egalitarian society, a classless culture based on educational opportunity, not chance of birth (Fischer, 2006). He urged the nation had a duty ‘to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life’ (as cited by Fisher, 2006). Throughout history, women’s roles have consisted of social norms casting them into subordinate, supportive, and inferior positions in both their private and public lives (Ainsberg & Harrington, 1988). Major grounds for the disparity of women in higher education, sport management pedagogy specifically, are social issues (Gill, 2007; Miller, 1999). One major social quandary is women’s inferior position in society and males who support the status quo and view women’s participation as a threat to their own power and authority. Women aspiring to attain leadership positions in education identified career barriers they experienced. These included gender bias, perceptions that women are too emotional for top leadership, do not understand budgets, and are not strong managers (Rhode, 2003; Searby & Tripses, 2006; Tripses, 2004). Many scholars have urged that we must “provide solid legal protection from the persistent, pernicious discrimination which is serving to perpetuate second-class citizenship for American women” (Gavora, 2002).

Due to a lack of access there are many avenues women do not know exist. Charmaine Williams (2001) argues that although postsecondary institutions respond to calls for diversity, for anti-oppressive practices, and for pluralism of representation. Their competitive system does not actually allow for the diversity of thought and styles, and for the valuing of activism that women (more specifically, Black women faculty), tend to bring to campuses. There is definitely an apparent male-dominated status of higher education in North America. White male scholars still largely continue to serve as the authorized agents of knowledge production (McDonald, 2005). Scholars have recognized universities as social institutions that prove to be of great significance to society as a whole. Therefore, there is a great need for equal opportunity to enter, advance, and gain overall gender parity in academia (Harris, 2007).

Hence, our elite institutions are a major indication as to whether society is on track in its intention to be an equal-opportunity country. It is now time for higher education scholars and observers to question why institutions have not done a better job of recruiting and retaining those individuals who traditionally have been considered to be on the “lower end” socially. There must be some efforts made to include women candidates in searches in all areas of academia. Women obtain approximately one-third of the Ph.D. degrees granted in this country, with higher percentages in the humanities and social sciences than in the sciences, yet do not constitute one-third of the faculty in most academic units in the U.S. academy (Harris, 2007). For example, women make up only eight percent of physics faculty at major U.S. research universities (Adam, 2007). Although science is supposedly a field established on universalism, meaning that acknowledgement and advancement should be based solely on the contribution to knowledge and not be influenced by personal or social attributes (Long & Fox, 1995); particularism, which involves the use of functionally irrelevant characteristics like sex and race as a basis for making claims and gaining rewards, is most prevalent in the field. Science is an institution with immense inequality in career attainments. Women and most minorities, as groups, have lower levels of participation, position, productivity, and recognition than do white men (Long & Fox, 1995).

While this was very prevalent in the 1980's and 1990's, this phenomenon continues in the new millennium. In an effort to combat this lack of representation,

science professors from one of the leading institutions of higher education in the area of science, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), assembled chairpersons of 50 major research-oriented departments in the country with 15 national laboratory managers and directors of major funding agencies. This assemblage met to discuss how to double the number of women in physics education and research (Fiore, 2007). MIT has focused on gender issues since 1999, when its study of gender bias reported that its School of Science routinely underpaid and disrespected female faculty. In 2007, only 1 of 25 faculty members granted tenure was a woman. This brought the school's percentage of tenured female faculty to 16%, up from 10.5% just ten years ago. In 2001, there was only one tenured female faculty in the economics department at Stanford; additionally, only 12 % of tenured professors in Ph.D.- granting economics departments were women (Fogg, 2004). According to researchers, the academic gap in the professoriate is characterized by underrepresentation in high positions such as chairs and deans, disparate numbers in disciplines traditionally dominated by men, smaller salaries for comparable positions, and overrepresentation. Dodds (2005) postulates that although productivity levels among men and women are proportionately similar, women receive less support, less fairness in tenure and promotion procedures, and greater discouragement with their careers.

When the chairpersons, administrators, and leaders of these different institutions were asked if they were aware of the inequities, most responded they did not realize the circumstances were as dire as they actually are (Fogg, 2004). It is important to acknowledge that while no one has to do anything deliberately, one can inadvertently exclude women by taking a very narrow view of what methodological approach one accepts or employs in the academy; individuals are ethnocentric, seeing the world through their own narrow view and judging the world by their own familiar yardstick (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2008). Conversely, the position and purpose of the university is to serve as an archive or an apolitical and asexual arbitrator of knowledge (King, 2005). Implications for the transformation of academic settings tend to have a recent and ongoing history of leadership on the part of the departmental chair or academic dean, in dealing with the issues of participation and performance of women (Fox, 2000). If this phenomenon is not soon recognized and addressed, higher education academia, more

specifically, sport management pedagogy, will remain a White male centered, dominated, and identified field, a context in which White male perspectives and practices shape the organization and dissemination of knowledge (King, 2005).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate and identify factors related to success and also ascertain, what role, if any, mentoring played in influencing female sport management faculty. Although there is a plethora of literature on mentoring and its influence on individuals within higher education, there is very little research in the area of sport management. Furthermore, an even smaller amount addresses mentoring from the perspective of women and none is qualitative in nature. Qualitative research methods seek to discover participants' subjective views regarding a specific experience or experiences and provide unique relevant data (Anda, 2002). Qualitative research also "affirms people's right and ability to have a say in decisions which affect them and which claim to generate knowledge about them" (Reason & Bradbury, 2001, p. 9). This work will provide an exploratory look at female faculty in sport management pedagogy and the role of mentoring in career choice and success. This will allow for a greater understanding of the participants and their experiences, and allow respondents to examine these factors from their own perspectives.

The rationale behind the need for this study is based on the under representation of women in the professoriate as well as in high positions such as chairs and deans, and overrepresentation in part-time positions such as adjuncts and assistant professors, and slower rates of earning tenure and promotion (Curtis, 2004; Dodds, 2005; Gerdes, 2003; Krefting & Rawls, 2003; Kurtz-Costes, 2006; Raddon, 2002). In 2001, nationally, women accounted for only 15 percent of the full professors, 31.2 percent of associate professors, and 41.5 percent of assistant professors at research universities, according to the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California at Los Angeles. By comparison, women comprised 47.8 percent of all faculty members at two-year colleges, 37.3 percent of full professors, 49.1 percent of associate professors, and 54.8 percent of assistant professors. In 2005, the National Science Foundation (NSF)

delineated the number of doctorates awarded to women by field of study. The numbers were as follows:

Table 1.0 Doctorates awarded to women, by field of study: 1996–2005.

Field of Study	Doctorates Awarded to Women: 2005	
	Number	Percent
Science and engineering, total	10,533	37.7
Biological/agricultural sciences	3,481	47.0
Earth, atmospheric, and ocean sciences	243	34.1
Engineering	1,174	18.3
Mathematics/computer sciences	551	23.6
Physical sciences	972	26.7
Psychology	2,264	68.0
Social sciences	1,848	44.7

Source: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics
Science and Engineering Doctorate Awards: 2005 (NSF 07-305).

In the 2006-2007 academic school year, 60,616 doctorates were awarded at U.S. institutions. Of the 60,616 doctorates awarded, 30,251 were awarded to males and 30,365 were awarded to females. More specifically, 8,261 total doctorates were awarded in education, 2,681 were awarded to males and 5,580 were awarded to females; 218 doctorates were awarded in parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies, 109 were awarded to males and 109 were awarded to females; and while 3,037 were awarded in social sciences, 1,627 were awarded to males and 1,410 were awarded to females (Digest of Education Statistics, 2008). Although at first glance, these numbers look promising, while the percentage of women earning doctorates has steadily increased, the proportion of women teaching at two-year colleges remains far higher than that of those teaching at the very research institutions where they received their degrees (Jacobson, 2003). Additionally, the percentage of women representing tenure-earning track positions is not congruent to the number of women earning doctoral degrees.

In 2007, approximately four-fifths of U.S. faculty in Higher Education were White, with 43 percent being White males and 36 percent being White females; minorities made up 17 percent of the faculty. Seven percent of the faculty was Black, 6 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, 4 percent were Hispanic, and 1 percent was American Indian/Alaska Native (Digest of Education Statistics, 2008). The National Center of Educational Statistics' (NCES) Digest of Education Statistics (2008) delineated the academic rankings of faculty at U.S. degree-granting institutions as follows:

Table 2.0 Academic Rankings of U.S. Faculty (Fall 2003).

Ranking	% White Males	% White Females	% Black Males	% Black Females	% Hispanic Males	% Hispanic Females
Professor	65.5	20.3	2.6	1.1	1.8	0.8
Associate Prof.	51.6	28.4	3.1	2.4	1.7	1.3
Assistant Prof.	41.0	33.6	3.1	3.8	2.3	1.9
Instructor	38.2	41.2	3.2	4.4	2.5	2.3
Lecturer	36.7	43.9	2.9	3.0	1.3	3.8
Other	38.8	39.8	2.5	3.9	1.7	2.2
No rank	40.2	43.0	1.5	2.0	2.3	0.7

Table 2.0 Continued

Ranking	% Asian/ Pacific Islander Males	% Asian/ Pacific Islander Females	% Amer. Indian/ Native Alaskan Males	% Amer. Indian/ Native Alaskan Females
Professor	5.7	1.1	0.8	0.4
Associate Prof.	7.0	2.9	1.0	0.5
Assistant Prof.	8.7	4.3	0.7	0.6
Instructor	3.1	3.1	0.9	1.1
Lecturer	2.4	4.0	1.3	0.7
Other	7.0	2.8	0.8	0.6
No rank	4.5	3.8	1.1	0.8

SOURCE: NCES, 2008

More specifically, there is also incongruence in the number of women receiving doctorate degrees in sport management and those actually teaching in the curriculums. The number of doctorates awarded in the 2006-2007 academic school year was as follows:

Table 3.0 Doctorate degrees received in U.S. institutions in 2006-2007 in Parks, recreation, leisure, and fitness studies.

Area of Study	Total Degrees Received	# of Males	# of Females
Parks, Recreation, Leisure, and Fitness Studies	218	109	109
Parks, Recreation and Leisure Studies	17	8	9
Parks, Recreation and Leisure Facilities Management	13	3	10

Table 3.0 Continued

Area of Study	Total Degrees Received	# of Males	# of Females
Health and Physical Education (General)	37	20	17
Sport and Fitness Administration/Management	11	9	2
Kinesiology and Exercise Science	113	59	54
Health and Physical Education/Fitness (Other)	17	4	13
Parks, Recreation, Leisure, and Fitness Studies (Other)	10	6	4

SOURCE: National Center of Educational Statistics, 2008.

Additionally, the proportion of women leading these institutions is also disheartening. Ninety-six (80%) of one hundred and twenty Division IA university presidents are White males. There are 17 females (14.2%) in this position, sixteen are White (13.3%), and one is Hispanic (0.08%). None are African American, Asian, or Native American (Lapchick, 2008).

Due to the incongruent number of women pursuing doctorates in relation to women faculty, there is a great need for mentoring at the university level. Recent studies show that women in the academy continue to feel they must be “perfect” in order to succeed (Barlow, 2005). While this issue is receiving much attention currently, it has been an enigma for decades. In an attempt to explain this enigma, Friedan (1963) interviewed fellow female graduates from the 1940s who had become full-time housewives by the 1960s and described this phenomenon as the “problem that has no name” in her book *The Feminine Mystique*. This experience she wrote over 30 years ago recently emerged in a report released by Duke University’s Women’s Initiative in 2003. This study was a comprehensive look at the situations faced by the school’s female graduate and undergraduate students, alumnae, faculty, staff members, and trustees. The most controversial conclusion was that women felt pressured by a fraternity-dominated culture to achieve “effortless perfection” (Barlow, 2005). In order to alleviate these concerns, scholars like Canada (1989) suggested more women need to be hired and

promoted to serve as role models and mentors at all levels of education, especially at the graduate level in particular. Mentoring is important for the development of our future scholars, therefore it is imperative to continue to expand our understanding of the issue (Bower, 2007).

Mentoring is a professional responsibility, as well as an opportunity for growth (Thompson, 2000). Mentoring, specifically in academia, is one method that has been proven to be successful in this plight of offering a counter-hegemonic approach and assisting those in the academy to apply research so that it impacts, and is meaningful to, the various communities that sport management has the potential to touch (Amis & Silk, 2005). So one must ask the question, do we need to employ mentoring strategies in an effort to increase the length of women's academic careers? Given the complex and challenging nature of educators' work, the notion that educators in various work settings and career paths should have mentors guide them through skill development and workplace management has become increasingly accepted. Women who have attained positions of power can model something useful for females who long to be mentored. To succeed in a political climate in which they are too frequently told is a "post-feminist" world, young women need strong female mentors more than ever (Barlow, 2005).

While there have been previous studies to assess mentoring and its effects in physical education, the majority of these studies assess it only from the formal mentoring standpoint. Researchers in sport management have noted that dissertation topics primarily focus on marketing, organizational behavior and organizational theory, with very little in other areas (Mahoney, 2008; Dittmore, Mahoney, Andrew, & Phelps, 2007; Soucie & Doherty, 1996). The literature in sport management that deals with mentoring addresses sport administrators (Benton, 1999; Fuller, 1985; Thomas, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990); while one piece of literature addressed faculty specifically and was a conceptual paper in nature promoting the context of peer mentoring (Pastore, 2003).

This research will attempt to ascertain and illustrate if mentoring influences female faculty in sport management, and if so, in what contexts and which types of mentor relationships are most positive. The investigation will focus on description, analysis, and interpretation of individuals' lived experiences. Results of this study are

important for several reasons. Little is known about how academic protégés describe their own experiences of mentoring because most mentoring studies rely on questionnaire data (Dodds, 2005). Given the gender gap and what is known about mentoring in other fields, furnishes credence to interviewing female faculty in sport management. This study will allow them to recollect and make sense of lived experiences they believe have guided them in their careers (Dodds, 2005).

This study will:

- identify characteristics of female faculty in sport management and other factors related to success;
- identify factors contributing or hindering progress to and in current positions;
- give instruction and guidance to other women aspiring to attain faculty positions in sport management;
- assist those currently in faculty positions, and
- assist sport management faculty who are educating women interested in faculty positions.

Research Design

A qualitative, descriptive-interpretive approach utilizing a cross case analysis of current female faculty in sport management will be employed. This was achieved by drawing from a critical as well as feminist theory approach. The orientation of critical research's supposition is that education is considered to be a social institution designed for social as well as cultural reproduction and transformation (Eisen, 1990). By drawing from critical theory, the knowledge generated from this mode of research is an ideological critique of power, privilege, and oppression in areas of educational practice (Merriam, 1998). Hooks (1994) described feminism as the struggle to end sexist oppression. This ideal is to encompass all women, regardless of social group, race, or class.

According to Rossman & Rallis (2003), qualitative research begins with questions; its ultimate purpose is learning. To inform the questions, the researcher collects data. Data are images, sounds, words, and numbers. When data are grouped into

patterns, they become information. When information is put to use or applied, it becomes knowledge (p. 4). Once this knowledge is attained and learning has occurred, much too often the end results are articles and reports languishing unread in academic journals. Such research should be balanced by research conducted with the explicit goals of use or actually being applied with the goal of improving some social circumstance. Lived experiences of individuals cannot and should not be obstinately forced into existing sociological models nor should be investigated through traditional sociological analyses (Eisen, 1990).

Eisen (1990) deftly stated that models, as we know,

“have the tendency to bend, warp, and oscillate under pressure. The complexity of a vibrant culture, with its minute confluences, is not easily captured by mere quantitative models. What is needed is the employment of socio-cultural theories, replacing sociological models. These will help see pools of stability in the flux of time, one that is qualitative and explanatory rather than exact and explicit, dealing solely with the quantifiable” (p.122).

Qualitative research is a broad approach to the study of social phenomena; the approach is naturalistic, interpretive, and draws on multiple methods of inquiry (Denzin, 1994); hence the decision to utilize qualitative research in this study. Demographic questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and documents such as vitas were used to collect data.

Research Questions

- RQ 1 How did female sport management faculty attain their present positions?
- RQ 2 What factors helped/hindered the attainment of their positions?
- RQ 3 What common characteristics do these women possess?
- RQ 4 What were the women’s personal experiences in their careers?
- RQ 5 Did having or not having a mentor play a role in career choice?

Significance and Implications

Many researchers have identified barriers women experience while aspiring to attain faculty and leadership positions in higher education, which range from gender bias to limited access. As researchers identify specific barriers to success for women to faculty and leadership positions, appropriate steps can be taken to correct the problem. While the issue of diversity in sport management has gained limited attention in the past three decades, most of the focus has been primarily on athletic administration (Benton, 1999; Fuller, 1985; Thomas, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990). Whereas this is a very significant area, more research needs to be dedicated to the subject of faculty, and more specifically, gender inequities in faculty. This is most important since, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008), women currently comprise nearly half of the labor force. Traditionally, however, women have needed more education than men to get higher paying jobs and they get paid less for the same work. The obstructive dynamics of sexism, especially in the workplace, has always hampered the full leadership potential in women.

Institutions of higher learning should matter to sport scholars not simply because of the powerful, profitable, powerful, and pleasurable sporting worlds that enliven them, but more importantly, because they are the first and foremost White male dominated institutions devoted in large part to imparting values, myths, and norms to the dominant social order to largely White student bodies (Schick, 2002). Consequently, colleges and universities figure prominently in the perpetuation of White male hegemony (Schick, 2002). According to organizational research, higher female proportions in a field should, in fact, bring greater organizational rank, performance, and power to women. However, in academic fields such as education, the work is female-typed but male-dominated. Women represent large numbers, yet low proportions of the higher status ranks and positions (Fox & Faver, 1985).

Several scholars have addressed the issues facing women in higher education and concluded women face greater obstacles and may approach the challenges of doctoral studies differently than men (Bagilhole, 1993; Gilbert et al 1983; Hudson & O'Regan, 1994; Kurtz-Costes, 2006; Leonard, 2001; Margolis & Romero, 1998; Raddon, 2002; Toews et al., 1997). Whereas women now receive bachelors and master's degrees in

greater numbers than men, unfortunately this is not the case at the doctoral level (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 2004; National Center for Education Statistics, 2003; UNESCO, 2003). Compared to men, women are less likely to pursue the most advanced level of education; are less likely to seek degrees in high status fields such as the physical sciences, engineering and economics; and are more likely to exit their programs before degree completion (Kurtz-Costes, 2006; Leonard, 2001; National Center for Education Statistics, 1995; National Science Foundation, 2001, 2003; Unesco, 2002). Despite the aforementioned attempts and progress scholars have made toward gender equity in recent decades, women are still extremely deficient in most areas such as higher education and business.

While there has been much research on mentoring in higher learning, no research has addressed it from the standpoint of sport management pedagogy. There are many arguments why this research is necessary. According to Fox (2000), for graduate students, departments constitute “little societies,” with norms, values, and belief systems that shape and control behavior; therefore, in understanding and improving the status of women in doctoral education, it is important to understand the complexity, or features of the environments of graduate education, particularly as they may vary with more or less positive indicators of women’s participation. Additionally, Golde (2005) maintained the department, rather than the institution as a whole, is the locus of control for doctoral education. This is to say that the graduate experience is not monolithic; one cannot assume what a doctoral student in chemistry experiences is similar to that of a doctoral student in history or a doctoral student in education. Again, an understanding of the discipline is central to the understanding of the experience in doctoral education. Becher and Trowler (2001) highlighted this point: “We may appropriately conceive of disciplines as having recognizable identities and particular cultural attributes” (p. 44). Therefore, as one seeks to better understand any facet of the graduate student experience, such as mentorship, one must look to one particular discipline or field of study to better understand and isolate the phenomenon, understanding that the field of study has its own culture, values, and attitudes that influence those working within it (Gardner & Barnes, 2007). Additionally, Patton et al. (2005) asserts, we must identify influences that appear to contribute or hinder their sustainability. Numerous studies have addressed the

problems that women face in higher education; however, there is a dearth of information about sport management pedagogy specifically.

Ziegler (2007) asserted that sport has become recognized unquestionably as one of humankind's fundamental social institutions. Although there is little research specifically in this area, there has been in the past and currently remains, an acknowledgement that much work needs to be done. As noted by King (2005), sport scholars have devoted little critical attention to the contexts in which most of them are employed, namely colleges and universities. Inglis (2007) described her memories of letters written by Dr. Earle Ziegler, one of sport management's most noted scholars, wherein he emphasized the significance of the role of women in the academy and in the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), and his understanding of women's issues in the academy. Senge (1990) also noted that a key factor in recognizing such issues is to develop an awareness of the current reality and mastery of the structural conflicts and the resulting behaviors; "Once we can see them and name them, they no longer have a hold on us" (p.160).

Furthermore, using qualitative methods in this study will help address a gap in the overall sport management literature. Slack (1996) and Olafson (1990) are among the prominent scholars who have called for more qualitative research in sport management. Quarterman, Jackson, Yoo, Koo, and Pruegger (2003) found less than 8% of all research articles published in the *Journal of Sport Management* from its inception in 1987 through 2002 were qualitative in nature. Kian, Noland, and Phelps (2004) noted only four qualitative-based research articles were published in *Sport Marketing Quarterly* from its first issue in 1992 through 2003, while only three qualitative articles were published in the *Sport Management Review* from 1998-2003.

Subsequently, although there is a plethora of research on mentoring in higher education, there is also very little information on mentoring and its influence on women faculty in sport management. In order to alleviate this disparity, in-depth, comprehensive studies must be employed. Sociologist Etter-Lewis (1991) stated, "all women must tell their own stories in their own words" (p.44). Once this occurs, people literally start to see more and more of reality as something they, collectively, can influence.

Assumptions

1. The respondents articulated their experiences as sport management faculty in ways that are valuable to this study.
2. The respondents answered all questions honestly and truthfully.
3. Triangulation was utilized to increase validity of the study.

Limitations

It is important to note limitations of the study. The findings in this study are not generalizable to all women in sport management, as experiences and perceptions are individualistic. This research will only seek to add depth and understanding to the sample studied. The fact that the study is a purposive sampling and the inclusion of only one disciplinary field for the study limits the overall understanding of the influence of mentorships on women faculty in general. The researcher's role in this study also must be acknowledged. Additionally, as the researcher is currently a doctoral candidate in sport management pedagogy, one's own experiences may influence the understanding and interpretation of the participants' experiences.

Delimitations

The number of participants was limited to eight due to the exhaustive nature of qualitative research. The interviews were approximately 60-90 minutes in length. The results of the study were specific to the participants of the study and are not intended to generalize, but to give meaning to the individuals' lived experiences.

Definition of Terms

1. Sport management faculty – a person who teaches courses on the undergraduate or graduate level in a sport management program (Masteralexis, Barr, & Hums, 2008; Parkhouse & Pitts, 2001).
2. Mentee – Individual who is being mentored (The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, 2007).
3. Mentor – An individual who is more experienced and assists in developing the character and competence of another individual. Some roles include teacher,

guide, motivator, coach, advisor, and role model (Green & Bauer, 1995; Healy & Welchert, 1990; Kaye & Jacobson, 1995; Johnson, 2007; Zey, 1984).

4. Mentorship - a relationship between a pair of individuals that is developmental in nature, and provides direction to mentee or protégé (Johnson, 2007).
5. Protégé' – Individual who is being mentored; synonym for mentee (Allen & Eby, 2007; Healy & Welchert, 1990; Kaye & Jacobson, 1995).
6. Success – The achievement of something desired, planned, or attempted. Satisfaction with the attainment of one's position, or favorable termination of attempts and endeavors (The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2007).

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Our system of higher education, though officially committed to the fostering of intellectual and personal development of students, provides mentoring that is generally limited in quantity and poor in quality.

(Levinson, Darrow, Klein, & McKee, 1978, p.334)

The Role of Mentoring

Many researchers and scholars have posited the relevance and importance of mentoring (Bower, 2007; Casto et al., 2005; Dubois et al., 2002; Hill et al., 1989; Hurte, 2002; Kaye & Jacobson, 1985; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Sorcinelli et al., 2007). Fontaine (1998) alludes to the powerful, life-changing potential of mentoring “when knowledge and emotion are transformed into sustained action” (p. 29). Murdaugh (1998) asserts that “we do not grow in a vacuum; the caring, mentoring, and support from others form our career trajectories as well as our professional and personal experiences” (p. 65). Johnson (2002), asserts mentoring allows a protégé to discern personal and vocational dreams, endorses it as realistic, and offers an environment that is conducive to facilitating the dream. In higher education, mentoring has been suggested as a vehicle to improve the socialization, orientation, and career outcomes of faculty as well as to promote increased equity for women faculty (Bower, 2007; Dodd, 2005; Gibson, 2004; Johnson, 2002; Kurtz-Costes, Helmke, & Ulke-Steiner, 2006). In business and industry, mentoring is proposed as an avenue to support career success (Aryee, Wyatt, & Stone, 1996; Chao, 1997; Hite & McDonald, 2001; Scandura, 1992; Wallace, 2001), to help women and minorities gain access to informational networks (Dreher & Dougherty, 1997; Noe, 1988; Scandura & Ragins, 1993), and to enhance organizational performance and commitment (Donaldson, Ensher, & Grant-Vallone, 2000; Eby, 1997; & Russell & Adams, 1997). Additionally, Owens & Patton (2003) found mentoring is also successfully and routinely used to shape business leaders, and Young & Perrewe (2000) found medical personnel

who had been mentored reported greater career satisfaction and success. Although the mentoring concept can be traced throughout history, only recently has much empirical research on mentoring been conducted or many practical recommendations been offered for improving mentoring relationships.

While mentoring proponents agree on the advantages of mentoring, the context in which mentoring is most successful is where researchers' opinions vary. Research on mentoring has explored issues such as the type of mentoring relationship, structural components such as frequency of contact and same versus cross gender and race matching, (Anda, 2001; Ogbu, 1990; Rhodes, Reddy, Grossman, & Lee, 2002; Zirkel, 2002), and functions served by the mentor and outcomes of the mentoring relationship (Ayers & Griffin; Bower, 2007; Chao, Dodds, 2005; Liang, Tracy, Taylor, & Williams, 2002; Walz, & Gardner, 1992). Many note that whereas mentoring does provide career-related and psychosocial functions, the contextual differences may influence to what extent these two primary functions are achieved. These contextual differences include informal mentoring (those that develop spontaneously without formal assignment by a third party) versus formal mentoring (those that are assigned) (Dodds, 2005; Bower, 2007), structural components such as same gender and same race versus cross-gender and cross-race mentoring (Dreher, Cox, & Taylor, 1996; Dufor, 2000; Zirkel, 2002), relational dimensions versus functional dimensions of mentoring (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002; Liang, et al., 2002; Rayle, Bordes, Zapata, Arredondo, Rutter, & Howard, 2006), and traditional mentoring versus alternative forms of mentoring such as peer, group or network, and the apprenticeship framework of mentoring (Emmerik, 2004; Ferris & Perrewé, 2008; Pelluchette & Jeanquart, 2000).

Many mentoring scholars have found that informal mentorships are evaluated as being more effective and meaningful than formal mentorships by protégés and mentors (Burke, 1984; Fagenson, Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Johnson, 2002; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Formally assigned mentorships result in less identification, less relational comfort, less motivation from mentoring, and ultimately less communication and interaction; while informal relationships report greater effect from, and satisfaction with the mentorship. Proponents of same gender and same race matching assert this type of matching provides information of particular relevance to members of one's own group

since gender differences in professional identity formation exist. One can form internalized representations of what is available to them, same gender and same race matching provides information that non-matched mentors are unlikely to provide (Ogbu, 1990; Robst, 1996), in addition to providing concrete information regarding what is possible to them as members of specific social groups (Anda, 2001; Zirkel, 2002). For example, Raddon (2002) noted, female mentors may be particularly important for women who plan to balance a career with motherhood. Conversely, numerous researchers think that cross-gender and cross-race matching is just as significant.

According to several researchers, the most enduring and effective relationships are based on common contributors to relational attraction (shared interests, similarity, frequent contact, and enjoyment of interactions (Kram, 1985; Johnson, 2002; Russell & Adams, 1997). While many scholars tend to look at mentoring as unidirectional or task or behavior oriented, focusing on providing information, advice, skill building, challenge, and role modeling (Flaxman, Ascher, & Harrington, 1988; Hamilton & Darling, 1989; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & Mckee, 1979); several scholars feel relational dimensions of mentoring aren't elucidated and suggest mentoring relationships which have a high presence of these qualities strongly influence success, including a sense of self-worth, vitality, validation, and empowerment (Daloz, 1986; Liang, Tracy, Taylor, & Williams, 2002; Philip & Hendry, 1996; Rayle et al., 2006; Sullivan, 1996). This means that the *quality and nature* of the mentoring relationship is more meaningful than the *quantity or structure*. However, these characteristics manifest themselves in situational contexts. These situational contexts are during adolescence for both males and females and for females more specifically.

For the purpose of this review, mentoring research will focus on four distinct areas-among youth, organizations, higher education, physical education pedagogy, and sport management pedagogy.

Mentoring and Youth

Issues such as formal versus informal mentoring, structural components such as same race matching and same gender matching as opposed to cross-race and cross-gender mentoring are the key areas of concern with regard to mentoring and youth. The impact of these contexts on mentoring of youth has been conducted with conflicting results. In a

qualitative study, which addressed formal mentoring, Anda (2002) presented a qualitative case study of a mentor program for four at-risk youth. The study took place in a low-income urban setting with high rates of youth and violent crime. The participants were chosen from a program sponsored through collaboration between a community agency and the city fire department. Firefighters served as mentors and were encouraged to meet with mentees on a weekly basis. Eighteen mentor–mentee dyads participated in the program, consisting of an equal number of males and females. Individual audio taped interviews employing a standardized set of open-ended questions were conducted in a community meeting room at the beginning of the program. A written survey format was used at the end of the program due to the issue that the youth were not available. The program lasted from September to June (9 months).

The findings suggested a considerable congruence between the mentees' expectations and their perceived outcomes. Most participants developed a valued relationship with their mentor. The positives were improved communication, emotional support, growth enhancing opportunities, and direct help with school work. Outcomes were also positive in that many of the mentees alluded to benefits at the interpersonal and affective levels, as well as concrete outcomes. Significant changes in values, goals, and perspectives and behavior in a more pro-social and achievement-oriented direction were mentioned. Essentially, the mentors and mentees agreed that the mentor relationship provided the mentees with a supportive and trustworthy listener and a caring sounding board. In terms of concrete outcomes, eight of the mentees graduated from high school; four of these were accepted into four-year state colleges, and two others enrolled at least part-time in two-year college programs. The remaining ten youth were continuing high school in the fall. Fifteen of the mentees completed a two-week job readiness course, and six had already obtained employment.

In summary, Anda (2002) found that mentor programs offer an effective low-cost method of expanding the number of youth who can receive individualized supportive intervention. The case study provided a constellation of concrete and psychosocial factors that contributed significantly to the mentees' development and success.

Similar to the preceding study, Thompson & Kelly- Vance (2001) examined the impact of mentoring on the academic achievement of at-risk male youth involved in a Big

Brothers/Big Sisters program. The participants ranged from 9 to 15 years old and participated in the program for nine months. There was a control group of 13 boys and a treatment group of 12 boys, with the control group not being assigned a mentor. The treatment group performed better in reading and math, while no difference was found in spelling. The results yielded that having a mentor positively impacted the academic achievement of at-risk males. This study not only addressed the importance of a mentor but also provided solid evidence of formal mentoring having a positive outcome on academic achievement.

Whereas Thompson & Kelley-Vance assessed the impact of mentoring of itself and the context of formal mentoring, Zimmerman & Bingenheimer (2002) assessed the impact of natural mentors in the lives of adolescents as opposed to formal mentors. Natural mentoring occurs through family, friendship, teaching, coaching, and counseling, while formal or planned mentoring occurs through structured programs in which an adult and a youth are selected and matched through formal processes. Seven hundred and seventy adolescents from a large Midwestern city were interviewed. This represented a 90% response rate from the original sample of 850 youths. The majority of participants were African American (79.6%). The remaining participants were White (17.1%) or Biracial (3.2%). Of the 770 participants in the study 414 respondents reported having a natural mentor. Youths with natural mentors reported more positive school attitudes than did youth without natural mentors, lower levels of problem behavior, less marijuana use, and fewer nonviolent delinquent behaviors. The adolescents with natural mentors were also more likely to like school, to believe that success in school is important, and feel capable of succeeding in school.

Several researchers have assessed mentoring and its importance in regards to race and gender matching. Rhodes, Reddy, Grossman, & Lee (2002) looked at the relative importance of making matches on the basis of shared racial background in a mixed method study. The investigators focused on mentoring in reference to same-race versus cross-race matching of 476 minority youth. The participants were given the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA), a 23-item scale that contained questions related to an adolescent's relationship with his or her prime caregiver and interviews with questions designed to assess the frequency and type of activities that mentors and mentees

participated in and the youth's feelings toward and impressions of his or her mentor. According to Rhodes et al (2002), homogeneous matching may expedite the development of trust but it does not guarantee a successful mentoring match. Findings suggested that racial configuration does not differentially affect youth outcomes in any robust or consistent manner.

Although the previous study found that racial similarity was not important in mentor relationships, some researchers suggest that this is not the case. One theory on the subject stated that allowing European Americans to mentor minority children becomes not just an issue of helping children, but a much larger intrusion and danger to the child's racial identity (Rhodes, Reddy, Grossman & Lee, 2002). An argument by proponents of racial matching is the "mentor and protégé have different goals from the beginning and that mentors approached mentoring with the 'zeal of a missionary', wanting to save at-risk youth from the hazards of their environments by engaging them in 'legitimate mainstream activities'" (Ogbu, 1990a, p. 8 as cited by Rhodes et al., 2002).

Another argument is that by cross-matching youth one could convey that appropriate role models are not of their own group or that there are not enough adults from their own community to serve as positive role models; while race- and gender-matched mentoring provides concrete information to young people regarding what is possible for them as members of specific social groups (Zirkel, 2002). Zirkel (2002) also explored the impact of race and gender-matched mentoring and how these aspects affect youth academically. The longitudinal study of 80 young adolescents 12 to 14 years old revealed that students who reported having at least one race- and gender-matched role model performed better academically up to 24 months later, reported more achievement-oriented goals, enjoyed achievement-relevant activities to a greater degree, thought more about their futures, and looked up to adults rather than peers more often than did students without a race- and gender-matched mentor.

While there has been much research on the impact of mentoring and the traditional conceptions, such as task and behavior orientations, very little has been elucidated on the relational dimension. Liang, Tracy, Taylor, and Williams (2002) define relational dimensions as mutual engagement; which is defined as perceived, mutual involvement, commitment, and attunement to the relationship; authenticity, which is the

process of acquiring knowledge of self and the other and feeling free to be genuine in the context of the relationship; and empowerment, which is defined as the experience of feeling personally strengthened, encouraged, and inspired to take action (Liang et al., 2002). The researchers looked at these underlying characteristics of mentoring relationships which are thought to be fundamental to their psychological development. The sample consisted of 296 first and fourth year female undergraduates between the ages of 17 and 23. The individuals were given the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire (MPDQ), a 22-item self-report measure that asks respondents to rate their perceptions of their relationship as well as the perceptions of the other's experience of the relationship. The results indicated that structural components of mentoring such as frequency of contact and gender- and race-matching have limited importance as compared to the nature and quality of the mentoring relationship. The relational dimension greatly relates to the extent to which mentors are meaningfully engaged in the mentoring process and has a significant impact on the retention of a protégé (Griffin & Ayers, 2005).

Darling et al. (2002) explored the extent to which relations with significant others, (also known as natural mentoring) were characterized by mentoring in Japan and the United States via a questionnaire. The study provided an initial exploration if the extent to which who provides mentoring, and the types of relationships in which it occurs, are comparable in a Western and non-Western culture. Fifty-six male and seventy female college juniors from the U.S. and 119 male and 120 female college freshmen from Japan participated in the study. U.S. participants were recruited in equal numbers from those majoring in science, the humanities, and business, with the distribution counterbalanced for gender. In both countries, participating adolescents were more likely to ascribe mentoring functions to adults than peers, to relatives than non-relatives, and to same gender than to cross-gender associates.

Whereas the mechanisms that differentiate successful and unsuccessful mentoring relationships and programs have not been conclusively established, a meta-analysis of 55 youth mentoring research studies suggests that while mentoring has demonstrated a moderate effect in some studies, when considered as a whole, mentoring programs achieve a relatively small effect (DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002).

Moreover, this meta-analysis study suggests that positive youth outcomes appear to be associated with mentoring programs that employ theory-based and empirically based “best practices.” While there is not enough data to conclusively determine which program practices are most important, the literature suggests the relative importance of three practices. These practices include:

- frequency of contact between mentors and mentees;
- duration of the mentor relationship (Grossman, & Rhodes, 2002); and
- perception of the quality of the mentor and youth relationship (Grossman, 1999; Jacovy, 2002).

In short, a growing social science base supports mentoring of youth as an effective and specific, preventive and development intervention (Anda, 2001; Darling et al., 2002; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002; Jacovy, 2002; Nobels, 1985; Ogbu, 1990); these risk areas include poor academic achievement and educational aspirations, potential for school dropout, criminal/delinquent behavior, gang affiliations, and substance abuse. Mentors provide youth with access to resources otherwise not available to them, and psychological and emotional support to foster behavioral and attitudinal changes (Anda, 2002). These include formal and informal mentoring, same and cross-gender matching, same and cross-race matching, and peer and traditional mentoring. Although the jury is still out as to which mechanisms differentiate successful and unsuccessful mentoring relationships and programs, mentoring relationships and programs using evidence-based practices that support long-term, quality relationships between adults and youth (traditional mentoring) can be expected to produce positive impacts on a range of academic, psychosocial and health behavior outcomes.

Mentoring within Organizations

While the aforementioned studies looked at youth mentoring, there also has been a plethora of research in regards to mentoring in the organizational setting. Mentors are frequently characterized as individuals who are committed to providing support to junior

members in an effort to remove organizational barriers and to increase the upward mobility of their protégés (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1985). Seminal work concerning mentoring relationships in organizations identifies two distinct, but related functions provided by mentors: career functions and psychosocial support. Career functions include aspects of the mentorship that prepare the protégé or mentee for career advancement such as sponsorship, exposure, visibility, and coaching, while psychosocial aspects are those that enhance the protégé's sense of competence and self-image, such as role-modeling, counseling, acceptance, and confirmation (Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992). Early mentoring researchers characterized mentors as typically 8 to 15 years older than their protégés (Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978). The argument is that age contributes to the overall quality of the mentoring relationship. Findings in research disputed this notion; reporting older mentors provided the least amount of both types of mentoring as opposed to younger mentors (Finkelston, Allen, & Rhoton, 2003). While some researchers assert that age contributes to the overall quality of a mentor relationship, others purport that the type of mentoring relationship, demographic characteristics, and perceived attitudinal similarity are major influences (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002).

Organizations can boast of many benefits from mentorships. Research has supported links between mentoring relationships and increased employee productivity, enhanced organizational commitment, and lower levels of turnover (Russell & Adams, 1997; Sosik & Lee, 2002). From an organizational perspective, mentoring has been widely accepted as a key career resource for developing managerial talent (Bernstein & Kaye, 1986; Ragins & Scandura, 1994; Sosik & Lee, 2002) and also as a tool for educating new employees or socializing them regarding the organization's values (Russell & Adams, 1997). Since organizations have acknowledged and recognized the value of mentorships, many have tried to formalize these relationships as part of the planned career development of junior managers and professionals (Chao et al., 1992). Three organizational outcomes affected by mentoring are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and retention or reduced turnover (Raabe & Beehr, 2003). In spite of their popularity, however, little is known about the effects of formal mentoring programs (Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). As Scandura (1998) noted, "to

summarize, the jury is still out on the efficacy of formal mentoring programs” (p. 454). The basic distinctions between formal and informal mentorships lie in the formation of the relationship. Informal mentorships are not managed, structured, nor formally recognized by the organization, and are spontaneous relationships that occur without external involvement from the organization (Chao et al., 1992).

In the study by Raabe & Beehr (2003), two companies interested in improving the career prospects of their female and minority professionals and managers, established formal mentoring programs, and were examined in an effort to (1) determine the strength of the relationship between the formal mentor’s and mentee’s perceptions of their relationship with each other and (2) to compare mentor–mentee relationships with supervisor–subordinate relationships and with coworker–coworker relationships in relation to mentee outcomes. The study examined and compared relationships of formal mentors, supervisors, and coworkers with regard to three employee outcomes: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. The relationships were compared between the immediate supervisor, the most liked co-worker, and the assigned mentor with the focal employee. Mentors were relatively high in the organizations’ hierarchy and at least two hierarchical levels above the mentee, and both were part of the companies’ formal mentoring program. Sixty-one pairs of mentors and mentees participated.

Supervisors, as well as formal mentors, can influence outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Given that the researchers deem that the Leader–Member–Exchange (LMX) theory is one of the most clear dyadic leadership theories, and mentoring is also a dyadic function, they measured LMX dimensions as the supervisor dimensions, and compared their relationship to employee outcomes with the mentor’s relations to employee outcomes. LMX theory of leadership focuses directly on one-to-one relationships between supervisors and subordinates, much like mentoring. This encouraged the researchers’ decision to focus on supervisor behaviors found in LMX theory for comparisons of supervisor relationships with formal mentor relationships. In order to examine differences between the supervisory and mentor dyadic relationships in the study, the researchers studied mentoring in organizations that had formal mentors who were not the mentees’ direct

supervisors. In this way, supervisors' potential effects on subordinates' outcomes could be examined separately from mentors' effects. Like the origins of mentorship theory, LMX theory is based on the concept of social exchange, providing a notable parallel between mentoring and leadership processes.

Social exchange theory is consistent with the specific idea that social relationships are akin to marketplace exchanges. Therefore, one is likely to continue in the relationship if one's exchange with the 'other' is favorable; for example, if one received more from the other person than one gave, there was sufficient reason to stay in the relationship (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Although different versions of the theory evolved so that it is sometimes more generally about satisfying qualities of relationships, the basic idea is still that favorable social relationships provide an incentive to stay in these relationships (Raabe & Beehr, 2003; p. 275).

Participation in the program was voluntary and followed a process involving applications, the fulfillment of certain eligibility requirements (e.g., minimum organizational tenure and stated commitment to participate in mentoring program activities), and a matching of goals of the mentees and skills and background. Mentees and mentors took part in an orientation meeting, received separate training, and had to commit to a minimum time investment of 2 hours per month and to program evaluations. The mentees' average age was 34.7 years, 61% were women, 77% had bachelors or graduate degrees, 62% reported that they were Caucasian, and they had been in their current jobs for an average of about 34 months (and in the company for 85 months). The mentors' average age was 44.1 years, 40% were women, 96% had bachelors or graduate degrees, 86% reported that they were Caucasian, and they had been in their current jobs for an average of about 47 months and in the company for 203 months. Questionnaires were filled out by all participants; all items of the measures were answered on seven-point Likert, agree–disagree scales. Alphas were derived from the sample of the 61 mentee–mentor dyads. The mentees' questionnaires measured their relationships with their mentors, their supervisors, and their best-liked coworker, as well as the outcome variables: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intent. The mentors' questionnaire measured the same three relationships between mentor and mentee that the mentee's questionnaire did, using items that were directly parallel to those in the mentee

questionnaire: career development that the mentor does for the mentee, psychosocial support of the mentor toward the mentee, and role modeling (the extent to which the mentee follows the mentor's model).

Key findings included supervisor and coworker relationships were more important than mentoring relationships in their potential effects on an individual's organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intent. Mentoring did not play a significant role for any of the outcome variables, which contradicted the researchers' expectations for mentoring relationships based on social exchange theory. Finally, in contrast to the aforementioned study, Ragins et al. (2000) found no differential effects of formal and informal mentoring programs, although they did not distinguish between supervisors and others who were mentors, a distinction that the present study suggests might be very important.

Additionally, Ensher, Grant-Valone, & Marelich (2002) embraced the theoretical framework from the leader-member exchange theory proposed by Graen and Scandura (1987) and the similarity-attraction paradigm. This paradigm states that individuals who perceive themselves to be similar are more attracted to each other than those who see themselves as dissimilar (Berscheid & Walster, 1969; Byrne, 1961; 1971; Grant, 1993; Harrison, 1976). The researchers compared similarity in immutable characteristics such as race and gender and relational demography which compares demographic characteristics such as race and gender of members of dyads, and type of mentor of 144 protégés from diverse backgrounds (54% female, 54% non-White). A survey utilizing a 3-factor scale of mentor functions was used to measure vocational, psychosocial, and mentoring support (Ensher et al, 2002). Type of mentor was defined as a peer mentor (co-worker), a step-ahead mentor (one or two levels above), and traditional mentor (much more experienced and farther ahead). The authors found that perceived attitudinal similarity was the most significant predictor of all three types of mentor support and protégés' satisfaction with their mentor, racial similarity did not predict protégés' support or satisfaction with their mentors; and gender was not positively associated with protégés' satisfaction with their mentors, but was positively associated with psychosocial support. A similar study by Nielson, Pate, & Eisenbach (2000) found that similarity in values and attitudes was a better predictor of relationship quality than was demographic

similarity. Fogg (2004) also noted this paradigm and contended the advisory role is more likely to occur between people who have something in common, whether it be sports, professional interests, or simply the same gender. In summary, the study suggests that perceived attitudinal similarity is more important than demographic similarity in affecting the quality of mentoring relationships and subsequent satisfaction with the relationship.

In the study by Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell (2000), a taxonomy of negative mentoring experiences was developed using descriptive accounts of negative mentoring experiences from the protégé's perspective. Surveys were administered in two executive development programs conducted at a large southeastern university as part of a 360 degree feedback process for program participants. Four hundred twenty-nine surveys were initially distributed, 277 were completed and returned, yielding a 65% response rate. Based on the returned replies, the average number of respondents associated with each participant in the executive development program was 6.88. Sixty-five percent of these respondents were employed in the private sector, 40% in manufacturing, and 25% in service organizations. The remaining 35% of the total sample were employed in government agencies.

Participants were generally members of upper level management (78%), including top managerial positions, such as CEO, CFO, COO, as well as vice presidents, directors, and division leaders. Seventy-three percent of the respondents were either the participants in the executive development program or their peers or higher level managers, with the remaining respondents (27%) being subordinates of the participants. Protégés reported an average of 3.4 mentors over the course of their careers. With regard to the gender composition of mentor-protégé dyads, 80% were same-sex relationships (93% male-male, 7% female-female). Of the remaining (cross-sex) relationships, 94% consisted of male mentors and female protégées.

The researchers utilized an inductive exploratory perspective in order to develop a taxonomy of negative mentoring experiences. This was developed using descriptive accounts of negative mentoring experiences from the protégé's perspective. Content analysis revealed 15 types of negative mentoring experiences, nested within five broad meta-themes: Match within the Dyad, Distancing Behavior, Manipulative Behavior, Lack of Mentor Expertise, and General Dysfunctionality. Qualitative analyses indicated that

protégées were more likely to report that their mentor had dissimilar attitudes, values, and beliefs when describing their most negative mentoring relationship compared to their most positive mentoring relationship. Additionally, results indicated that as perceived or actual mentor–protégé similarity increases, so does the amount of mentoring received.

Virtually all empirical research has focused on the benefits of mentoring in a dyad (one protégé and one mentor). More recently, the question has been raised as to whether groups or peers can provide effective mentoring. This is particularly relevant as organizations increasingly restructure by reducing their hierarchical structure and adopt flatter frameworks with larger spans of control. According to many researchers, group mentoring represent relationships that are synergistic, in which co-mentors, in a relationship that is reciprocal and mutual; engage as co-learners in a process of discovery. This allows opportunities to develop dispositions and abilities as well as strengthen individuals' capacities to grow personally and professionally (Kochan & Trimble, 2000). This method of mentoring causes changes in the way individuals think about themselves, their relationships, and their place in the work environment (Bona, Rinehart, & Volbrecht, 1995; Kochan & Trimble, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994; Sumsion & Patterson, 2004).

Peer mentoring is another form of mentoring that is gaining in popularity. Peer mentoring is defined as an individual who holds a comparable position in terms of status and experience to the protégé (Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001). In peer mentoring relationships, both partners take turns at giving and receiving similar types of guidance and support. Research suggests that peer relationships are unique because they offer a degree of mutuality that enables both individuals to experience being the giver and receiver of key functions, in contrast to traditional mentoring in which the mentor specializes in the role of guide or sponsor (Isabella & Kram, 1985). As a lateral form of mentoring within the organization, the relationship between co-workers provides both career and psychosocial support in addition to being more accessible, empathetic, and providing emotional support on a day-to-day basis (Russell & Adams, 1997).

However, the study by Ensher et al. (2001) dispelled these suppositions. The investigators applied the social exchange theory as a conceptual framework in order to examine the effectiveness of various types of mentors and protégés' satisfaction with

their mentors, jobs, and perceived career success. There were 142 participants of which 46% were male and 54% were female. In relation to ethnicity, 11% were Asian, 19% were Black, 18% were Hispanic, 46% were White, and 6% identified themselves as “other”. Organizational composition consisted of 46% were hourly employees, 39% were salaried, non-managerial employees, and 15% were first-line supervisors or managers. Forty percent of the protégés had graduated from college or completed a graduate degree, 51% had completed some college or earned a two-year associate degree, and 9% reported that they had some high school education or had graduated from high school. Approximately 49% of the protégés defined their most influential mentor as traditional, 32% a step-ahead, and 17% as a peer. Thirteen percent had been in a mentor relationship for a year or less, 55% for a year to five years, 17% for five to ten years, and 15% for greater than ten years. The questionnaire was closed-ended and there was a 51% return rate. All responses were anonymous.

Scandura & Katerberg’s (1988) 18-item Mentor Functions Questionnaire (MFQ) was used to measure three types of mentor support-vocational support, role modeling, and social support. The results indicated that vocational support was a significant predictor of proteges’ job satisfaction and perceived career success. Protégées were also more satisfied with, had higher job satisfaction, and reported that traditional mentors provided significantly more support than step-ahead or peer mentors.

Mentoring in Higher Education

Despite the fact the studies on mentoring and its effects on individuals in organizations and youth addressed males and females, the majority of the higher education literature that will be reviewed addresses females. The primary rationale for this is that women now make up 58 percent of graduate students. For the past several years, the number of doctorates awarded to women has been rapidly rising. Women earned over 20% of all doctorates earned in 1975, over 35% of the doctorates in 1990, and almost 45% of the doctorates awarded in 2000 (Hoffer et al., 2001). In education, women earned almost 65% of the doctorates awarded in 2000, representing the largest number of female doctoral recipients within any of the broad fields of study (Maher et al., 2004). Although women are the minority in MBA programs, non-education doctorates

and law degrees and Master of Science programs, they are the majority in medicine at 51% and health science professional programs at 53% (American Council on Education, 2003). These statistics have spawned a host of studies that seek to better understand the purposes, processes, and outcomes of the doctoral education experience (Fagen & Suedkamp Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Lovitts, 2001; Nettles & Milett, 2006; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000).

Women continue to be under-represented at the senior level in most disciplines (Leonard, 2001), and the lower representation of women faculty in many departments may create an unwelcoming atmosphere for some students and greater conflict in determining their role as women in and outside academia (Margolis & Romero, 1998; Raddon, 2000; Ulku-Steiner, Kurtz-Costes, & Kinlaw, 2000).

According to several scholars, the higher the status of the university, the more male academics are likely to work there (Hearn, 2001). Priola (2007) suggests that women not only have to show outstanding abilities to be appointed to senior management positions such as chairpersons and deans in universities, but that they also must not be seen as a threat in terms of management style and subject identity. Women “fail” to gain inclusion because they are judged in systems set up by men reflecting male standards and criteria (Oakley, 2001, p.xii). A study identifying “leaks” in the academic pipeline for women indicates that women are 27 percent less likely than men to become an associate professor and 20 percent less likely than men to be promoted to full professor within a maximum of sixteen years (Agogino, 2007).

The persistence of a masculine culture in higher education institutions may explain the difficulties women face in gaining top positions both at the managerial level and professorial level. Additionally, only seven percent of universities worldwide are led by women (Priola, 2007). Gherardi (1994) argues that femininity and masculinity, while socially constructed, represent a binary opposition in which the feminine part is subordinate, suppressed, and seen as weak and powerless. Mentoring is needed in order to negotiate the “academic glass ceiling” (Harris, 2007). Women who are mentored often report higher ratings of career and life satisfaction as well as more rapid promotion and higher salaries (Casto, Caldwell, & Salazar, 2005; Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

Although the proportion of women faculty has increased, this proportion has not increased as rapidly as the number of female doctoral students (Willis & Diebold, 1997). Female faculties remain under-represented in most departments except traditionally female disciplines such as nursing, and are especially under-represented at the highest ranks (Acker, 1994; Leonard, 2001). Mentoring female students is an increasingly important responsibility of academic women (Barlow, 2005), due to the fact that it can assist in combating feelings of isolation and marginalization (Casto et al., 2005). Yet, because fewer women are in higher-rank positions, particularly in high status fields, female students often have difficulty finding women to mentor them (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Willis & Diebold, 1997).

In most doctoral programs, particularly those in the social and natural sciences, the student's faculty advisor plays a central role in both guiding the student through the dissertation-writing process, and also more broadly in the student's professional development (Foster, 2003; Larsson & Frischer, 2003). In addition, gender issues continue to be the norm not only in degree completion rates but also in objective success criteria such as salary and promotion rates once individuals have launched their careers (Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Bagilhole & Goode, 2001; Jacobs, 1996; Kurtz-Costes, Helmke, & Ulke-Steiner, 2006). Within academia, female graduate students need advice, guidance, support, and networking assistance (Casto et al., 2005). Women may be in particular need of mentors to serve as role models and to help overcome barriers to advancement (Raddon, 2002; Schlegel, 2000).

There are many different perspectives and viewpoints one can possess in relation to what constitutes a successful mentoring relationship. Young and Perrewé (2000) identified five antecedent factors that have an impact on the mentoring relationship: individual characteristics, relationship factors, environmental factors, career factors, and relationship type. Scholars such as Harris (2007) believe that the mentoring process can be either formal or informal. Shaw (2005) points out, to be successful, mentoring must be "meaningful" both to the mentor and protégé; the relationship must entail a genuine rapport. Kalbfleisch (2002) asserts the mentor has to have achieved personal or professional success and is willing and able to share covert and overt practices that have assisted him or her in becoming successful.

The study by Maher et al. (2004) investigated the degree progress of women doctoral students and ascertained factors that constrained, facilitated, and differentiated them in terms of early, average, and late finishers. Early finishers were defined as those that finished the process in less than 4.25 years, average finishers took 4.5 to 6.5 years, and late finishers took 6.75 years or more to complete their doctoral degree. The survey was mailed to 295 doctoral degree recipients admitted to one of several programs in the Stanford School of Education between 1978 and 1989. The last degree recipient who returned a usable survey had completed all degree requirements by the fall of 1997. A 46 item survey that was created out of focus groups and interviews identified 18 factors thought to facilitate degree progress, and 28 factors thought to constrain degree progress. All items were placed on a three-point ordinal scale designed to assess whether each factor affected progress “to a great extent”, “to some extent”, or “to little or no extent”. The survey also included space which allowed for respondents to identify and rate the significance of any factors that either facilitated or constrained progress but were not included in the survey.

Findings included the availability of viable and stable funding sources, the presence of an involved and supportive advisor, and opportunities to participate in meaningful research projects were factors that facilitated the doctoral progress. The authors also noted that designing formalized student mentoring systems would facilitate students’ ability to receive ongoing academic, social, and psychological support from their student colleagues throughout their doctoral tenure. Conversely, several researchers have found that women in formal mentorships receive less coaching, role modeling, friendship, social interactions, and counseling than those in informal mentoring relationships (Ragins & Cotton, 1999).

There are many proponents of same gender mentoring (Barlow, 2005; Farrington, 2007; Harris, 2007; Raddon, 2001). According to a number of psychological theories, people look to individuals who are perceived as similar to themselves in terms of personality characteristics, background, race and sex as models to emulate; thus, women role models would demonstrate and legitimize the professional role for women students (Rothstein, 1995). Other arguments for this stance are female mentors can offer personalized attention that female students need to deal with problems specific to them as

women that they may encounter in the higher education environment (Hurte, 2002); women will have someone to listen to their ideas and give them objective, critical feedback without the influence of gender bias (Greene, 2002); and they can significantly affect women's graduate-level academic experience by increasing connections and decreasing the sense of ostracism, especially for women of color (Ellis, 2001).

In the qualitative study by Kurtz-Costes, Helmke, and Ulke-Steiner (2006), students enrolled in doctoral programs were interviewed to examine the role of gender in their academic experiences. The purpose of the study was to identify factors that impede and enhance progress of all doctoral students, with a focus on gender. Gender was examined in three ways: gender of the student, gender of the student's faculty supervisor, and gender make-up of the faculty within the student's department or academic unit. The goals of the research were to examine characteristics of and relationships among the mentoring relationship, stress, personal/family and professional conflict, and career commitment of doctoral students; and to determine if reports differed according to student and faculty gender. The participants for the study were 20 doctoral students, 12 women and eight men, in their third and fourth years at a large state university in the southeastern region of the U.S. Lengthy interviews were conducted and main themes were abstracted from the data. All students reported the importance of supportive faculty mentors, while women students preferred women faculty mentors.

The findings included that the mentoring relationship often shape motivational and affective aspects of the student's progress, such as his/her level of self-confidence, commitment to the field of study and whether the student persists, and that women students valued women faculty mentors. Researchers also found that women doctoral students who had female role models reported higher levels of self-esteem, instrumentality, work commitment and career aspirations than women with male faculty role models (Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999). In comparison, a recent large-scale study of doctoral students by Ülkü-Steiner, Kurtz-Costes, & Kinlaw (2000) found no differences in reports of mentor support based on the gender of the student's mentor, but lower career commitment among women in programs where the majority of faculty was male. This leads one to postulate that there may be challenges for male mentors of female mentees to overcome, such as pervasive or unaddressed sexist attitudes toward

women in the department, gender politics, and power relations. Socialized roles may interfere in cross-gender mentoring by creating a double bind for female mentees because they find themselves in traditionally subservient positions as both a student and a woman (Olson & Ashton-Jones, 1992). Women perceive that same gender mentorships provide more social support and networking and focus less on the aspect of power differentials than cross-gender mentorships. Alternatively, many researchers deem that cross-cultural mentoring can be successful; however, mentors need to recognize how issues such as differences in communication and power dynamics can influence the mentoring relationship (Brinson & Kottler, 1993; Casto et al., 2005; Williams & Schwiebert, 2000).

Traditional mentoring is when an older, more experienced person serves one of two main functions: a task-related or career-related function, a function geared at providing advice, support, and information related to task accomplishment, professional development, and career success; or a psychosocial function, a function geared at providing emotional and psychological support (Kram & Issabella, 1985). Unlike traditional mentoring, peer mentoring links mentors and mentees who are roughly equal in age, experience, and power to provide task and psychosocial support (Angelique, Kyle, & Taylor, 2002). Peer mentoring in higher education is regarded as an effective intervention to ensure the success and retention of vulnerable students. Structured around Kram's (1983) model of mentoring, which divides mentoring functions into career and psychosocial related functions, Terrion & Leonard's (2007) literature review resulted in a taxonomy that classified ten peer mentor characteristics that were most salient and noted the percentage that each characteristic was cited in the literature.

The researchers employed a term search using 'mentoring' through the Ontario Scholars Portal (OSP) search engine, which provides access to the Ontario Council of University Libraries as well as the Canadian Research Knowledge Network. Results from the following database were used: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Proquest ABI/INFORM Global, and Education: A SAGE Full-Text Collection (includes 26 peer-reviewed journals published by Sage). The search returned 677 articles and in order to be considered for inclusion in the review, articles had to satisfy the following criteria: 1. The article could not be a case study (i.e. focusing on a single mentor); 2. Mentoring had to be the focus of the article; 3. Mentoring had to occur

directly between people (i.e. not be computer-mediated); and 4. Regardless of industry, any mention of mentor selection criteria was included. A total of 54 articles met all four criteria.

Two student peer mentor characteristics supported the career-related function and eight peer mentor characteristics supported the psychosocial function of mentoring. In addition, five prerequisites for the student peer mentor also developed from the review of literature, because of the inability to assign the characteristics to just one function. The two career-related functions of mentoring were program of study (13%) and self-enhancement of motivation (5.5%); the eight psychosocial functions in descending order of frequency were communication (over 35%), supportiveness (30%); trustworthiness (30%); interdependency (24%); empathy (24%); personality match (15%); enthusiasm (13%); and flexibility (11%). The five prerequisites were ability and willingness to commit time (26%); gender and race (18.5%); university experience (13%); academic achievement (9.26%); and prior mentoring experience (1.9%).

Mentoring in Physical Education Pedagogy

Very little research focuses on mentoring in physical education (Bower, 2007; Kovar & Overdorf, 1996; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004; Silverman, 2003); however, the modicum that does exist focuses on two distinct areas in relation to mentoring (Griffin & Ayers, 2005; O'Sullivan, 1989). These two areas of focus are beginning teachers (McCaughtry, N., Kulinna, P.H., Cothran, D., Martin, J., & Faust, R. 2005; Napper-Owen & Phillips, 1995; Patton et al., 2005; Solmon, Worthy, & Carter, 1993; Smyth, 1995; Stroot, Faucette, & Schwager, 1993) and higher education faculty (Dodd, 2005; Kovar & Overdorf, 1996; Mitchell & Ormond, 1989; Safrit, 1984; Thomas, 1997; Williamson, 1993). While physical education pedagogy scholars agree that mentoring is integral to success, (Dodds, 2005; McCaughtry et al., 2005; Stroot et al., 1997; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2001) several argue that the context in which mentoring occurs determines its effectiveness. Many argue that effectiveness of the mentor is the most important factor; the extent to which mentors are meaningfully engaged in the mentoring process has a significant impact on the retention of a protégé (Bower, 2007; Griffin & Ayers, 2005). Although the literature on the outcomes of effective mentoring in relation to

beginning teachers is limited, it does suggest that teachers who receive mentoring are more likely to stay in teaching, be satisfied, hold better teaching attitudes, and implement more effective instructional practices and long term planning (McCaughtry et al., 2005; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Prior to 1990, the majority of literature on mentoring in physical education consisted of program descriptions, survey-based evaluations, definitions of mentoring, and general discussions of mentors' roles and responsibilities, and did not focus on the practice of mentoring directly (Griffin & Ayers, 2005). Limited numbers of comprehensive studies had been done that were well informed by theory and were designed to examine context, content, and consequences of mentoring (Dodds, 2005; Little, 1990).

The millennium brought on an emergence of exploring the various mentoring relationships that serve to support and enhance the professional development of physical educators at different points in their career paths (Patton, et al., 2005). Consequently, mentoring was introduced as a reform tool which was spurred by the necessity to improve the quality of the teacher workforce (Patton et al., 2005); the primary reason for this materialization was driven by the need to increase student achievement. At the public school level, more than 25 states developed some type of new teacher support, and formal mentoring programs were frequently a key aspect of these programs (Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999; McCaughtry et al., 2005; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Research confirms new instructors struggle during induction and could benefit from mentoring (McCaughtry et al., 2005; Smyth, 1995; Williams & Williamson, 1998; Wright & Smith, 2000). Researching the mentoring process ensures that mentors and protégés will be able to work together more effectively in order to have more successful facilitation by the mentors and a greater transfer of knowledge to the protégés (Zachary, 2000).

In an effort to clarify and elaborate on this phenomenon, chief researchers in physical education developed a monograph of three different studies about mentoring, across the physical education profession in an effort to build on, contribute to, and fill in gaps in current research and theory (Griffin & Ayers, 2005). While these studies were not planned, designed, or conducted together, they include descriptions and summaries of current research about mentoring in physical education, in an attempt to share which type

of mentoring individuals along different career paths report as being most beneficial to their personal and professional development.

Patton et al. (2005) described the impact of mentoring and explored the various mentor relationships in order to assist teachers in examining and reframing their assessment practices and to increase students' knowledge and behaviors of physical activity. The researchers investigated key aspects of formal mentoring within a reform-based teacher development project, and explored the various mentor relationships in a qualitative, two year study, which utilized a situated learning perspective. The situated learning perspective is based upon three central themes: cognition is situated in particular physical and social contexts; cognition is social in nature; and knowing is distributed across the individual, others, and tools (Putnam & Borko, 2000). The research questions which guided the study were: (1) what factors contribute to effective mentoring and professional growth and (2) what contexts, activities, and interactions among participants influenced mentoring relationships. The participants included twelve teachers from six middle schools, volunteer mentors from each school (6), and a research team (7 project researchers). The mentors consisted of university faculty and experienced physical education practitioners, with a single mentor being assigned to each school.

Data for the research were collected from mentor records, field-notes from in-service training and mentor brainstorming sessions, four teacher interviews, one mentor interview, and one researcher focus-group interview. Mentor records included phone and email correspondence between mentor and protégé including progress, teacher accomplishments, and problems encountered in implementing project components, teacher goals, and the date and time of the next scheduled mentor contact. Field-notes were taken from videotapes of summer institute training and mentor brainstorming sessions. Four semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers during the project. Interview transcripts were analyzed using open coding (conceptualize, develop, and define categories and their properties and dimensions), axial coding, (identifies subcategories and investigate possible interaction and relationships among subcategories), and selective coding (identifies connections among data sources in order to determine what degree the mentoring process influences).

All teachers reported they experienced an opportunity to work with like-minded people which was an important source of support and contributed to their professional development, opportunities to extend professional networking in order to gain additional training and support, dissolution of hierarchical barriers and stereotypes (i.e. theory vs. practice), and embracement of a sense of empowerment. Issues of power, trust, and vulnerability had to be addressed before mentorships could be developed. In conclusion, the investigators endorsed a form of mentoring that recognized the social and situated nature of mentorship and of teacher learning.

Similar to the aforementioned study, McCaughtry, Cothran, Kulinna, Martin, and Faust (2005) examined the effects of a formal mentoring program on inexperienced elementary physical educators. They investigated the potential outcomes that a reform-based mentorship program would provide for both mentors and their protégés. The two research questions consisted of: how does a reform-based program influence experienced teachers' self-rated competence in mentoring and how these experienced mentors could influence newer teachers' thinking about teaching and the mentoring experience.

The research was taken on in the Midwestern school district which had just adopted the Exemplary Physical Education Curriculum (EPEC) developed by the Michigan Fitness Foundation. EPEC is a health-related physical activity curriculum and has four content areas: physical fitness, activity-related knowledge, motor skills, and personal/social skills. Two groups of teachers volunteered for the year long project, 15 experienced EPEC teachers and 15 newer teachers who would learn and be mentored on the EPEC curriculum. The 30 participants included 12 men and 18 women, mentors were comprised of 12 women and three men, whereas protégés included six women and nine men, with the majority of the participants reporting their ethnic background as African American (n=14) or Caucasian (n=15) and one teacher reporting other. The mentor group was comprised of seven African American and seven Caucasian and one other, while the protégé group reported eight Caucasian and seven African American. Average years of experience for the mentors were 13.56, while the protégé's average was 5.36.

The intervention consisted of EPEC training for protégé teachers, mentor training for mentor teachers, a mentor a protégé merging workshop, an EPEC and pedometer workshop, an EPEC follow-up workshop, and chat room communications prior to and

between workshops. The instruments that were used included the *Mentor's Aptitude Inventory*, which mentors completed nine times and the *Mentoring Functions Scale* (MFS), which protégés completed seven times during the intervention.

The results suggested a general upward trend in teachers' self-reported competencies. After the first mentoring workshop, protégés reported a large increase in positive psychosocial dynamics with their mentors and in the perception that their mentors could assist their teaching and career development and were maintained over time. Older and more experienced mentors were matched with the older but newer teachers. The investigators also noted it is important to consider that when utilizing formal mentoring one must determine whether the potential mentor has the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary to assist the protégé. The study also substantiates the assertion that formal mentorships can be and are successful. Additionally, another factor the researchers felt played a major role in the success of the formal mentoring reform-based program was that mentors were partnered with protégés who had similar types of schools, grades, subjects, and personalities. This outcome corroborates the premise that relational dimensions can and do play a major part in success of mentor relationships.

The qualitative study by Bower (2007) attempted to understand mentoring from the perspective of the mentor and discover factors influencing a mentor's decision to engage 1st-year faculty in physical education departments. The researcher focused on two primary questions: What are the individual reasons for mentoring first-year faculty and what organizational factors inhibit or facilitate mentoring first-year faculty? The study utilized a purposeful snowball sampling and relied on three in-depth interviews of five participants, three females and two males; all identified their race as White. The first interview was thirteen questions and examined the life history of the mentor as protégé and lasted about 60 minutes. The second interview consisted of 26 questions and considered the personal narrative of the mentor as mentor and lasted approximately 120 minutes, and the final interview which was six questions consisted of participants conceptualizing the protégé and mentoring experiences by reflecting on the mentoring experience and lasted approximately 45 minutes. The researcher utilized a phenomenological approach that employed the constant comparative method of analysis in order to develop categories and themes.

The mentors' average number of years in academia was 28.8, ranging from 16 to 39. Four of the participants experienced an informal mentoring program, and one mentor participated in a formal mentoring program. From the questions which focused on how their past experiences as protégés influenced their decision to mentor, three themes emerged: assisted in helping them prepare their own system to advise students in the future; build a means for structure in mentoring relationships; and their friendships helped develop their role as a mentor. When asked what characteristics their mentor had that led to a successful mentoring relationship, four main themes were described: role modeling (leading by example); nurturing (providing care, support, and taking both a personal and professional interest); displaying a personality (displaying a positive attitude, honesty, enthusiasm, listening skills, and humor); and being competent (effective communicator and having knowledge of teaching, scholarship, and service). The final interview question, which asked what outcomes are associated with the mentoring received as a protégé, identified three themes: mentors influenced their personal lives, helped them to develop professionally, and demonstrated how to become a role model for future protégés.

In summary, the mentors' personal portraits as protégés corresponded with the four psychosocial functions set forth by Kram (1983)-role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The researcher posits that since all mentors indicated their early mentoring relationships were positive, this may have led to the desire to mentor first-year faculty.

First-year faculty are pressured to excel in teaching, scholarship, and service (Bower, 2007; Rice et al., 2000). Mentors guide protégés through collaborative efforts on research, discuss teaching methods and creative ideas for service, and provide support. While the majority of the physical education pedagogy literature addresses mentoring from the formal mentoring standpoint, some researchers, like Harris (2007) believe the mentoring process can be successful whether it is formal or informal. She purports that "mentoring can be a nebulous concept if it is not tied to the strategic goals of an academic unit, college, or a university" (p.16). At the same time, junior faculty members seeking informal or unofficial mentors have more confidentiality in communicating about a

combination of personal and professional goals as well as climate issues they might experience in the academic unit.

While all of the aforementioned studies assessed the impact of mentoring on male and female faculty, Dodds (2005) looked at this experience from the female faculty's perspective. The study examined two time periods, childhood and adolescence (referred to as pre-professional or anticipatory socialization) and during one's faculty career, before and after doctoral education (referred to as organizational socialization). Participants were fifty-four of approximately eighty women Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) who had completed an instruction or curriculum doctorate and published in the field's four prominent journals and/or presented research at annual meetings of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance or the American Educational Research Association between 1995 and 2000. Based on their curriculum vitae (CVs), subjects represented the full range of faculty ranks from beginning professor to full professor; years of experience as higher education faculty range from 1 to more than 35 years.

Fifty of the 54 participants were currently employed, four were fully or partially retired, and 11 had changed institutions since the interviews. The research questions that guided the study were: who do women faculty consider to be their mentors? What does one believe their mentors do during the anticipatory/pre-professional and organizational socialization phases of participants' careers, what do they think they learn from the mentors during their careers, and how did they actively participate in mentoring processes? Data collection consisted completion of two paper-and-pencil inventories (rainbow of life roles and a career timeline) and two 4 hour interviews, which were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. Data analysis included both inductively derived categories formulated directly from the data set and deductive categories based on a priori constructs from relevant literature. Open, axial, selective, and process coding were used to interpret data in developing mentoring categories.

The findings were as follows: mentors included family, K-12 teachers, undergraduate professors, and faculty colleagues; family and K-12 teachers taught them basic life values and administrative and faculty colleagues assisted them in learning their profession. Mentors often worked through role modeling, challenging protégés, and

provided opportunities for growth and advancement. Mentors also taught or reinforced what protégés needed to survive and thrive in university cultures, about career and advancement through tenure and promotion, and how to measure up to institutional and individual expectations for research and teaching as major components of faculty work. There was also recognition of the various mentoring relationships such as individual and multiple, formal (official, assigned) and informal (unofficial, voluntary); long and short term; and traditional (single mentor in an intense relationship over time) and multiple forms of assistance at different points in their careers. In summary, the examples of mentoring strongly supported both psychosocial and career development functions found in other research (Kram, 1983; 1985); while role modeling was the most distinct form of mentoring from the data set.

In conclusion, mentoring, when used effectively, is a tool of empowerment and professional enhancement that allows mentors and protégés to join their expertise together in order to generate critical yet practically grounded reflection on their teaching styles and methods in order to become wiser, more skilled professionals (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990, p. 230). It is important to note that not only does mentoring provide positive effects for protégés, but there are also residual effects on all involved professionals (Patton et al., 2005).

Mentoring in Sport Management

During the mid to late 70's and early 80's, physical education at the university level became severely downgraded, and while one program was being eradicated, a new one was being formulated. According to Zeigler (2007) "Burgeoning interest in commercialized, highly competitive sport in higher education and the public sector created a need for establishing and developing college curricula in sport management" (p. 304); causing sport management to become a "field in its own right with its own curriculum independent of former physical education and athletics administration courses" (p. 304). During the mid 1980's the creation of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) came to fruition. With this new development, collegiate administration and athletes were consigned into this discipline.

Limited research has focused on mentoring in sports with regard to educational administration, athletes, and students. The limited amount of research that exists focuses on intercollegiate athletic administration specifically (Benton, 1999; Fuller, 1985; Thomas, 1999; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002; Young, 1990), and does not study mentoring itself, but as a factor, antecedent, or dynamic for outcomes such as success and job satisfaction. For example, Benton's (1999) qualitative study examined the dual factors of race and gender and how these affected black female intercollegiate athletic administrators and to also identify the factors that enhanced and hindered their professional growth. Isolation, marginalization, and nurturing/networking (mentoring) were the common themes that developed from the data. Disappointingly, only one portion has focused on sport management faculty specifically, and is conceptual in nature and addresses the topic from the standpoint of induction to doctoral students (Pastore, 2003).

Pastore (2003) promotes the concept of peer mentoring, which was proposed by Kram (1988) and encompasses mentoring from the context of information, collegial, and special peers. She gives the definition of each of these contexts of mentoring and proposes how they can work in sport management. No research has looked at this issue in relation to gender. Although there have not been any studies on mentoring, its effects, or the different contexts in which it exists, there has been a call by notable scholars in the field to address this deficiency. According to Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke, and Salmela (1998), "the largest body of research on mentoring has been conducted in the field of education" (p. 268); and as Pastore (2003) admits, "Since we are educators at heart, I propose that our field revisit mentoring" (p. 2).

SUMMARY

Historically, sport has always been viewed as a hegemonic social institution that "naturalizes men's power and privilege over women" (Pedersen, 2002, p. 304). As Maher, Ford, & Thompson (2004) persuasively noted, if higher education is to realize the benefits of the growing number of women doctoral students and potential women doctoral degree recipients, it must create an environment that supports them in their struggles and provide opportunities and resourceful strategies to meet the challenges

posed by their worthy pursuit (p.403). Individuals in a positive mentoring relationship are more likely to mentor in the future (Bower, 2007; Ragins & Cotton, 1993); consequently, it is important to determine the factors influencing or motivating these individuals. Therefore, it is important to question how and why gender influences these experiences.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that counts can be counted.

Albert Einstein

The primary purpose of this research was to ascertain, what role, if any, did mentoring play in the career choice and success of female sport management faculty. In contrast to the focus of previous literature, the current study looked holistically at this experience in terms of the essential themes of being mentored across a variety of types of mentoring experiences. This was accomplished by interviewing participants and examining curriculum vitae (CVs). This chapter will provide insight into qualitative research, justifications for the use of this method of inquiry, explanation for the sample selected, and the interview protocol. Additionally, data collection, data analysis, limitations, and delimitations will also be discussed.

Research Questions

The primary research question for this study is: How did a specific group of female sport management faculty attain their present positions?
Some of the additional research questions that will be addressed in this study include:
What factors helped/hindered the attainment of their positions?
What common characteristics these women do/do not possess?
What were the women's personal experiences in their careers?
Did a mentor play a role in career choice and career development?

Qualitative Research

Due to the dearth of research and information on the topic of the influence on mentorships, a qualitative approach was utilized for the study as it allows for the identification of unanticipated phenomena and influences (Maxwell, 1996) and facilitates

a better understanding in what is largely an exploratory study (Creswell, 2003). Qualitative research is inductive and holistic and its aim is to explore complex human issues; it is iterative and flexible in nature. The researcher is an integral part of the research process and aims to show transferability of a study's results or findings (Marshall, 1996). According to notable scholars in the field, there is a tendency to over focus on the same theories and paradigms (Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008). The sport management field must have innovative approaches and look beyond the dominant mainstream frameworks and approaches, hence the search for and integration of alternative methods must be an ongoing process (Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008). This viewpoint was further supported by Amis & Silk (2005) when they articulated:

There is a need for a variety of ways of seeing and interpreting in the pursuit of knowledge; the more one applies, the more dimensions and consequences of the field can be illuminated. It is in this sense that we embrace an expansion of knowledge, of ways of seeking and interpreting through engagement with alternative ontological, epistemological, ideological, political, and methodological approaches to the study of sport management (p. 361).

This qualitative design supports Frisby's (2005) recommendation to utilize multiple paradigms, and more specifically, the critical social science paradigm more often in sport management. According to Inglis (2007) 'this type of research works closely with participants to achieve desired change' (p. 8); and allows ordinary people to address common needs arising in their daily lives and, in the process, generates knowledge (Park, 2001, p. 81 as cited by Frisby et al., 2005). This qualitative approach to the study was also indicative of the epistemological and theoretical perspectives inherent in the design.

By asking research questions from a critical perspective, the use of qualitative approaches must be used in order to best address these questions. A feminist approach will be utilized; this tradition is chosen because it validates personal experience and recognizes marginal voices. The feminist tradition is defined as follows (Gardiner et al., 2000):

Feminist research validates multiple and diverse perspectives, in particular the values of examining these perspectives to clarify one's own beliefs and values, and for the pedagogical opportunities to help one consider viewpoints of other individuals. Women learn from other women's voices and experiences (p. 29).

The intent is to improve current standings in regards to diversity, not only in terms of gender, but in ethnicity. This diversification is integral to the survival and steady augmentation of our programs as viable fields of study. Notable researchers in the field like Frisby (2005) have long called for paradigmatic plurality. There is little doubt that some related disciplines—such as education, cultural studies, leisure studies, and the sociology of sport—have progressed more rapidly than sport management in their acknowledgment of the value of different ideological, epistemological, and methodological approaches. “No specific method or practice can be privileged over any other” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 7). In order for researchers and scholars to proficiently address the multitude of issues in our field, a diverse assemblage is necessary. This assemblage will ensure that various perspectives and viewpoints are addressed in our research endeavors. This ultimately will bring greater understanding in all areas of sport management research.

Phenomenology

This study will depend solidly upon a constructivist view of reality, wherein “all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (Crotty, 1998, p. 42). This will be accomplished by utilizing a phenomenological mode of inquiry. The phenomenological approach focuses on the ways that the life world—the world every individual takes for granted—is experienced by its member (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.489). Phenomenology involves searching for the essences or commonalities of shared human experience, and a rigorous analysis of these experiences is required so that subsequently the basic elements or essence of these experiences can be understood (Patton, 1990). An essence is "The most invariant meaning for a context. It is the

articulation, based on intuition, of a fundamental meaning without which a phenomenon could not present itself as it is" (Giorgi, 1997, p. 242).

According to Rossman & Rallis (2003), this tradition 'seeks to understand the deep meaning of an individual's experiences and how he or she articulates these experiences' (p. 72). The foundational question of phenomenology asks what is the meaning, structure, and essence of the lived experience for this person or group of people, and asks for the very nature of a phenomenon-that which makes a some-'thing' what it is-and without which it could not be what it is (Van Mannen, 1990, p.10). Essentially, there is a focus on exploring how individuals make sense of experience and transform experience into consciousness, both individually and as a shared meaning (Patton, 2002). In its purest form, phenomenology seeks "to transform lived experience into textual expressions of its essence" (Van Maanen, 1990, p. 36). This is accomplished by thoroughly capturing and describing the experience from the participant's viewpoint; how they perceive it, describe it, feel about it, judge it, remember it, make sense of it, and talk about it with others. This is done by employing in-depth, exploratory interviews as its primary means of collecting data (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). Reflection on lived experiences is not introspective, but rather, retrospective; this reflection is always recollective; it is reflection on experience that is already passed or lived through (Van Mann, 1990). Patton described it best when he ascertained:

Experience must be described, explicated, and interpreted. Yet, descriptions of experience and interpretations are so intertwined that they often become one. The purpose of phenomenological studies is to focus on how people put together the phenomena experienced in such a way in order to make sense of the world, and in doing so, develop a worldview; hence there is no separate (or objective) reality for people. There is only what one knows their experience is and means. The subjective experience incorporates the objective thing and becomes a person's reality, thus the focus on meaning making it the essence of human experience (p. 106).

The phenomenon that is the focus of inquiry can range from an emotion (loneliness, anger, and jealousy); a relationship, marriage, or job, or a program, an

organization, or a culture. The goal is to surface the experiential knowledge of participants as distinct and important (Frisby et al., 2005). What knowledge we are able to observe and reveal is directly related to our vantage point; our interaction with the social world is affected by our gender, race, class, sexuality, age, and physical ability, and how these aspects of our identity intersect.

Phenomenological studies are primarily undertaken as a major social science perspective, primarily in clinical fields such as psychology and education. The units of analysis vary from an individual to groups (Creswell, 1998). There is one major assumption that must be acknowledged in the phenomenological approach: there is an essence or essences to shared experiences. These essences are the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced. The experiences of different people are bracketed, analyzed, and compared to identify the commonalities of the essence of the phenomenon (Patton, 2002). There are three major nuances of focus-transcendental (essential meanings of lived experience), existential (social construction of group reality), and hermeneutic (language and structure of communication). This study will utilize the transcendental approach.

The transcendental phenomenological model consists of four stages-epoche, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and structural synthesis. According to Moustakas (1994),

Epoche is a Greek word meaning to refrain from judgment, to abstain from or stay away from the everyday, ordinary way of perceiving things. In a natural attitude people hold knowledge judgmentally; we presuppose that what we perceive in nature is actually there and remains there as we perceive it. In contrast, epoche requires a new way of looking at things, a way that requires that we learn *to see* what stands before our eyes, what we can distinguish and describe. In epoche the everyday understandings, judgments, and knowings are set aside, and the phenomena are revisited, visually, naively, in a wide-open sense, from the vantage point of a pure or transcendental ego (p. 33).

Epoche is a primary and necessary procedure, and in this process the researcher engages in to remove, or at least become aware of prejudices, viewpoints, or assumptions

regarding the phenomenon under investigation (Katz, 1987). As such, epoche is an ongoing analytical process rather than a single fixed event. The process of epoche epitomizes the data-based, evidential, and empirical (vs. empiricist) research orientation of phenomenology (Patton, 2002, p. 485). The second analytical step, phenomenological reduction, consists of bracketing out the world and presuppositions to identify the data in pure form, uncontaminated by extraneous intrusions (Patton, 2002). The elements and essential structures are uncovered, defined, and analyzed. It is treated as a text or a document; that is as an instance of the phenomenon that is being studied (Patton, 2002).

Bracketing involves the following steps:

1. Locate within the personal experience, or self-story, key phrases and statements that speak directly to the phenomenon in question.
2. Interpret the meanings of these phrases, as an informed reader.
3. Obtain the subjects' interpretations of these phrases, if possible.
4. Inspect these meanings for what they reveal about the essential, recurring features of the phenomenon being studied.
5. Offer a tentative statement or definition of the phenomenon in terms of the essential recurring features identified in step 4 (Denzin, 1989, p. 55).

Once the data are bracketed, all aspects are treated with equal value and is "horizontalized" and spread out for examination, with all elements and perspectives having equal weight. It is then organized into clusters where a delimitation process is undertaken. Irrelevant, repetitive, or overlapping data are eliminated (Patton, 2002). The third step, imaginative variation, involves identifying invariant themes within the data. During this step enhanced or expanded versions of the invariant themes are developed; this moves into the textural portrayal of each theme, which is a description of an experience that doesn't contain the experience. The textural portrayal is an abstraction of the experience that provides content and illustration (Patton, 2002). In the final step, structural synthesis, the researcher looks beneath the affect inherent in the experience to deeper meanings for the individuals, who, together, make up the group (Patton, 2002). This requires an "integration of the composite textual and composite structural descriptions, providing a synthesis of the meanings and essences of the experience"

(Moustakas, 1994, p. 144). In order to ascertain this information, certain questions must be asked and answered.

Interview Protocol

The researcher's interest is in gaining a deep understanding of the essential nature and meaning of the mentoring experience for women faculty, in order to gain insight into what this experience is like for women faculty. This line of inquiry led to the research question, which was as follows: What is the experience of being mentored like for women faculty? The following questions were asked in order to answer the aforementioned research questions:

Background Information

- 1) Tell me a little bit about yourself and how you came to be a graduate student in sport management.
 - a. Prompt for educational background, family's educational background, and previous professional experience.
 - b. Prompt for marital status and parental status.
- 2) What were your career aspirations when you completed graduate school?
 - a. Prompt for academia – why or why not?
 - b. Prompt for age, type of program taught in, years in program, and tenure or non-tenured track position.
- 3) When did you start and complete your Ph.D. program?

Influence of Mentorships

- 4) What was the most inspiring thing you recall in graduate school?
- 5) What was your biggest challenge, roadblock, or obstacle?
- 6) Who did you look to for support while in graduate school?
- 7) Who or what was the most influential factor in your successful degree completion?
- 8) Who or what was the biggest influence in your decision to go into pedagogy?
 - a. Prompt for type of relationship-formal or informal.
 - b. Prompt for type of mentor-traditional, step-ahead, or peer.

Data Collection

A purposeful snowball sampling technique was utilized to obtain the study's sample. In this technique, the researcher actively selects the most productive sample to answer the research question/s (Patton, 2002). The sample consisted of those who had similar experiences, known as a critical case sample (Marshall, 1996). The study's sample size consisted of eight participants. The study's sample size was based on Rossman & Rallis's (2003) recommendation that when embarking on a phenomenological study, due to the exhaustive and extensive data that is collected, it is unwise to have more than eight subjects. The other caution is saturation of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall, 1996), which is 'a point in the study at which the interviewer begins to hear the same information reported (Seidman, 1998, p. 48).

The informants were females who obtained their doctorate degrees in sport management and are currently assistant professors teaching on the undergraduate or graduate level in sport management programs. The participants are located at various types of Carnegie classified institutions (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2004) from Doctoral/Research (extensive) to Baccalaureate Colleges (general). The participants were stratified on two racial categories, Black and White. The respondents were chosen from sport management programs in various regions of the United States. This information was obtained by accessing websites of the programs via the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) website and selecting potential subjects according to their first name.

The initial contact was done so by sending an email to three of the potential participants. The potential participants were planning to attend the national conference for sport management faculty and other sport management personnel hosted by the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM). Once at the conference, snowball sampling was undertaken to identify other participants. Snowball sampling consists of subjects identifying and recommending other useful potential candidates for a particular study (Marshall, 1996). Six of the eight participants attended the NASSM conference, which was held on May 27, 2009 to May 30, 2009 at the Columbia Metropolitan Convention Center in Columbia, South Carolina.

All six participants who were attending the conference agreed to be interviewed at the conference. Face-to-face interviews were held in a secluded area away from the normal activity of the conference. The faculty members were interviewed for approximately 60 to 90 minutes in length. Face-to-face interviews were not feasible for two of the respondents; therefore, they were interviewed via telephone conferencing. After the initial interview was held, a follow-up phone call and email with preliminary results for each participant was sent along with a request for an updated curriculum vita. Each participant was given a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality.

Chapter Summary

The primary purpose of this research was to ascertain, what role, if any, mentoring played in career choice and career development of female sport management faculty. The qualitative mode of inquiry was utilized in this exploratory study. This approach was chosen as it allows for the identification of unanticipated phenomena (Creswell, 2003; Maxwell, 1996). Additionally, this mode of inquiry supports sport management scholars' recommendations of employing paradigmatic plurality (Amis & Silk, 2005; Frisby et al., 2005; Park, 2001; and Quatman & Chelladurai, 2008).

Phenomenology was used and involves searching for the essences or commonalities of shared human experiences. This tradition seeks to understand the deep meaning of an individual's or group's experiences and how they articulate these experiences (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In an effort to analyze and describe their experiences, the researcher interviewed a selected eight female sport management faculty, dichotomized by race, which lasted for approximately 60-90 minutes. After the initial interview was held, a follow-up phone call and email with preliminary results for each participant was sent along with a request for an updated curriculum vita.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

All interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed according to the cross case analysis constant comparative method, “a research design for multi-data sources, which is like analytic induction, in that the formal analysis begins early in the study and is nearly completed by the end of data collection” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 66). The steps of the constant comparative method, according to Glaser (1978) include: (a) begin collecting data; (b) find key issues, events, or activities in the data that become main categories for focus; (c) collect data that provide many incidents of the categories of focus; (d) write about the categories explored, keeping in mind past incidents while searching for new; (e) work with the data and emerging model to discover relationships; and (f) sample, code, and write with the core categories in mind. The steps of the constant comparative method occur simultaneously during data collection until categories are saturated and writing begins. This study utilized Glaser’s steps in data analysis, which allows for emergent themes to develop from the data and provides a means by which large amounts of data can be compressed into meaningful units for analysis in an effort to “focus on the ways that the life world-the world every individual takes for granted-is experienced by its members (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 489).

Initially, the researcher listened to the interview transcripts before transcribing them verbatim. After transcription, the interviews were read individually, and while reading, key phrases and statements were highlighted. From these statements and phrases, similar themes began to emerge and were delineated by different colors in order to isolate them. These themes were subsequently given descriptors. These emergent themes were identified in each subsequent interview, and if they did not exist, new themes were created. After these initial themes were formulated, the transcripts were analyzed for themes impelled by the primary research questions. Subsequently, cross-case matrices were compared for common themes across all participants.

The Microsoft® Office OneNote 2007 program was utilized as a resource to gather, organize, search, and share notes, clippings, thoughts, reference materials, and other information. Microsoft® Office OneNote is a software package for free-form information gathering and multi-user collaboration. OneNote's interface is an electronic version of the familiar tabbed ring binder which can be used directly for making notes, but also to gather material obtained from other applications such as word processors, spreadsheets, database applications, and media players. By utilizing this program, the researcher was able to store documents and other files directly on a singular OneNote page, which included audio taped interviews, curriculum vitas, transcription notes, and field notes. Due to the mass storage capabilities of this program, the researcher had the ability to comprise unlimited amounts of information in one location, which allowed for more accurate interpretation and analyzing of data.

Trustworthiness

In an attempt to validate the study the researcher utilized several strategies. The initial strategy was triangulation; which serves as an integral methodological instrument in qualitative research. This methodology strengthens a study by combining methods or utilizing different data sources (Patton, 2001). Semi-structured interviews, curriculum vitae, demographic information, and member checks were all utilized in this study, although most of the data collected emerged from the interviews. Furthermore, thematic summaries and categories were confirmed through direct quotes from the participants. Additionally, the role of the researcher in the study was addressed.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher served dually as the researcher and the research instrument (Patton, 2001); therefore was responsible for not only the research design and framing of the study, but the data collection and analysis, which essentially makes meaning of the lived experiences. The researcher is a Black female doctoral candidate in sport management. The researcher is in a doctoral program because of the influence of a mentor. Due to the researcher's personal experiences, the study will be undertaken from an emic perspective. An emic perspective "views the phenomena through the eyes of

their subjects”; self-determination and self-reflection are emphasized in this approach (Helfrich, 1999). Additionally, the experiences of the researcher could possibly lend itself to researcher bias; however, by acknowledging this before, during, and after the data collection and data analysis process, and embracing one’s role and involvement in research, diminishes its likelihood (Patton, 2001).

Participants

The interviewees for this study were eight females, four of whom are Black and four of whom are White. All eight females are ranked as assistant professors at their respective universities and are on tenure earning tracks. The average age of the participants is thirty-two years old. Average number of years for degree completion was four years. Six of the participants are single, one is married, and one has a domestic partner. One participant has a child, but did not have any children during degree attainment. All participants received their doctoral degrees between 2002 and 2009. One participant received her degree in 2002, four received their degrees in 2006, two received them in 2008, and one participant received her degree in 2009. Half of the participants were first generation college students. All participants were given pseudonyms to protect their identity and all other descriptors such as universities and individuals’ names are fictitious.

Participant #1: Theresa

Theresa is a thirty-two year old single Black female with no children. She grew up in the Midwest with her mother and father and an older brother. Both of her parents were educators, and are currently administrators in the K-12 public school system. Her parents married while they were undergraduates and Teresa reminisces about how both her parents obtained their masters while married. After her father completed his, her mother commuted while simultaneously raising two children. According to Teresa, education was always promoted by her parents; therefore, attending college was always expected. Teresa was a high school track athlete and eventually went to college on an athletic scholarship to a Division I university in the Southwest in which she was a dual major and received a Bachelor of Science in Psychology and Exercise Science.

Upon obtaining her degrees, she had not decided what direction she wanted to go in career wise, so she decided to move back home with her parents. While at home with her parents, she worked in K-12 education for nine months. Approximately four months into the job, Teresa realized it was not a good “fit” for her and decided to return back to school to pursue a Master’s degree. She began looking for graduate schools that she could not only attend as a student, but also be employed utilizing her B.S. in Exercise Science. After sending out numerous resumes and applications, she eventually received an opportunity at the University of Madison, a Division I university in the Southeast. She was employed in the Department of Campus Recreation supervising an outdoor facility for a year and during that year she began her Master’s degree in Exercise Science. At this point in her life, Teresa believed that upon graduation she would pursue a career in collegiate coaching or something along the physical fitness aspect or avenue of sport. She worked in the Department of Campus Recreation during the entire time she was completing her Master’s, and upon completing the Master’s the department went through an administrative shift and she was transferred to supervise the fitness center at the university, which she felt was directly in-line with her degree.

During the latter part of obtaining her degree, Teresa would meet who would eventually become her major professor in her doctoral program. During the last year of obtaining her Master’s degree, she went to a Black male professor to ask him to critique a paper she was writing for one of her classes. She chose him to critique the paper because he had actually written a book that was related to the paper. After reading the paper, he suggested to Teresa that she seriously think about pursuing her doctorate degree, to which she replied, a very strong “No thank-you”. According to Teresa, although she repeatedly told him no, he was relentless. He knew that she worked in campus recreation and asked her to guest lecture in one of his classes about her job. After guest lecturing in that class, he asked her come back to lecture the following semester in another class and continued to try to persuade her to pursue the doctorate. Again she declined and explained that she was looking to pursue a career in campus recreation and progress in the field.

After searching for jobs for approximately a year and nothing ever coming to fruition, she reluctantly agreed to apply to the doctoral program at the University of

Madison. During the initial stages of obtaining the doctoral degree, she states that she fell in love with process and could not find an argument as to not pursue the degree. Due to her professor tutoring and mentoring her while obtaining the degree, she fell in love with teaching and decided to go into pedagogy. This was further confirmed when that same professor introduced her to regional and national conferences related to the field of Sport Management. During her entire time in the doctoral program, Teresa was employed full-time and also taught classes because she was on a graduate assistantship. Teresa feels that her major professor/mentor was the most instrumental factor in her successful degree completion. Another factor that she acknowledged was a cross-discipline all Black female group of doctoral students. She completed her doctoral degree in 2008 and is currently employed as an assistant professor in sport management on a tenure earning track at a predominantly White university in the Southwest region in the United States. She has been teaching there for one year.

Participant #2: Pamela

Pamela is a thirty-three year old single Black female with no children. She grew up in the Southwest region in the United States. She is the youngest of four children and has one older brother and two older sisters. Her parents both have high school diplomas; her mother is a teacher's aide and her father is retired from the military. According to Pamela, her father was drafted while in high school during his senior year and actually received his diploma after serving in the military. Pamela is from a working class family and many of her relatives do not possess high school diplomas. In fact, a goal that is encouraged in her immediate and extended family is to complete high school; college is not "expected". In fact, her mother has stated that one thing she is most proud of is the fact that all four of her children completed high school.

Pamela received her Bachelor of Science in kinesiology from Calkin State, a college in her home state. Pamela was a high school teacher for five years and coached track and field for three years. While teaching and coaching, she decided that she was dissatisfied and wanted move into working in an athletic department on the collegiate level so she decided to pursue her Master's degree in Sport Management at Calkin State, the same university she received her bachelor's degree. While pursuing her Master's one of her professors, a white male, suggested that she pursue her doctorate degree. She was

not interested and told him “No thank you”; however, he continued to pursue her. She repeatedly told him no and explained her career aspirations to him. While finishing up her Master’s she applied for approximately twenty positions and did not receive a call for a single interview. She was very disappointed and felt that the Master’s degree along with her high school teaching and coaching experience along with her experience working at the athletic department on the collegiate level while obtaining her Master’s would definitely assist her in her career aspirations. During this time, her professor again told her that he “saw something in her” and truly felt that she had what it took to pursue a doctorate degree. He actually gave her an ultimatum stating, “Look I have to put my budget in, so are you going to be my doctoral student or what?” She acknowledges that shortly before that conversation with him, he had actually brought in a Black male professor as a guest speaker to the department to speak to the students.

During her entire time pursuing her bachelor’s and master’s degrees, she had never had a Black professor and actually seeing a *Black professor in sport management* made the possibility of obtaining a Ph.D. tangible to her. She could now see herself pursuing a Ph.D. because before this moment, she couldn’t. She states that coming from a family where the emphasis on education was simply obtaining a high school diploma, obtaining a doctoral degree wasn’t anything she thought of or aspired to do. So the third and final time her professor approached her, Pamela finally agreed, after discussing it with her parents. She acknowledges that without her professor (who actually became her major professor) pushing and urging her she would not have pursued her doctoral degree. She also admits that her major professor and her fellow classmates were the two most important factors in her degree completion. She received her Ph.D. in 2008. Pamela is an assistant professor on a tenure earning track in the Sport Management at a Research/Division I university in the Midwest region of the United States. She has been teaching there for one year.

Participant #3: Monica

Monica is a thirty-three year old married Black female with no children. Monica recently married in 2007 to her best friend of fourteen years, which was during the latter part of her degree attainment. Monica is the eldest of two girls. Her mother and father both went to college for two years and never obtained degrees. Her father worked for an

insurance company while her mother works in the k-12 school system as the director of an after-school program. According to Monica, education was always pushed in her family, so she knew at a young age that she would be attending college. Monica attended a Historically Black College/University (HBCU) in the Southeast region of the United States and majored in Biology. She majored in biology because medicine was implanted in her head at a young age by her parents. She was also a varsity golf athlete all four years in college.

After receiving her Bachelor of Science degree in Biology with an emphasis in Chemistry, she realized that her focus had changed. While playing golf, she fell in love with everything about it and was persuaded to pursue a Master's degree in Sport Management by her head coach and attended another HBCU in the same region. While obtaining her degree, Monica interned with a national golf association and through the direction of her female supervisor, she decided that her area of specialization would be golf administration. After receiving the Master's degree, she worked with her supervisor in golf administration working for a golf foundation for two years. Due to a shift in ownership, the mission and goals of the foundation changed, which meant the focus of the entire program shifted. Since the opportunity to do what she loved wasn't there anymore, she decided to apply to graduate school to pursue her doctoral degree at a university in the southwestern region of the United States.

While pursuing her doctorate, she still had the desire to own her own golf program. During her third year in the program, she started working in the athletic department; while working there she realized that athletics was not her "niche". She came to this conclusion because while working in athletics, she realized that what she was being taught in relation to athletic administration about athletics and what actually happens were very dissimilar. She recollects it as being a rude awakening. While working in athletics, she was presenting at workshops as well as having a teaching assistantship- she actually recalls this is how teaching sort of "falling in her lap"; she realized she was more comfortable teaching as opposed to working in administration.

Monica recalls initially entering the doctoral program and everyone wanting to go into pedagogy. She states that her first response to this was "I definitely don't want to go back in the classroom"; she actually taught elementary school for a year and after that

experience, she was adamant this was not the place for her. While presenting in workshops and guest lecturing during her assistantship, she kept being told that she was good at teaching and people were learning things from her workshops; this made her stop and pay attention to what people were saying. After deciding to become more serious about studying and developing her own course outline and teaching her first class, she fell in love with teaching. While obtaining her Master's in graduate school, Monica recalls how creative one of her female professors was in the program; she didn't hold class lectures the traditional way and was constantly thinking "out of the box". She feels this was one of the most inspiring experiences she had and has guided her in developing her own teaching philosophy. Monica completed her degree in 2009 and is currently an assistant professor on a tenure earning track at a predominantly White university in the Southeastern region of the United States.

Participant #4: Kim

Kim is a thirty-four year old single Black female with no children. She is from a small town in the Southeastern region of the United States and has one older brother. Kim's mother has a bachelor's & master's degree in physical education and was a high school physical education teacher and coach. Her father obtained his high school diploma and is retired from the military. Kim was a high school and college athlete and went to college on a volleyball scholarship. She majored in Physical Education at Mitchell State, an HBCU in the Southern region of the United States. Upon completing her bachelor's degree, she became an adjunct professor at Mitchell State and started pursuing her Master's degree in Education; after one semester, she and a woman she considered to be her mentor came to the conclusion this was not a good fit for her and she should pursue an alternate career choice. She then applied and was accepted to the Graduate Program in Sport Administration at a Division I university in the Midwestern region of the United States. While obtaining her Master's she was teaching activity classes and coaching volleyball. After obtaining the Master's degree, her initial intent at that time was to work in a governing body of collegiate sport, such as in a conference office.

While completing her degree, Kim applied to a few positions, but during this process, she was recruited to come teach-she was contacted by approximately two

universities who were interested in hiring her as an instructor. This stopped the job search and she accepted the teaching position at a small liberal arts school in the Southern region of the United States because it was somewhere she was “comfortable going and the hours were great”; the school was actually in the same town as Mitchell State. Kim was also the athletic director at the university. In fact, she was the first full-time and first female in the school’s history. Kim attributes her successful transition through the doctoral program to her mother. Kim is in an assistant professor on a tenure earning track at Mitchell State, the very university she received her undergraduate degree from. She has been teaching there for six years.

Participant #5: Tina

Tina is a White 30 year old married female with one child. She grew up in the Midwest and was raised by her mother and father with her two older siblings, one brother and one sister. Tina is the first in her family to obtain a college degree. Both her parents have high school diplomas and both her siblings went to work immediately after high school. Tina did not get married or have her child until after obtaining her Ph.D.

Tina was a high school athlete and went to college on an athletic scholarship. She attended a university in the Midwest near her hometown and majored in communication media studies with the intent to work in the sport journalism field. While obtaining her bachelor’s degree, she interned at one of the major network television station in sports broadcasting. After obtaining her bachelor’s degree, she realized that this was a very competitive field and that is she wanted to be successful in it she needed to be more specialized in her training so she decided to go get her master’s in sport management at a Division I/Research I university in the southeast. She attended this university for two years and while working on her degree, she also worked in athletic administration in athletic fundraising department on a graduate assistantship. While in the master’s program, Tina decided that after acquiring her master’s, her career aspirations were to work in intercollegiate athletic administration, in either athletic development or media relations.

While working in administration her boss approached her and asked her had she ever considered pursuing a Ph.D. She admits her initial response, was “no, never.

There's no way", but after talking to professors and other individuals, she decided that she actually could "hack it" so she applied and decided obtain her doctoral degree at the same university. She continued to work in athletic fundraising on a graduate assistantship and during her last two years she was a teaching assistant. Although her initial intent was not to teach after obtaining her doctorate, she fell in love with teaching and decided to go into pedagogy. She admits that while teaching in higher education was a very challenging experience, it showed her that she could and does fit into academia. Her biggest challenge while in the Ph.D. program was being young and female; these two characteristics made her feel as if she wasn't respected as much as her counterparts; being in sport management which was and is a male dominated field. She credits her colleagues and boyfriend as the major contributors to her successful degree completion. She states she and her colleagues had very similar backgrounds and research interests; additionally, her boyfriend was also in a doctoral program, they actually defended their dissertations in the same month.

Tina completed her doctoral degree in 2006. After graduating, she was offered a position at a Research III/Teaching university in the Northeast. Tina is an assistant professor on a tenure earning track position. She has been teaching there for three years.

Participant #6: Lisa

Lisa is a 30 year old single White female and was raised in the North with her older brother by her mother and father. Her father has a college degree in accounting, while her mother completed two years of college. Her father is a managing director of a food and beverage company and her mother works in retail. Her older brother has two undergraduate degrees and a Master's degree. He works in the insurance field.

She attended college as an undergraduate at Samson University, a Division I/Research I university in the south. Lisa became interested in Sport Management because of the dormitory Resident Assistant (RA) during her freshman year. Her RA was majoring in through Leisure Services Management with an emphasis in event planning. She states that talking to the RA helped her realize she was interested in the 'business side' of sport. As an undergraduate, Lisa decided to volunteer with a minor league baseball franchise, and after volunteering one year, she ended up performing her internship that's required for graduation with the same franchise. After completing the

internship, she knew she wanted to pursue her Master's degree in order to make herself more marketable in the field. She also states that at this time she had no interest of obtaining a Ph.D.; in fact she had no knowledge of the doctorate degree in Sport Management.

While there was no aspiration to obtain a doctoral degree, she does acknowledge that she always had aspirations to obtain her Master's; obtaining the master's degree was simply a personal, intrinsic goal and was not because of any environmental stressors. After applying to several schools in the Southeast near her current school and being accepted to them, she decided to obtain her Master's at the same university and received a graduate assistantship as a research assistant for one of the professors in her program during her second semester in the program.

While progressing through the Master's program, one professor would talk to the students about the creation of a doctoral program in the department. She reiterates that she still had no aspiration to pursue a Ph.D. In fact she remembers thinking, "no that's crazy, why would I want to do something like that? More school, I've already been here for six years." She also mentions that while the conversations were taking place about the potential doctoral program, the main emphasis was that the doctoral program equaled research; pedagogy was never introduced. After participating in the conversations with other students and professors, and contemplating career opportunities, she realized that she liked the industry but did not like what people were doing in the industry. After speaking to the professor who originally introduced the idea to her, she finally decided that she would give the doctoral program a try. Once she decided to obtain the doctorate, she knew her focus would be pedagogy.

Lisa does not recall how/when the actual transition from the master's program into the doctoral program. She really feels that she sort of "fell into it", in fact, she didn't apply to any other programs and believes that if her professor would not have introduced it and not created a program at her university, she would not have obtained her doctorate. She states, "He finally broke me down". Lisa completed her doctoral degree in 2006. Although Lisa received all three of her degrees from a Research I institution, she acknowledges that she had no intentions of teaching at a Research I institution. She has always had an aspiration to work at a university that was not primarily research focused.

She states that being in pedagogy but still being able to have “a life outside of academia” was extremely important to her. She is an assistant professor on a tenure earning track position at a Research II institution in the Northeast. She has been teaching there for three years.

Participant #7: Sandy

Sandy is a thirty-eight year old single White female with no children. She was raised by her parents with her two younger brothers. She is a first generation college graduate. Both her parents have high school diplomas, are self-employed and own their own business. Sandy received her bachelor’s degree in biology and a master’s degree in athletic training at universities in the Midwest. Upon attaining her certification in athletic training in 1995, she went to work full-time as the only athletic trainer at a small Division III university for approximately two years. Due to the size of the school, Sandy felt overworked and underpaid. Career advancement meant she would have to contemplate relocating to a larger school, which essentially would have destined even more hours at work and even less personal time; thus she came to the conclusion that athletic training was going to be a self-limiting career.

When she came to the conclusion that she had to make a career change, higher education is the first alternative she contemplated. She felt this would give her the opportunity to “have a soapbox to stand on” because she always had an opinion about something. While she had the undergraduate biology and masters in athletic training background, she knew she did not have any aspiration to pursue a doctorate or do research in the sports medicine/exercise science area. She has always had an interest in the underrepresentation of women in sport, so she knew she wanted to focus more into the social science aspect would be more amenable to her interests. She started looking at programs that had her area of interest that were near where she was working and where she was from, which led her to applying and attending a Division I/Research I university in the area. She admits that while she was looking for programs, geography was the main factor, because this is what she could afford.

Sandy worked part-time as an athletic trainer her first year in the program and received a graduate assistantship during the second year of her doctoral program. Sandy states that the most motivating factor that occurred while obtaining her degree was

having the opportunity to be around people who wanted to talk about ideas and think about things more deeply; she hadn't ever thought about sport as critically as she had while in the doctoral program.

Sandy completed her doctoral degree in 2002. She is an assistant professor on a tenure earning track position at a Research I institution in the Northeast. She has been teaching there for five years.

Participant #8: Sarah

Sarah is a thirty year old partnered White female with no children. She grew up in the North and was raised by her mother and father with her younger sister. She describes her childhood as “very much the benefit of socio-economic opportunity and had the benefit of being in an upper middle-class to upper-class environment, and it was always assumed that I was going to go to college”. Both her parents were first generation college students and came from “blue collar environments” but raised their own children in “very white collar environments, which gave us a good perspective”. She admits that she has always acknowledged “that growing up in such an economically advantaged situation is such a head start”. Both her parents obtained masters degrees. Her mother has a Master's in Business Administration (MBA) and her father received a Master of Arts. Her mother worked for the State Medicaid office and is now unemployed and her father is deceased.

Sarah received her undergraduate degree at St. Vernon College, the oldest women's college in the country and attributes it as the singular, most important experience of her life. She states that everything that she likes about herself derived from her experiences at the university. She majored in politics and was a student-athlete. Due to developing a close relationship with Deborah, the school's athletic director, Sarah became interested in Sport Management during her sophomore year. She was able to enroll at a university near hers to take sport management classes, and from that point, she decided to pursue a masters. She went to Deborah for advice and direction as to where to go. Deborah used her networking capabilities and was able to get her admitted into one of the oldest, most popular programs at Douglas State University, a Research I university in the Midwest. She states this was the first time she realized that there was an ‘old girls network’. She acknowledges that “while men have the advantage, women have each

other; which is a renewable resource-the collective power of women to fight for each other”.

Sarah ended up attending Douglas State University to obtain her master’s degree in Sport Management. She was immediately paired with a colleague of her mentor from St. Vernon College, where she obtained her bachelors degree. Upon entering the master’s program, Sarah articulates that she went there with the intention of eventually obtaining a Ph.D. because of the advice and tutelage of her mentor, Deborah. She states that while she didn’t love the university, but she was definitely afforded great professors. She states that the entire program was dynamic, including the students. In fact, she actually obtained both her master’s and doctoral degree from Douglas State University.

After obtaining her Master’s degree, Sarah worked in minor league baseball for approximately one year. While working in baseball, she describes the experience as “brutal” and was exposed to sexist and homophobic jokes. Sarah asserts that she had a “horrific experience being a woman in baseball”; however she also feels that she “possessed the tools to be able to rise above that” and attributes it to her experiences as an undergraduate at St. Vernon College. Once she realized that baseball was not going to work out, she immediately decided that she would pursue the Ph.D. and pedagogy was going to be her focus.

When Sarah reflects on her current position, she admits “The undergraduate Sarah would be shocked that I’m sitting here right now, because I always wanted to be a lawyer or work in politics”. She feels she is currently a professor because of the influence of her mentor Deborah who she’s had throughout her collegiate career. Sarah is currently an assistant professor on a tenure earning track at a Research III/Teaching institution. Although she obtained her degree from a Research I university, her focus has always to be at a university where teaching and advising is emphasized. She has been teaching there for four years. All eight participants’ demographic information is detailed below:

Table 4.0 PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Participant	Race	Age	Marital Status	# Of Kids	Yrs in Program	Mother's Educ. Status	Father's Educ. Status	Siblings
Teresa	B	32	Single	0	3	Master's K-12 Admin.	Master's K-12 Admin.	Older Brother
Pamela	B	33	Single	0	3	HS Diploma Teacher's Aide	HS Diploma Retired Military	Older Brother 2 Older Sisters
Monica	B	33	Married (ABD)	0	6.5	Some College Dir. of After School Program	Some College (Deceased)	Younger Sister
Kim	B	34	Single	0	3.5	Master's Retired P.E. Teacher	High School Retired Military	Older Brother
Tina	W	29	Married (Post PhD)	1 (Post PhD)	4	HS Diploma Administrative Work	HS Diploma Systems Analyst	Older Brother Older Sister
Lisa	W	30	Single	0	4	Some College Sales (Retail)	B.S. Managing Dir. Food & Bev Co.	Older Brother
Sandy	W	38	Single	0	4	HS Diploma Self-Employed	HS Diploma Self-Employed	2 Younger Brothers
Sarah	W	30	Partnered	0	3	MBA Unemployed	Master's (Deceased)	Younger Sister

Findings

While reading the verbatim transcriptions, several similar characteristics and themes began to emerge from the data. Each similarity in issues and events in the text were highlighted using different colors and emerged as themes, these textual similarities subsequently developed into a total of seven major themes and six major personality traits and characteristics of the participants. The seven themes included athletic involvement (highlighted in yellow), career in athletics (green), career aspirations (light blue), pedagogy decision (pink), influence of mentor (red), mentor roles (grey), and context of mentoring (dark green). The six personality traits/characteristics were athletic involvement, career in athletics, parental support, single with no dependents, competitive/confident, and vigilance/determination.

Major Themes

Athletic Involvement

Seven of the eight participants had some affiliation with athletics in both high school and college, which led to their initial interest in going to college. Teresa, Monica, Kim, Tina and Sarah were scholarship funded collegiate athletes; Pamela was a high school coach, and Sandy was an athletic trainer at a university. Lisa was the only participant who did not mention any athletic affiliation before going to college.

Career in Athletics/Sports

All the participants were employed in sport-related fields or athletics but were dissatisfied or desired improved career aspirations. Teresa was employed as a director of campus recreation, Pamela was a high school track coach, Monica was employed in golf administration, Kim was a college volleyball coach, Tina worked for a major sports network, Lisa interned in minor league baseball, Sandy was an athletic trainer, and Sarah worked in minor league baseball.

Career Aspirations

Upon attending college, and even pursuing the master's degree, none of the participants had aspirations to either pursue a doctoral degree or enter into pedagogy.

Pedagogy Decision

None of the participants had any intention to go into pedagogy; several of the women were still resistant to pedagogy even upon entering a doctoral program. All their decisions to subsequently enter the field came from external influences.

Influence of Mentor

Everyone had some form of a mentor previously and currently present in their lives; the major types being a traditional mentor, group mentoring, and peer mentor. Several of the respondents had more than one form of mentoring occurring simultaneously.

Traditional Mentoring

Teresa conveys that she was definitely the benefit of effective mentoring:

“My major professor/mentor Dr. Jenkins was definitely the most influential factor in my successful degree completion. He kept pushing me. Him being with me and showing me the ropes played a big part also. We would also meet once a month just to talk about life. Even after my degree completion we remained extremely close. We're as thick as thieves. We talk all the time. He knows my family and everything, he and my dad have gone fishing together. He's a part of the family at this point”.

Lisa also mentions having a strong mentoring relationship with not one, but three faculty members at her university:

“Dr. Fountain maintained that mentor role throughout my academic career, I consider him more of a friend than a mentor now. The doctoral program is where the transition from mentor to friend happened. Dr. Jones and Dr. Smith [males] were my mentors in the doctoral program also and have transitioned into friends now as well”.

Tina acknowledges that her faculty advisor provided her with support:

“I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him, his door was always open. I had a really good dissertation committee that really helped me, whether it was academic or personal support. I also had great student colleagues. We had very similar interests and very similar backgrounds, so we could really relate to each other. Kim also mentions having effective aspects of mentoring during her academic tenure:

“In my Master's program there was a lot of mentoring, emotionally, spiritually, and mentally”.

Additionally, Monica mentions having mentors while in her undergraduate and master's programs:

“I was introduced to sport management by my head coach. So I decided to go to Hamburg State for my master's. I worked under some great people, Dr. Delores King and Dr. Walter Douglas. They really paved the way for me to understand that this was my niche”.

Although faculty mentoring was not available in Monica's doctoral program, it was observed by her when interacting with the cohorts from her minor program:

“Their instructors were awesome over there. Ours were awesome too, but they were more hands off. Theirs were totally engulfed in their career-they wanted to know everything that they were doing, they wanted to make sure they were graduating, wanted to make sure that they had a job, and I just didn't have that type of support. Like even the department head-they used to call her mom. It was just a whole different dynamic versus my dynamic and my department”.

Peer/Group Mentoring

Although Monica had traditional mentors while in her undergraduate and master's programs, she states she missed this during her doctoral process. Instead she relied on fellow classmates and colleagues:

“During my third year two other African American students joined the program. They became my sister and brother. We were all very far away from home, and the two of them were away from their spouses. We would go out together, study together, and be each other's support system.

She also mentions a cohort she was able to join because of her minor:

“They immediately accepted me into their group. We would get together and counsel each other. We would actually meet once a month and we would meet at each other's houses, and there was a counseling game that we actually made up in a class. And you would discuss things that were going on in your life. We would sit and we would eat and drink wine and relax and it was the best thing. I used to totally look forward to that. Even now we still talk”.

Kim also articulates having peer mentoring while in the Ph.D. program:

“While in the Ph.D. program I looked to my colleague Dr. Willis, we were in the same classes and going through it together. We were also working full time teaching and traveling back and forth during the summer and breaks, trying to cram it all in because of the type of program, we had to do a lot. We supported each other and watched out for one another”.

Although Teresa had a very strong influence of a traditional mentor, she also articulates about the group of women she was affiliated with while in her program:

“I had a group of Black women; we were all getting our Ph.D.s in different disciplines. We were called SisterGirls. There were 30-40 of us. At least four or five of us would get together at least once a week, on Sundays we would write, on Wednesdays we would meet and write on whatever we had. A lot of it was just about how was your week, how have you been, but then doing some writing and asking "what do you have to work on next week?" We made each other accountable but we also had that support system. We laughed together we cried together. I didn't have a cohort of students. Being with them really helped. We would see each other at different events-a lot of us worked on campus. Every semester one of was graduating every semester. Three of us actually presented at a multidisciplinary conference together. Positive women. We networked and we still have a listserv-WomenDocs”.

While Tina mentions her advisor and committee members as academically and emotionally supportive, she credits her peers and her boyfriend as the people she looked to for primary support:

My now husband was also a big support, boyfriend at the time. We went through the process together. We actually defended the same month. My boyfriend and my colleagues were the most influential factors in my successful degree completion. We were all in the same state of mind, we got burned out. There were only 8-10 of us in the program. We would trade stories and classroom techniques. We were together all the time. I'm still really close to them today”.

Mentor Roles

All of the mentor roles, as defined by Kay & Jacobson (1995) were expressed to be present by the participants. These included teacher, guide, counselor, motivator, coach, advisor, role model, sponsor, referral agent, and door opener.

Mentor Roles: Teacher

Teresa: “It was being with him and having him show me the ropes”.

Monica: “She was teaching us all these things about her cultural values and she was able to tie it into sport; I was floored”.

Mentor Roles: Guide

Sarah: “It was my mentor that introduced me to this world of sport management. While in undergrad and being involved w/my mentor at the women's college, she often told me how sport management was a growing field”.

Kim: “I was in grad school in another area, in education, not sport related, and after one semester, a mentor of mine and myself decided I would move on to something else and I enrolled into a sport management master's program”.

Mentor Roles: Counselor

Pamela: “He is also still my mentor; although I'm gone it hasn't stopped. As a student, I didn't open up, but as a colleague I'm opening up.

Sarah: When I broke up with my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was. She was like ‘you live together, do you need somewhere to stay’?”

Tina: “I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him and his door was always open.”

Mentor Roles: Motivator

Pamela: “This was also during the time he was trying to convince me to get my PhD. I had never had a Black professor my entire time at A&M [BS & MS] and to actually see a Black male w/a PhD in sport management. It created the situation where I was like ok; you know what, NOW I can see myself, because before I couldn't. Like I said I came from a family background where you just got a high school diploma. I was also in a situation where you don't see any prominent Blacks who are in higher education. That was a big turning point for me. It was very important for me and other Black students to see a Black professor coming in and that definitely influenced my decision”.

Teresa: “Attending the conferences he took me to, I saw a lot of Black Ph.D.s there. That opened my eyes to the possibility of being a professor. I met a lot of Black professors and that gave me an even bigger push”.

Mentor Roles: Coach

Teresa: “He had his own ways of introducing me to new things. Introducing me to the classroom, he suggested that I co-teach and I said ok. I guest lectured in the class and he suggested I do some research in there”.

Lisa: “He had me submit my manuscript to the NASSM Student Paper Award”.

Mentor Roles: Advisor

Monica: “I gave her a call first and ran it by her to see if she thought it was a good idea for me to make such a huge move”.

Pamela: “I even took my job offers to him first before deciding anything”.

Mentor Roles: Role Model

Sarah: “I just loved seeing her in the classroom everyday, how she would engage students”.

Teresa: “It was being with him and having him show me the ropes, but also giving me the inside perspective on what it means to be a Black professor at a predominantly White institution was helpful”.

Mentor Roles: Sponsor

Lisa: “My first semester in the doc program, Dr. Smith had us presenting. He was the one making sure you get out there in that aspect [career]”.

Pamela: “My first year he had me presenting at conferences”.

Teresa: “He had me presenting my second year of my Ph.D.”.

Mentor Roles: Referral Agent

Lisa: “Dr. Jones introduced you to the people when you were at the conferences.

Sarah: She taught me the value of the "Old Girl's Network", in a way that although men have the advantage, women "have each other". That's a renewable resource; the collective power of women to fight for each other”.

Mentor Roles: Door Opener

Sarah: "I then decided I wanted a master's in sport management. I went to her and said where do I go? She told me where to go-she explained it was difficult to get in but she would make some calls and I would get in. I didn't pay a dime of tuition for my master's or Ph.D. She made sure I was fully funded".

Sandy: "She actually introduced the idea that I could obtain a Ph.D. because I had never thought about it before. She actually introduced that idea to me".

Teresa: "He just sort of showed me what the possibilities were so I could open my range and open my mindset as to where I could really make an impact and make a difference".

Context of Mentoring

Several respondents conveyed different contexts of mentoring, such as the stages of mentoring, career and psychosocial functions, same-gender, and same-race contexts.

Stages of Mentoring

Teresa and Lisa both described the four stages of a mentoring relationship which evolve from mentorship to collegiality; they include initiation-admiration and respect towards mentor; cultivation-psychosocial functions are active; separation-independence and autonomy; and redefinition-relationship takes the form of a friendship (Chao, 1997; Kram, 1983; 1985):

Lisa: "Dr. Fountain maintained that mentor role throughout my academic career, I consider him more of a friend than a mentor now. The doctoral program is where the transition from mentor to friend happened. Dr. Jones & Dr. Smith [males] were my mentors in the doctoral programs and have transitioned into friends now".

Teresa: "I think he saw that potential in me. So from then forward we developed a relationship. We're as thick as thieves. We talk all the time. He impacted my life and is now a staple in my family".

Career & Psychosocial Functions

Pamela mentions the importance of having psychosocial aspects of mentoring:

“It is important to have a supportive mentor who has a personal interest in your success. I know he felt if I wasn't successful, he wasn't successful”.

Lisa was provided career functions of mentoring by her faculty mentors, but looked to peers for emotional support (psychosocial functions).

“My first semester in the doc program, Dr. Smith had us presenting. He was the one making sure you get out there in that aspect [career]”. “Dr. Jones introduced you to the people when you were at the conferences [career]. But I looked for support from the people I went through the program with, because no one understands what you're going through like the people going through it [psychosocial]. They played different roles-we went through it in different ways. We definitely needed each other to get through the program”.

Sandy also relayed receiving both career and psychosocial components of mentoring; however, she received them both from her faculty mentor:

“My second advisor definitely was a friend & mentor. We went out, we laughed, I was able to come to her when I was frustrated. We had a very positive peer relationship as well. She was much more than an advisor, she was definitely a friend. I definitely think that's important to have someone like that during the process”.

Sarah also suggests that she received career and psychosocial support from her faculty mentor:

“She understands that advising is much more than guiding you on the classes you take and the questions you ask. She understands that you are a person. She was such an incredible support structure. She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable”.

Mentoring Context: Same Gender

Many researchers support the importance of same gender same race mentoring because it provides clear messages about the opportunities available to one's own social group (Zirkel, 2002). Sarah also mentions how having a mentor of the same gender affected her:

“She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable. She was such a HUGE [emphasized] support. I don't think I would've

gotten that from a man. I think there is something about it and that is so important. When I had a master's student that wanted to get her Ph.D., I wouldn't send her to a school that didn't have a woman & I think part of that is because I felt taken care of.

Mentoring Context: Same Race

While Sarah mentioned her belief in the importance of having the same gender mentor, Teresa mentions this in reference to race:

Teresa: "Make sure you go to a school with a Black professor that you're going to be working with. It was being with him and having him show me the ropes, but also giving me the inside perspective on what it means to be a Black professor at a predominantly White institution was so very helpful".

Monica also mentions race, but it is in a negative light; she initially questioned whether her mentor's interest in her was motivated because of her race:

Monica: "Initially I questioned if he wanted me because I was a Black female".

Research Question #1: How did the female sport management faculty attain their current positions?

The participants in the study all had the desire to work in sport, but due to dissatisfaction with their various jobs, or inability to enter chosen field, they decided to return to college for their doctorate degrees, which subsequently led to their careers in sport management pedagogy.

Pamela: "My aspiration was to get the Master's and get a job in an athletic department. I applied to approximately twenty jobs, and I did not get called for a single interview. It surprised me because I really felt that having that experience at the high school level coaching and also while obtaining my master's I was working in the athletic department, so I had college experience, but I couldn't get a job. And that was my goal, get the master's and get a job".

Sarah: "I worked in baseball for a year and had a horrific experience being a woman in baseball. Once I realized that baseball wasn't going to work out, I knew I was going to be a professor".

Sandy: "I enjoyed being involved in sport but felt that athletic training was going to be a self-limiting career. I always wanted to be in Higher Education, and have a "soapbox" to stand on because I always had an opinion about something".

Tina: "My plan was intercollegiate admin/athletic development/media relations Initial interest was in communication, sport broadcasting/journalism, but the field was too competitive. While obtaining my master's degree, I was working in athletic fundraising as a graduate assistant and my director/boss placed the idea of getting my Ph.D. in my head. I thought to myself "Hey I can do that!" Last two years were spent as a teaching assistant, and it showed me that I could fit in the classroom".

Kim: "While in undergrad, I didn't think I was going to teach, I wanted to work on the professional side of athletics. After receiving my Master's, my initial intent at that time was to work in the governing bodies of collegiate sport. While I was at Loflin, I was the AD [athletic director] for a year. I was the first full time AD in the school's history and the first female from my undergraduate university to be an AD at a college/university. Doing this, I realized I enjoyed the classroom more".

Lisa: "Upon doing my internship with minor league baseball I decided I wanted my Master's degree to make me more marketable in sport. While in class w/several professors, the world of Ph.D. sort opened up".

Teresa: "With my job that I was currently holding, I was going through my own woes, I was the first black female in campus recreation, I was working full time and I was on call 180 hours per week, was in charge of a weight room, in charge of sixty students and one full-time employee, and renovating a facility, at that point in my life I just wanted to slow down. Looking at the Ph.D. in terms of pedagogy gave me that opportunity".

Monica: "Working in athletics and really getting my feet wet, I was very shocked on the differences of what I thought "went this way" and "this is how the structure goes" and just learning it was totally the opposite way. It was more like a rude awakening. I decided on a career in golf administration. While working with this organization, the mission and the goals of the organization changed. The opportunity was no longer there for me. After this happened, I applied to the doctoral program at the Minnesota University".

Research Question #2a: What factors helped transition through doctoral program?

Emotional support, guidance/contact with major professor, and parental support were the factors cited by the respondents that assisted with the successful transition through the doctoral program in sport management.

Emotional Support

Teresa: “My major professor/mentor Dr. Jenkins would meet once a month just to talk about life. It was helpful to have that dialogue with someone you knew understood.

Sarah: She understands that you are a person-you know when I had broken up with my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was. She was like you live together; do you need somewhere to stay? She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable”.

Sandy: “My second advisor definitely was a friend and mentor. We went out, we laughed, I was able to come to her when I was frustrated. We had a very positive peer relationship as well. She was much more than an advisor, she was definitely a friend. I definitely think that's important to have someone like that during the process”.

Pamela: “My fellow classmates also helped me along the way. That last year they became a support group and helped me get through the process. It was like they were my little fan club. They were always there cheering me on through each step of the process.

Lisa: “I looked for support from the people I went through the program with, because no one understands what you're going through like the people going through it. They played different roles-we went through it in different ways. We definitely needed each other to get through the program”.

Sandy: “I also looked to other female faculty that I had for classes, not just in my area. These were my academic supporters. My friends & significant other at the time were my emotional supporters. I also had fellow graduate students who were helpful; it was mostly guys, so it was me and the boys”.

Guidance/Contact with Major Professor

Teresa: “My major professor/mentor Dr. Jenkins would meet once a month just to talk about life. It was helpful to have that dialogue with someone you knew understood”.

Monica: “My dissertation chair was also very influential in my successful degree completion-I talked to him everyday. We had a standing appointment at two o'clock until I actually finished”.

Pamela: “I'll definitely say my advisor [White male] was someone I looked to for support, I was able to go to him and talk to him about certain things. He would pull me in and ask are you ok, have you eaten, do you need anything? I really appreciated that, him showing that concern. He was also one of the most influential factors in my degree completion”.

Sandy: “My second major advisor was an influential factor in my successful degree completion for sure, she was very helpful in making sure the process was finished and was finished in a timely manner in terms of reviewing chapters and providing opportunities for support. Although my major professor wasn't in my content area, she made sure that I was able to move through the process and move through the degree.

Tina: I had a really good advisor. Although he was extremely busy with all his other roles, such as serving as the coordinator for the undergraduate program, his door was always open”.

Sarah: “Although I didn't love the university, I admired who I worked with, she was great, she was always available and her door was always open. I could discuss anything with her”.

Parental Support

Teresa: My mom and dad were really supportive. Initially, I would go home and attempt to write, but they would want to go out to eat and to movies and stuff-you know to help me relax. “My mom was kind of my greatest inspiration in the sense that she had two kids and would commute back and forth like an hour and a half each way just to get her Master's. Knowing that I was like, well I guess I can do it”.

Lisa: “My family and parents were definitely people I looked to for support while in graduate school”.

Pamela: So when I went home I took it to prayer, talked to my parents, I had only saved up money for one year. My advisor had already told me, I'll get you out in three years. So I was like, that's three years without a major paycheck coming in. So I knew I

would be leaning on my parents. After talking to them I decided to do it". They were so supportive throughout the entire process".

Sarah: My parents raised us in a very affluent area, upper-middle class environment; it was always assumed that I would go to college. Parents came from very blue collar backgrounds, but raised us in a very socio-economically advantaged environment.

Kim: I looked to my mother for support and inspiration. She definitely was one of the main reasons I chose to go into pedagogy; you know just being a creature of nurture. When I looked at her life it inspired me".

Research Question #2b: What factors hindered transition through doctoral program?

Lack of mentor, working full-time, lack of financial support, self-doubt, and isolation were the factors cited by the participants that hindered their transition through the doctoral program in sport management.

Lack of mentor

Monica: "Their instructors were awesome over there. Ours were awesome too, but they were more hands off. Theirs were totally engulfed in their career-they wanted to know everything that they were doing, they wanted to make sure they were graduating, wanted to make sure that they had a job, and I just didn't have that type of support. Like even the department head-they used to call her mom. It was just a whole different dynamic versus my dynamic and my department.

Sandy: "Because I wasn't savvy about how to select a Ph.D. program, I didn't recognize the importance of your major advisor. My advisor was not a very good mentor. He didn't mentor me at all".

Monica: I feel that the dissertation process is a very difficult one, and from my experience, many programs aren't set up to ensure doctoral students are fully aware of what that process is. I think that with a mentoring aspect brought into just that phase, the dissertation phase would be tremendously helpful and so much more stress free".

Working full time

Teresa: “I was working full time while obtaining my Ph.D. I was on call 180 hours a week, was in charge of a weight room, in charge of sixty students and one full-time employee, renovating a facility, at the same time teaching classes and a full time PhD student. So at that point in my life I wanted to slow down.

Monica: “I worked the entire time I was in the Ph.D. program. This taught me that I needed to focus more on school. My husband was the most influential factor in my successful degree completion. He allowed me to take two years off to complete my dissertation. That was a load off for someone who has been working since they were fourteen years old. I knew with my job in athletics, it was becoming more demanding. I wouldn't be able to finish my dissertation and work. So when we got married, he told me to take that time off to finish. I would not have finished it without him”.

Kim: “At the time I was also working at Loflin. I relocated during the summers. I would be teaching during the semester, then during breaks, and the summers I would go down to school and take as many classes as they would allow me to”.

Lack of Financial Support

Kim: “Money was my biggest challenge while in school. I didn't work during the summer, so there was no money coming in.

Sandy: “I was also from that area, I didn't do a lot of research in programs in general, I really thought more geographically, because that's what I could afford. I wouldn't recommend that as the best way of doing it, but it worked out okay”.

Self Doubt

Pamela: “The only barrier would've been me and my thinking process and me self-limiting myself. It took me getting past that internal barrier for me to succeed in the program. Or the constraints that I put on myself. A lot of times you don't have that self-confidence. When I entered the program I kept questioning "should I really be here" and I kept comparing myself to some of the other doctoral students. Initially I questioned if he [advisor] wanted me because I was a Black female. I kept thinking they're better than me, they deserve to be here. It was definitely a situation of low self-confidence.

Especially after that first year, I considered quitting. I really thought I didn't deserve to be there”.

Tina: “One roadblock was being young, I felt I wasn't as respected because of my age and gender possibly, being a woman teaching predominantly males was very intimidating. I had days where I'd be in the classroom, thinking "that was a horrible lecture"!”.

Isolation

Monica: “Getting used to the culture-I felt like an outsider, I dealt with a lot of racism. Even from other African Americans. It's a very sheltered culture and they are not open to new ideas-so you are treated like an outsider purposefully. I never experienced a situation where I had been categorized as being **Black** [emphasized in speech] the moment I stepped through the door. Was always asked "why do you guys do this, why do you guys do that? As if I could speak for the entire race! During my third year two other African American students joined the program. A lot of the stress I was carrying was able to be divided up among not just me, but the three of us”.

Pamela: I isolated myself a lot of times, so sometimes it was hard because I needed a support system. Unfortunately I kept our relationship more formal and school oriented, I really had a problem opening up, I could have but I didn't. He [advisor] was showing that concern but that is something I've always had a problem with”.

Monica: We started realizing that some of the information that our counterparts were gaining, we weren't gaining. We would have to talk to each other to figure out certain information. Things that were common knowledge to some students but wasn't to us. It was hard to have to go and seek out pertinent information that should've been given to me but wasn't. It was most difficult when I was going through the dissertation process.

Research Question #3: What characteristics do these women possess?

Athletic involvement, career in an athletics or a sport-related field, competitiveness/self-confidence, vigilance/determination, and being single with no children were common characteristics that several to all of the participants possessed.

Athletic Involvement

Teresa, Monica, Kim, Tina and Sarah were college athletes; Pamela was a high school coach, and Sandy was an athletic trainer.

Career in Athletics/Sports

All the participants were employed in sport or athletics before deciding to obtain their doctorate degrees.

Competitive/Self-Confidence

Many of the women expressed confidence and a spirit of competitiveness while being interviewed. While no one actually accredited it directly to this being a factor, many researchers purport the influence of participation in athletics or sports as a contribution to self-confidence. Additionally, Pamela, Monica, Tina & Sandy all were the first in their immediate family to receive a college degree.

Sarah: “Not being a quantitative researcher at a quantitative school in a quantitative field. I just kept having to justify myself, but I think in the end it made me a better qualitative researcher because I couldn't waiver. I had to know, I couldn't be half-assed about it. I had to defend it, and in the process of defending it, it meant I had to be completely sure of myself. It makes me a more complete researcher and a more complete person. There are no barriers. You don't ask permission, you just take it”.

Lisa: “I was the most influential factor in my degree completion-they pushed me, but I don't think you can do it if you don't have it in you. I started it so I'm going to finish it. No one was going to write the paper for me. Yes my parents, and advisors, friends, etc. all helped, but it was up to me”.

Tina: “I've always been internally driven, I'm the youngest of three children and have always been a perfectionist and wanted to do everything right. I always did very well in school. This was going to be no different”.

Kim: “We were the only two black females and we were kicking everybody's butt. We were pretty proud of that just to see how well we were doing. It was good to see that two African American females could come in and do so well in a PhD program.

We were competitive among ourselves also, but just to come in and do so well was very inspiring”.

Vigilance/Determination

Sarah: “It was that fear that was that motivating factor-it wasn't like academic interest or it wasn't like I had someone cheering me on, it was the voice inside my head that said what if you don't get this done??!! & I didn't want to know the answer to that question”.

Kim: “Survival played the biggest role in my successful degree completion. I started the program and it was definitely about job satisfaction and future career growth. That factor of wanting to move forward professionally. My only option was to stay in it and finish it”.

Lisa: “They pushed me, but if you don’t have it in you, you won’t finish.”

Tina: “I’ve always been internally driven. I guess it was being the youngest of three children.”

Teresa: “Balancing all my responsibilities was my biggest obstacle. But I got it done-there was no other option.”

Single/No Children

Seven of the eight participants were single during the time they were earning their doctoral degrees. One participant got married during the latter part of degree obtainment (she was ABD). None of the participants had children or dependents while obtaining their degrees.

Research Question #4: What are the women's personal experiences in their careers?

All of the participants spoke positively about their experience as a faculty member and being employed in pedagogy.

Teresa: “I realized that I wanted to have a job in which I had some freedom, my own autonomy, and to be able to help, to really help and mentor, and continue to mentor athletes”.

Sarah: “Also the quality of life of being a faculty member is great. We don't work construction-I don't get up at 7:00 A.M. and come home at 6:00 P.M. Nobody feels bad for us-the quality of life for a faculty is phenomenal”.

Pamela: “I love my job, the faculty members in my department immediately embraced me once I started working there. Although I'm the only African American faculty member in my department, I do not feel like an outsider”.

Lisa: “I wanted to have a life and be in the academic world-it's about BALANCE [emphasized], & I'm thinking about things other than academia in my future. There are goals I have in my life that go far beyond my career; career is a PART [emphasized] of your life”.

Kim: “I started the Ph.D. program and it was definitely about job satisfaction and future career growth. That factor of wanting to move forward professionally. Now as I teach, I think about going back to sport, but I think about my schedule, with teaching you have your weekends and your summers”.

Teresa: “I realized that I wanted to have a job in which I had some freedom, my own autonomy, and to be able to help, to really help and mentor, and continue to mentor athletes. Seeing that they could still travel, because I love to travel and you sort of have your own hours in a sense. And I was going to be able to share my information throughout the country, not just at a particular university; which if you become a practitioner, if I wanted to work in D-1 institutions, senior women's administrator, AD [athletic director], of that sort-I'm going to be at one school. I really felt like the work that I was doing, my research focus was on Black female collegiate athletes, I wanted to get to the masses. Not just to those few at a particular university”.

Monica: “Honestly I truly didn't accept this was my calling until my first two weeks here at my current job. I'm feeling like this is my place”.

Sandy: “It's exciting to have an opportunity to be around people who want to talk about ideas and think about things more deeply. I've always wanted a "soapbox" to stand on because I've always had an opinion about something. I hadn't thought about sport as critically as I started to think about sport when I was in my Ph.D. program”.

Research Question #5: Did having or not having a mentor play a role in career choice?

None of the participants' career choice included obtaining a doctoral degree in sport management and going into pedagogy. The career choices of all the respondents were to obtain master's degrees in an effort to make themselves more marketable and to better position themselves professionally. All were introduced to the idea of pedagogy by someone they considered a mentor or role model.

Sarah: “My parents raised us in a very socio-economically advantaged environment. We always knew we would go to college. It was my mentor that introduced me to this world of sport management. Dr. Jans immediately became my advisor and although I didn't love the university, I admired who I worked with, she was great, and I think that's why I'm here. I think I'm a professor because I've been afforded great professors my whole life and it's a great quality of life. In my dissertation, in the acknowledgements I say "This is here because of her". She really opened up a lot doors I didn't even know existed. It wasn't that I thought I couldn't be in sports, it just never occurred to me”.

Monica: “I was introduced to sport management by my head coach. So I decided to go to Hamburg State for my master's. I worked under some great people, Dr. Delores Miller and Dr. Edward Douglas. They really paved the way for me to understand that this was my niche”.

Kim: “I ended up teaching by being recruited, I didn't apply, they found me. I was literally walking through the hallway, my former professor says I have to take a sabbatical and I think you would be great to teach five classes. I was like me? I'm only 21, and he said I think you can do it. Up to this point, it was a bit of mentoring and a lot of what I enjoyed doing”.

Sandy: “It was an intrinsic decision to go into pedagogy, but I would have to credit a female professor I had while getting my master's. She was brilliant, she was a sport psychologist. We actually had a couple of conversations about moving forward beyond the Master's. She actually introduced the idea that I could obtain a Ph.D. because I had never thought about it before. She actually introduced that idea to me”.

Tina: “While working in Athletic fundraising as a GA [graduate assistant], director/boss placed the idea of getting my Ph.D. in my head. I thought to myself "Hey I can do that!" Last two years were spent as a Teaching Assistant, showed me that I could fit in the classroom. Teaching in Higher Education, showed me I do fit in the classroom, and can provide a lot of experience, although I am young and female. I realized that a college professor doesn't have fit the stereotype, doesn't have to be that older, real wise, Caucasian male. It's not just the older males that are professors today”.

Lisa: “I just wanted a Master's. I had absolutely no desire to get a Ph.D. The connection for wanting a Ph.D. didn't happen until Dr. Smith came in. He would be talking about it in class, and I would be like "No, that's crazy, why would I want to do that? At one point it clicked & I was alright, let's look into it, & I began to talk to Dr. Smith-I don't even remember applying for the Ph.D.! He finally broke me down! Once I started the doctoral program, I knew academia is what I wanted to do”.

Pamela: “While in the master's program, Jim Finley, who was my advisor at the master's level, told me "you ought to consider a Ph.D. I was like, "NO!"[laughing]. I'm not coming here to do all these years. I want to get a Master's and then go get a job. He came back to me like a week later and said, I think you do really good work, I see something in you, you really should go for your Ph.D. I had the same reaction-No. The last time he came to me and said, I have to put the budget in-I need to know if you are going to be my grad student or not. So when I went home I took it to prayer, talked to my parents, I had only saved up money for a year. He had already told me, I'll get you out in 3 yrs. After talking to them I decided to do it. I owe a lot to him because I would not have been here, I told him no twice and he didn't give up. Trying to get a Ph.D. wasn't even something I thought of or aspired to do”.

Teresa: “During the last year of my master's program, I met who became my major professor for my Ph.D. I met him and showed him a piece of my work I had done for my master's on athletic retirement and transition. He read the piece and said to me, "you know you should really pursue your Ph.D. And I said "No thank you!" [laughing]. And so he sort of stayed on me. The decision to go into pedagogy happened while in the Ph.D. process. The conversion happened because of my major professor”.

Summary

Excellent mentoring represents one of the most important features of graduate education (Ellis, 1992; Johnson, 2002). Our system of higher education, though officially committed to the fostering of intellectual and personal development of students, provides mentoring that is generally limited in quantity and poor in quality (Levinson, et al., 1978, p. 334 as cited by Johnson, 2002). Mentoring can be a nebulous concept if it is not tied to the strategic goals of an academic unit, college, or a university (Harris, 2007, p.16). In most doctoral programs, particularly those in the social and natural sciences, the student's faculty advisor plays a central role in both guiding the student through the dissertation-writing process, and also more broadly in the student's professional development (Foster, 2003; Larsson & Frischer, 2003); therefore faculty advisors must move beyond content and get to know their students. Unfortunately, there is an erroneous assumption that students with advisors are engaged in helpful mentorships.

Although the entire female faculty had active mentors in their lives, they alluded to the importance of the relationship one has with their major professor. All participants stated when faculty advisors were actively involved with their advisees, all reported smoother and more expeditious transition through the doctoral program. Teresa confirms this in her assertion "My major professor Dr. Hawkins was the most influential factor in my successful degree completion. He kept pushing me, we would meet once a month just to talk about life. It was helpful to have that dialogue with someone you knew understood." Pamela also affirms this when she states "My major professor Dr. Cunningham is the major reason I'm here today."

In a similar study, women doctoral recipients at Stanford University reported that an active advisor facilitated the successful completion of their program; the participants reported receiving both career-enhancing benefits and emotional support (Maher, Ford, & Thompson, 2004). Women value reciprocal, peer relationships that provide emotional support (Isabella & Kram, 1985; Rayle et al., 2006); therefore it is integral for women to be provided these components in order to be successfully socialized to the world of higher education in every aspect (Arrendondo, 2001, Rayle et al., 2006). There is not a more effective way than mentoring. Mentoring relationships are an integral in the early stages of a protégé's career or during critical turning points. Mentors represent someone

who has accomplished the goals to which they aspire, offering a tangible model, encouragement and support (Daloz, 1990).

Many researchers give emphasis to certain contextual components to include informal mentoring-those that develop spontaneously without formal assignment by a third party; versus formal mentoring-those that are assigned (Dodds, 2005; Bower, 2007); structural components such as same gender and same race versus cross-gender and cross-race mentoring (Dreher, Cox, & Taylor, 1996; Dufor, 2000; Zirkel, 2002); relational dimensions versus functional dimensions of mentoring (Ensher, Grant-Vallone, & Marelich, 2002; Liang, et al., 2002; Rayle, Bordes, Zapata, Arredondo, Rutter, & Howard, 2006), and traditional mentoring versus alternative forms of mentoring such as peer, group or network, and the apprenticeship framework of mentoring (Emmerik, 2004; Ferris & Perrewé, 2008; Pelluchette & Jeanquart, 2000). However, other notable scholars note that successful mentoring relationships employ theory-based and empirically based “best practices.” These include frequency of contact between mentors and mentees (Dubois et al., 2002); duration of the mentor relationship (Grossman, & Rhodes, 2002); and perception of the quality of the mentor and mentee relationship (Grossman, 1999; Griffin & Ayers, 2005; Jacovy, 2002). Additionally, researchers found that perceived attitudinal similarity was the most significant predictor of protégés’ satisfaction with their mentor, racial similarity did not predict protégés’ support or satisfaction with their mentors, and gender was not positively associated with protégés’ satisfaction with their mentors, but was positively associated with psychosocial support (Ensher et al., 2002; Nielson & Eisenbach, 2000).

Furthermore, the most enduring and effective relationships are based on common contributors to relational attraction (shared interests, similarity, frequent contact, and enjoyment of interactions (Kram, 1985; Johnson, 2002; Russell & Adams, 1997). Pamela (a Black female) is a great example of this concept; as her mentor and major professor is a White male that she purports is still a key person in her life today; in fact she states “It is important to have a supportive mentor who has a personal interest in your success. I know he felt if I wasn't successful, he wasn't successful”.

One of the most notable findings in the study was the fact that all the subjects' mentoring relationships developed informally or naturally; many mentoring scholars have found that informal mentorships are evaluated as being more effective and meaningful than formal mentorships by protégés and mentors (Burke, 1984; Fagenson, Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Johnson, 2002; Ragins & Cotton, 1999). Several researchers support the notion of a protégé actively seeking out a mentor who has expertise and shows a willingness to guide them (Barlow, 2005; Harris, 2007; Searby & Tripses, 2006). Two of the participants actually initiated contact with a mentor:

Monica: "Towards the end of my Ph.D., while on the internet, I came across a Black female who I felt I had to meet. I said I have to email this lady! So I emailed her and I told her my whole story, how I saw her bio and how she has done everything I want to do and I told her I think you are awesome, I have to have you in my life. Lucked up and I got the opportunity to meet her and have dinner with her. She really helped steer me on, ok you are about to graduate, we really need to start looking for you a job like yesterday. Sometimes when you are working on your dissertation, you forget there is an after dissertation, so she helped me with the after dissertation. Even when I was involved in the hiring process with the school I'm at, I called and asked her what she thought. She was awesome, she told me it was a perfect fit for me".

Teresa: "I actually "found" my mentor. I'm a book collector and one day while in the bookstore, I saw this book entitled "The Black Athlete". The book didn't have a price and no one could help me so I wrote the title down and went online and looked. When I looked further, it said he worked previously at my university; then I found out he was still here, and upon further digging, I found out, "he's in the same building, he's upstairs!". I went up to his office and introduced myself and told him I was a collegiate athlete and was working on my master's and worked in campus recreation. So he told me to show him some of my work so I shared with him my piece. I think he saw that potential in me. So from then forward we developed a relationship. We're as thick as thieves. We talk all the time. He's a part of the family at this point".

Moreover, several of the participants were involved in peer or group mentoring. In peer mentoring relationships, both partners take turns at giving and receiving similar types of guidance and support. Research suggests that peer relationships are unique

because they offer a degree of mutuality that enables both individuals to experience being the giver and receiver of key functions (Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001). Group mentoring represents relationships that are synergistic, in which co-mentors, in a relationship that is reciprocal and mutual; engage as co-learners in a process of discovery. This allows opportunities to develop dispositions and abilities as well as strengthen individuals' capacities to grow personally and professionally (Bona, Rinehart, & Volbrecht, 1995; Kochan & Trimble, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1994; Sumision & Patterson, 2004).

Mentoring can be formal or informal, can evolve spontaneously or naturally, or can be planned and systematic; it can be same-gender, or same-race, as part of a program, with a cohort group or one-on-one (Girves, et al., 2005). It can also take place over a short period of time or can endure. Context is not as holistically important as actually having a mentor. As evidenced by the participants' experiences, mentoring itself, is far more important than the context in which it occurs.

While the study provided enlightening information about the impact of mentoring in the lives of these women in sport management, this information is indigenous to this group only. Golde (2005) maintained the department, rather than the institution as a whole, is the locus of control for doctoral education; therefore an understanding of the discipline is central to the understanding of the experience in doctoral education (Beecher & Trowler, 2001); and as Lisa so eloquently stated, "I don't think anyone has the exact same experience, everyone has their own weird little journey". This study assists in identifying the influences that contribute or hinder sustainability to this particular field of study (Patton, 2005).

CHAPTER V

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications

Many researchers and scholars have posited the relevance and importance of mentoring (Bower, 2007; Casto et al., 2005; Dubois et al., 2002; Hill et al., 1989; Hurte, 2002; Kaye & Jacobson, 1985; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Sorcinelli et al., 2007).

Researchers have noted that graduate students report development of professional skills, enhancement of confidence and professional identity, scholarly productivity, enhanced networking, dissertation success, and satisfaction of one's doctoral program (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000; Johnson, 2002; Mellott, Arden, & Cho, 1997). Post doctoral benefits include increased income, more rapid promotion, career "eminence", willingness to mentor others, and increased career satisfaction and achievement (Fagenson, 1989; Fagenson-Eland, Marks, & Amendola, 1997; Roche, 1979; & Russell & Adams, 1997).

All of the respondents in the study (Teresa, Pamela, Sarah, Sandy, Monica, Lisa, Tina, and Kim) emphasized the importance of having a mentor and the role it played in their success as students in higher academia; these factors included more expedient degree completion, involvement in scholarly activities such as presentations at regional and national conferences and publishing early in one's professional career; as well as relational dimensions such as frequency of contact, enjoyment of interactions, and shared interests.

There are many characterizations of a mentor-an older, more experienced person who seeks to develop the character and competence of a younger person (Thompson & Kelley-Vance, 2001); a wise and faithful counselor or monitor (Crampton & Mishra, 1999); a senior, experienced employee who serves as a role model, provides, support, direction, and feedback (Noe, 1988); or a person who provides feedback regarding career plans and interpersonal development. These characterizations are summarized in the following roles: teacher, guide, counselor, motivator, coach, advisor, role model, sponsor, referral agent, and door opener.

As a teacher, the mentor relays the skills and knowledge required to perform a position successfully. As a guide, one helps develop professional interests and sets realistic career goals (Geiger-Dumond & Boyle, 1995; Kaye & Jacobson, 1995). The role of counselor requires the mentor to establish an open and lasting relationship; confidentiality and respect are integral components of this role (Chao, 1997; Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). As a motivator, one must encourage and inspire a person. The main function of coaching is feedback; positive feedback to reinforce behaviors and constructive feedback to change behaviors (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995). Advising consists of acting as a sounding board for ideas and concerns, and providing both formal and informal information as well as recommend development opportunities and strategies (Geiger-Dumond & Boyle, 1995). Role modeling consists of providing a living example of values, ethics, and professional practices of the field or area of interest (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995). A sponsor creates opportunities-opportunities that otherwise may not be available. As a referral agent, one recommends or assists in promotional opportunities, and arranges for involvement in highly visible activities (Geiger-Dumond & Boyle, 1995). As a door opener, the mentor identifies resources and finds educational and employment options; he or she also connects one with “the right people” who have either the power or knowledge to further enhance learning or performance (Kaye & Jacobson, 1995).

While a mentor may adopt several or all of these roles, these roles are not synonymous with mentoring, however, they are important aspects of successful mentoring. These characterizations lend credence why mentors are so integral-when these roles are embraced by the mentor, protégés report higher personal and vocational success. For each characterization described, at least two respondents in the study expressed their mentor displayed these roles. Teresa and Monica alluded to the teacher role; Sarah and Kim cited the guide role; the counselor role was mentioned by Pamela and Tina; Pamela and Teresa expressed the motivator role; The role of coach was mentioned by Lisa and Teresa; advisor roles were alluded to by Monica and Pamela; Sarah and Teresa mentioned the role model characterization; the sponsor characterization was mentioned by Lisa, Pamela, and Teresa; the referral agent role was mentioned Sarah and Lisa; and the role of door opener was mentioned by Sandy, Sarah, and Teresa.

While there is debate among scholars in relation to which aspect of mentoring is most successful, such as which type-formal or informal, traditional, peer, or group; in what context-relational versus functional or same versus cross race and gender matching (Anda, 2001; Ayers & Griffin, 2005; Bower, 2007; Chao, 1997; Dodds, 2005; Harris, 2007; Liang et al., 2002; Walz & Gardner, 1992); scholars agree on the advantages of mentoring. While all of the participants alluded to some type of mentoring being present during their doctoral studies, several respondents articulated that a certain type or context was present, and credited it as making their experience more successful. The context of same-gender mentoring was referred to by Sarah; while same-race mentoring was cited by Teresa. Several of the women mentioned receiving different functions of mentoring from different sources. Lisa, Tina, Pamela, and Teresa all mention receiving the career and psychosocial functions of mentoring from their faculty mentors, but also received the psychosocial functions from peers or cohorts/groups they were involved with.

Although there is not clear agreement about *what* makes mentoring successful, there is widespread agreement that it does work and more of it is needed (Crosby, 1999; Gibson, 2004; Girves et al., 2005; Healy, 1997; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Ragins & Cotton, 1999; Zachary, 2000); therefore mentoring women is critical in shaping and raising expectations about academic careers, preparing for the job market, and managing their careers once they gain entry to a faculty position (Girves et al., 2005).

Recommendations

This study contributes to the research on the experiences of women faculty in sport management. The qualitative nature of this work provides the women's personal experiences in relation to mentoring and its influences on their pedagogical decision. Due to the dearth of literature in this area, this study provides a stepping stone to future research.

An implication of this study is while it solidified and corroborated the need and value of mentoring, it also validates the need for further exploration into this area. The sole purpose of this particular study was to ascertain if mentoring played any part in women's career choice and transition. While this study was qualitative in nature and

seeks to give meaning to personal lived experiences, in an effort to foster intellectual breadth, varied methodologies, such as quantitative and mixed methodologies should be undertaken. Quantitative studies could lend insight on the actual demographic information of those women employed in sport management pedagogy, as this number is not available via any of the professional associations affiliated with the field.

Additional research is warranted to identify the relationships/associations between student gender, type of mentorship, and amount of mentoring provided, and time to degree completion. Factors that place women at a disadvantage also have received little attention. Little research that specifically addresses how female students' personal or family needs affect or are affected by their doctoral studies has been undertaken. A study ascertaining whether employing mentoring strategies increases the length of women's academic careers should also be undertaken. Strategies for recruiting women into administrative positions as department chairs, associate deans, deans, provosts, and presidents should also be explored. Additionally, investigations as to if and how women faculty members, who are often mentored by males, maintain a commitment to women's issues. Obstacles to mentoring can also be explored and examined; these include organizational, departmental, and individual barriers. Moreover, the contexts of mentoring, such as career and psychosocial functions and relational functions, and same versus cross-gender and race can also be compared. The effectiveness of different models of mentoring (i.e. peer, group, and network) can also be investigated. As this is not an exhaustive list of potential research opportunities, it is a step in the right direction.

Concluding Remarks

The first doctoral degree was granted in Paris in the twelfth century. The degree doctor of philosophy (Ph.D.) originated in the early nineteenth century at Berlin University and soon spread to the United States. The first Ph.D. degree awarded by an English university was granted in 1920 (Kurtz-Costes, et al., 2006, p.138). According to Hoffer, Dugoni, Sanderson, Sederstrom, Ghadialy, & Rocque (2001), of the doctorate degrees awarded in 2000, approximately half of the recipients were women; between 1996-2005, approximately forty-five percent of Ph.D.s awarded in the social science field have been to women (National Science Foundation, 2005). Although women represent

almost half of those receiving doctorates is the social sciences, these numbers are not congruent to the number of women who constitute faculty members at colleges and universities. This disparity is also evident in sport management pedagogy.

In this country, education remains the heart of opportunity for its citizens. We as a society must ensure that women can also succeed and be part of the American dream. It is imperative that society provide equal opportunity and eliminate barriers to the development of human potential (Girves et al., 2005). While this has always been a personal passion of mine, it is truly inspiring and uplifting to know that I am not alone, as evidenced by the conversations and messages of the participants in this study. I leave you with the final words of advice from the phenomenal women in this study:

Teresa: After you finish it's important to put your story out there for others. It's so helpful. Understand you need a support system, even if it's just one or two people. No one can do it alone.

Tina: Don't be intimidated. You may not know everything there is to know. Sport management is a very male dominated field, it's very encouraging and inspiring to see the growth of women through the years.

Lisa: Being true to yourself is most important. Know what you want-if I had listened to where my advisors wanted me to go, and I wasn't true to myself I wouldn't be happy now. There are goals I have in my life that go far beyond my career, career is a PART of your life. And again that is me being true to me.

Sandy: Seek out an advisor whose work is congruent in what you're interested in. Gender doesn't make a difference, as much as someone whose work is good work and is going to be supportive of your work. It doesn't have to be exactly the same, but within that same area.

Sarah: Don't be afraid of what you want. Don't apologize for who you are. Don't let people make you something you're not. Don't let your advisor decide your research interest based on what he or she is because you'll never do good research. You can't fake it.

Kim: A doctoral program is just running a marathon-it's about just finishing it-completing the program successfully.

Pamela: You have to have minorities in leadership positions because minorities coming in have to see that, so that they can see themselves in that position. It also taught me I have to do what my advisor did for me. When you see someone you have to go out and try to encourage that person. And that's what he did for me. Again, I never even thought about pursuing a PhD. I think there are a lot of minorities out there who have the potential, but no one goes to them and says "you know what, I really think you have something here, you have the potential, I think you ought to consider this, because they don't know their other options.

Historically, mentoring practices have served to keep dominant white males in power (Searby & Tripses, 2006); mentoring has been associated with power, privilege, and social stratification (Gardiner et al., 2000). Now, however, mentoring serves as an effective strategy to recruit and retain individuals in fields, such as sport, that have historically had under representation (Girves, Zepeda, & Gwathmey, 2005).

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Interview Consent Form

This consent form outlines my rights as a participant in the study of The Role and Influence of Mentoring on Women's Decisions to Pursue Doctoral Degrees in Sport Management conducted by Melissa Noland, a Doctoral Candidate at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida.

The purpose of this study is to investigate and identify factors related to success and also ascertain, what role, if any, mentoring plays in influencing female sport management faculty. The study will allow for a greater understanding of the participants and their experiences, and allow respondents to examine these factors from their own perspectives.

I understand that

1. Taking part in this study is entirely voluntary.
2. It is my right to decline to answer any question that I am asked.
3. I am free to end the interview at any time.
4. I may request that the interview not be taped.
5. My name and identity will remain confidential in any publications or discussions.
6. My name will not appear on any tapes or transcripts resulting from the interview.

Interviews will last approximately ninety (90) to one hundred and twenty (120) minutes. Although conversations will be taped, name of participant will be documented on a separate sheet that only the researcher. Tapes and transcripts will be kept up to two years, but will be locked in a file which only the researcher will have access.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Melissa Noland. You may ask any question you have now. If you have a question later, you are encouraged to contact me at 2733

Kennedy Drive, Tallahassee, Florida 32310, (850) 878-7388, man03f@fsu.edu or Dr. Michael Mondello at (850) 645-4825, mondello@coe.fsu.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the FSU IRB at 210 Levy Street, Research Building B, Suite 276, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2742, or 850-644-8633, or by email at humansubjects@magnet.fsu.edu.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

FSU Human Subjects Committee Approved on 5/6/2009. Void after 5/5/2010. HSC#: 2009.2421

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

_____	_____
Signature	Date

_____	_____
Signature of Investigator	Date

The records of this study will be kept private and confidential to the extent permitted by law. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only the principal investigator will have access to the records.

FSU Human Subjects Committee Approved on 5/6/2009. Void after 5/5/2010. HSC#: 2009.2421

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Age: _____

Degree Earned: _____ Discipline: _____

Yrs Attended: _____ Where: _____

Degree Earned: _____ Discipline: _____

Yrs Attended: _____ Where: _____

Degree Earned: _____ Discipline: _____

Yrs Attended: _____ Where: _____

Degree Earned: _____ Discipline: _____

Yrs Attended: _____ Where: _____

Marital Status: _____ # of Children: _____

Other Jobs Held Since First Degree for at Least One Year: _____

Mother's Educ. Level: _____ Occupation: _____

Father's Educ. Level: _____ Occupation: _____

Sibling Gender: _____ Older: _____ Younger: _____

Sibling Gender: _____ Older: _____ Younger: _____

Sibling Gender: _____ Older: _____ Younger: _____

Family member currently a college/university faculty member? _____ Relation: _____

Family member a retired college/university faculty member? _____ Relation: _____

APPENDIX C

CODING SAMPLES

CODING SAMPLES

Teresa

#1 I grew up in XXXXXX. Education is big in our family-both my parents are educators. I was a track athlete, so I eventually went off to college @ XXXXXX. Double majored in exercise science and psychology. Not really knowing what I wanted to do, I found myself moving back home (@ that time it was XX). Worked in k-12 education for about 9 months but after the first four months I said "I can't do this anymore" and realized I wanted to go back to school. I decided I was gonna look for schools that I could go to but hopefully work somewhere within the area. After sending out resumes over and over, I lucked up and got an interview, an opportunity, an offer at the XXXXXX in the dept. of campus recreation and I also realized I could go to school there as well. I worked in campus recreation for a year, it was a brand new job and the position was new as well, so I really wanted to get an understanding of what the job entailed. Within that year I started my MS in exercise science because at that point I thought I was going to go in collegiate coaching possible or something more from a physical fitness avenue. Started out in that job as a coordinator running an outdoor sport facility. Once I completed my MS, our job had an administrative shift-so they moved me over to run the weight room, which actually worked out because I had the degree in exercise science and I was more qualified for that. So I was like "cool, I'll run the weight room".

Parents are married, both obtained their MS while married w/children. They sort of alternated he would commute then she would commute-you know they sort of got their degrees together. They met each other in HS and got married as undergrads. Both work in K-12 education. Both of them have been role models to me.

#2 After doing that [working in campus recreation] for about a year, actually the last year of my master's, I met who became my Major Professor for my PhD. I met him & showed him a piece of my work I had done for my master's on athletic retirement and transition. He read the piece and said to me, "you know you should really pursue your PhD". And I said "No thank you!" (laughing). And so he kinda stayed on me. He knew I was working in campus recreation, so one day he said, why don't you come in and do a guest lecture for my class and tell us about your job. So I came in and did that and told them what I

did, and taught the class a little bit. So he told me "good job, great-you know I have another class this spring and I would like for you to come in. It's Sport and the Black Culture. I want you to tell them about your experiences and talk about the influence of Black women in sport and how they influenced you. So I went in and did that presentation, and again he said, you know you really should pursue your PhD. And I said again, you know, no thank you, I'm looking to pursue a career in focusing on campus recreation and I really wanna move up in that field. In looking for a job nothing really panned out so I was like ok-I give in and reluctantly started my PhD. But through that process of him mentoring me and I guess sort of "tutoring me" if you will, I really kind of fell in love with that actual process and on top of that, which was helpful, was that I had some friends that were on campus that worked full time and they had started their PhDs as well and they were around my age. So that really helped me to just go forward and parents have always been tremendously supportive.

The decision to go into pedagogy happened while in the PhD process. "The conversion happened because my major professor and I grew to know each other very well. He knew me as well as my mom did in that I was one that could not be told what to do. So he had his own ways of introducing me to new things. Introducing me to the classroom, I did not want to teach. I told him I did not want to be a professor, that I wanted to do more of the practical application. He had that same class I guest lectured in before and suggested I do some research in there, and I thought "that would be great". So he suggested that I co-teach and I said ok. So I started helping him teach it and the next thing I knew I wasn't seeing him around as much! I ended up taking over the class. After looking at my options and my research focus started to develop more and more and looking at career options, because while in a program you definitely want to look at that. I realized that I wanted to have a job in which I had some freedom, my own autonomy, and to be able to help, to really help and mentor, and continue to mentor athletes. And after looking at those things, even going to talk to the Senior Women's Administrator, who happened to be a Black female on campus, got some insight from her. She actually told me that she eventually wants to go into the classroom from her job because of the hustle and bustle. I grew up as an athlete, a collegiate athlete, was always traveling, even with my job that I was currently holding, because I was working full time while obtaining

my PhD. I was on call 180 wk, was in charge of a weight room, in charge of students, building a facility, at the same time teaching classes and a full time PhD student. So at that point in my life I wanted to slow down. Looking at the PhD and that opportunity. Also attending the XXXX conference he took me to. I saw a lot of Black PhD's there. He had me presenting my second year of my PhD. That opened my eyes to the possibility of being a professor. I met a lot of Black professors and that gave me an even bigger push to say "you know what, let me check this out". Seeing that they could still travel, because I love to travel and you sort of have your own hours in a sense. And I was going to be able to share my information throughout the country, not just at a particular university; which if you become a practitioner, if I wanted to work in D1 institutions, senior women's administrator, AD, of that sort-I'm going to be at one school. I really felt like the work that I was doing, my research focus was on Black female collegiate athletes, I wanted to get to the masses. Not just to those few at a particular university. He just sort of showed me what the possibilities were so I could open my range and open my mindset as to where I could really make an impact and make a difference.

#3 XXXXXX. MS & Ph.D.

#4 It was being with him and having him show me the ropes, but also giving me the inside perspective on what it means to be a Black professor at a predominantly White institution was helpful. Because even in my own job, I was going through woes, I was the first black female in campus rec. So those things were overlapping. Then I was reading about Black women in sport and experiencing those things and being able to slowly unpack some of that in my writing was therapeutic. It was very cathartic. I think that in itself brought me out of my shell in the sense of finding my voice and figuring who I was and really what I wanted to be. When I finished my Master's I didn't feel complete. I didn't feel like I was going to be able to contribute much to the world. I had a deep sense of responsibility of taking care of others or mentoring others and my parents have raised me that way. I felt, "yes I can do it through fitness", but there's just something deeper there and I couldn't figure out what it was. So I would honestly say that through that program, those three years and experiencing things, reading things, writing things, going to conferences, it all just came together.

I became more conscious of the realities and the scope and the depth of my worth and what these students are going through and wanting to share that with them. Through my job I brought in a lot of students of color and student athletes to work in campus rec.

Pamela

#1 Started with my interest in sports. I coached cross country and track in HS for three years. After teaching for 5 yrs, I decided that I wanted to get away from the HS level. My intention was to only go back to school for 1 yr, get the MS and go back into the industry.

My dad is retired military-he never finished his senior yr, but finished after being in military for a few years. My mother also only has her HS diploma. A key thing in my family is just to complete HS because a lot of my family members aren't getting that. Youngest of 4-two sisters, 1 brother. Brother is the oldest.

Single, no children.

#2 While in the Master's program, XXXXXXXXXXXX, who was my advisor at the master's level told me "you ought to consider a PhD. I was like, "NO!". I'm not coming here to do all these years. I want to get a Master's and then go get a job. He came back to me like a week later and said, I think you do really good work, I see something in you, you should go for your PhD. I had the same reaction-No. The last time he came to me and said, I have to put the budget in-I need to know if you are going to be my Grad student or not. So when I went home I took it to prayer, talked to my parents, I had only saved up \$\$ for a year. XXXX had already told me, I'll get you out in 3 yrs. So I was like, that's 3 yrs w/o a major paycheck coming in. So I knew I would be leaning on my parents. After talking to them I decided to do it.

My aspiration was to get the Master's and get a job in an athletic dept. I applied to approximately 20 jobs, and I did not get called for a single interview. It surprised me because I really felt that having that experience at HS level coaching, but also while obtaining my MS I was working in the athletic dept, so I had college experience, but I couldn't get a job. And that was my goal, get MS & get a job. Trying to get a PhD wasn't even something I thought of or aspired to do.

#3 All 3 degrees from XXXXXXXXXXXX. 2008

#4 One thing that did influence that decision was XXXXXXXX (Black), in Jan 2005 he was invited as a speaker. I go up to XXXXXXXX, and I say thank you. XXXXX is like what, why, he didn't get it. This was also during the time he was trying to convince me to get my PhD. I had never had a Black professor my entire time at XXXXX (BS & MS) and to actually see a Black male w/a PhD in SM. It created the situation where I was like ok, you know what, NOW I can see myself. Because before I couldn't. Like I said coming from a family background where you just get a HS diploma. And also being in a situation where you don't see any prominent Blacks who are in Higher Education. That was a big turning point for me. It was very important for me and other Black students to see a Black professor coming in and that definitely influenced my decision.

#5 The only barrier would've have been me and my thinking process and me self-limiting myself . It took me getting past that internal barrier for me to succeed in the program. Or constraints that I put on myself. A lot of times you don't have that self-confidence. When I entered the program I kept questioning "should I really be here" and I kept comparing myself to some of the other doctoral students. I kept thinking they're better than me, they deserve to be here. It was definitely a situation of low self-confidence. As far as I'm aware, my colleagues didn't think that.

#6 I isolated myself a lot of times, so sometimes it was hard because I needed a support system. I'll definitely say my advisor (White male), I was able to go to him and talk to him about certain things. Church was a very important support system for me. Having friends there, one of my good friends, she helped me deal with a lot of situations. & my other friend, he was the same way. Especially working on the dissertation. It was so stressful-even XXXXXXXX would pull me in and ask are you ok, have you eaten, do you need anything? I appreciate that, he was showing that concern. But I kept it more formal and school oriented, I really had a problem opening up, I could have but I didn't. He was showing that concern but that is something I've always had a problem with. Having my friends also. Especially after that first year, I considered quitting. I still thought I didn't deserve to be there, I talked to my friends and they gave me that vote of confidence.

#7 My advisor & fellow grad students. That last year they became a support group and helped me get through the process. It was like they were a little fan club. Words of encouragement, etc. I was also doing it for my family.

#8 My Major prof-Dr. XXXXXX. He let you know that he was training you for a research 1 school, but if you chose to go to a teaching institution, it was your choice. My 1st yr he had me presenting. He is also still my mentor, although I'm gone it hasn't stopped. Initially I questioned if he wanted me because I was a Black female. As a student, I didn't open up, but as a colleague I'm opening up. I even took my job offers to him. I owe a lot to him because I would not have been here, I told him no twice and he didn't give up. Now I am very strong in mentoring myself. It is important to have a supportive mentor who has a personal interest in your success. I know he felt if I wasn't successful, he wasn't successful (All aspects of mentoring-door opener, coach, etc.). You have to have minorities in leadership positions because future ones coming in have to see that, so that they can see themselves in that position. It also taught me I have to do what my advisor did for me. When you see someone you have to go out and try to encourage that person. And that's what he did for me. Again, I never even thought about pursuing a PhD. I think there are a lot of minorities out there who have the potential, but no one goes to them and says "you know what, I really think you have something here, you have the potential, I think you ought to consider this. Because they don't know their other options.

Monica

Played golf in college (XXX) Majored in biology w/an emphasis in chemistry, put in head as a young child by parents. Medicine implanted early. Neither finished college degrees. Once I finished my undergraduate degree, my interest changed. I wanted to have more of an emphasis on golf. I was introduced to Sports Management by my head coach. So I decided to go to XXXXXXXX for my MS. I worked under some great people. Dr. XXXXXXX & Dr. XXXXXXX. They really paved the way for me to understand that this was my niche. Through a conference we had at our school, I was introduced to Dr. XXXXXXX, who was at the XXXXXXX as an associate professor and I was blown away by what she taught us about the healing well. She's Native American and she was teaching us all these things about her cultural values, she tied it into sport & I was floored and sold on the school. I went there and was happily accepted and graduated w/my doctorate.

#2 I was fortunate enough to get an internship w/the XXXXXXXXXXXX during my MS and got the honor of a lifetime to work under XXXXXXXXXXXX, 1st and only AA woman to hold a seat on the women's committee for the XXXXXXX. To work under her was a huge honor, she was someone who I respected far before I was given the opportunity to work with her. I worked with her for two years in XXXXXXX and through her tutelage I decided I wanted to do golf administration. She became a wonderful role model and continues to be one of my top mentors today, even with taking this job here in XXX. I gave her a call first and ran it by her to see if she thought it was a good idea for me to make such a huge move. It was such a huge move-she was great, she's always great on helping me out in that respect. I really wanted to follow in her shoes, she was at that time the President of the XXXXXXXXXXX. At that time I really saw myself working with this woman for the rest of my life, just because she was doing so many things for minorities in golf. And there was so much to be done, that I really didn't see me leaving, because I felt like to leave her was to kinda leave the dream that she had. At that time I really felt like that was my place. But the thing that actually pushed me away was that we sat down and we talked and she told me that the XXXXXXX actually took over the XXXXXXX. This caused the mission and the goals of the organization to change. It wasn't focused on AA kids, but it focused on all kids. I wanted to be with a program that

focused on AA kids and golf, and my mentor going back to the XXXXXX, that opportunity was no longer there for me.

After this happened, I applied to the doctoral program at the XXXXXX I still had the desire to have my own golf program until my third year when I started working in the athletic dept and was thinking yea I'll work in an athletic dept of a univ, but after worked there for three years I realized that that was not my place. Teaching kinda fell in lap, actually through athletics-doing workshops and doing a lot of teaching assistantships. I really found myself more comfortable with teaching versus working in administration. When I first started my PhD everyone wanted to teach and I said to myself I taught elementary for a year, and I thought I DEFINITELY don't want to go back into the classroom. But while doing workshops I kept hearing I was good at it, and I kept hearing that people were learning things from me and they really enjoyed my workshops. They really enjoyed when I taught a course for one of my instructors. So when you are hearing someone saying that type of thing constantly, you have to wake up and listen. Then once I really put my mind to it and I really studied and I developed a course outline and taught my first course, that love for it was awakened.

#3 Jan 2003-Aug 2009

#4 During my Master's it was meeting teachers that were so creative, Dr. XXXXXX held her classes non traditionally.

On the doctorate level it was my dissertation and all that craziness that went along with it. Working in athletics and understanding the huge differences of what we're being taught about athletics and experiencing what happens. Working in athletics and really getting my feet wet, I was very shocked on the differences of what I thought "went this way" and "this is how the structure goes" and just learning it was totally the opposite way. It was more like a rude awakening.

#5 Getting used to the culture-I felt like an outsider, I dealt with a lot of racism. Even from other African Americans. It's a very sheltered culture and they are not open to new ideas-so you are treated like an outsider purposefully. I never experienced a situation where I had been categorized as being Black the moment I stepped through the door. Was always asked "why do you do this, why do you do that..." During my third year two other African American students joined the program. A lot of the stress I was carrying

was able to be divided up among not just me, but the three of us. We realized that a lot of info our counterparts were getting, we weren't getting.

I feel that the dissertation process is a very difficult one, and from my experience, many programs aren't set up to ensure doc students are fully aware of what that process is. I think that with a mentoring aspect brought into just that phase, the dissertation phase, would be tremendously helpful and so much more stress free.

#6 XXXXXX from XXXXXX. I worked the entire time I was in the PhD program. This taught me that I needed to focus more on school. During my third year two other African American students joined the program. They became my sister and brother. We were all very far away from home, and the two of them were away from their spouses. We would go out together, study together, and be each other's support system.

Also received a minor in multicultural counseling and we had our own cohort (10 of us). They were very close because they took all their classes together. They immediately accepted me into their group. We would get together and counsel each other. They would find me so amusing because they would listen to the types of issues I was having in sport and they just weren't having them. Their instructors were awesome over there. Ours were awesome too, but they were more hands off. Theirs were totally engulfed in their career-they wanted to know everything that they were doing, they wanted to make sure they were graduating, wanted to make sure that they had a job, and I just didn't have that type of support. Like even the dept head-they used to call her mom. It was just a whole different dynamic versus my dynamic and my dept. At first it was really weird to be in a setting where it was ok to cry, because in sports you really don't cry, you're tough & emotionless; just to be able to let all of that go with those guys was awesome. We would actually meet once a month and we would meet at each other's houses, and there was a counseling game that we actually made up in a class. It was like Monopoly based game board and you would discuss things that were going on in your life. We would sit and we would eat and drink wine and relax and it was the best thing. I used to totally look forward to that. Even now we still talk.

Career wise in the end it was Dr. XXXXXXX, President of XXXXX. I just got on the internet and towards the end of my PhD I really had a desire to do something w/ XXXXXX. While on the internet looking at their website, I saw that the president was

this Black female who was also a member of my sorority. I said I have to email this lady! So I emailed her and I told her my whole story, how I saw her bio and how she has done everything I want to do and I told her I think you are awesome, I have to have you in my life. Lucked up and I got the opportunity to meet her and have dinner with her. She really helped steer me on, ok you are about to graduate, we really need to start looking for you a job like yesterday. Sometimes when you are working on your dissertation, you forget there is an after dissertation, so she helped me with the after dissertation. Even when I was involved in the hiring process with the school I'm at, I called and asked her what she thought. She was awesome, she told me it was a perfect fit for me. Also my mom.

#7 My husband-he allowed me to take two years off to complete my dissertation. That was a load off for someone who has been working since they were fourteen years old. I knew w/my job in athletics, it was becoming more demanding. I wouldn't be able to finish my dissertation and work. So when we got married he told me to take that time off to finish. I would not have finished it w/o him.

Also my chair Dr. XXXXX-I talked to him everyday. We had a standing appt at two o'clock until I actually finished.

#8 People-hearing over and over again from people that this was my niche. Honestly I truly didn't accept this was my calling until my first two weeks here at my current job. I'm feeling like this is my place.

Kim

From XXXXXXX. Was a HS school athlete, went to college on athletic scholarship. Majored in P.E., because at that time that was the only option-health or P.E. I finished in 1996, stayed there and taught a year as an adjunct prof. I was in grad school in another area, in education not sport related, so after I semester, a mentor of mine and myself decided I would move on to something else. I went to the XXXXXXXXXX. There I was majoring in Sports Admin., teaching activity courses, and coaching volleyball. After finishing there, I came back to XXXXX to XXXXX Univ. & collaborated w/another colleague and developed a SM program, which had emphases in Marketing,

Administration, & Finance. At that time I just had a Master's. We started working on our doctorate degree two years later.

While in undergrad, I didn't think I was going to teach, I enjoyed it but I wanted to work on the professional side of athletics. But when I kept teaching, I enjoyed it-and while I was at XXXX, I was the AD for a year. I was the first full time AD in the school's history and the first female from XXXXXXXX to be an AD at a college/university. Doing this, I realized I enjoyed the classroom more, and decided I may go back into sport later. Up to this point, it was a little bit of mentoring and a lot of what I enjoyed doing.

#2 After receiving my MS, my initial intent at that time was to work in the governing bodies of collegiate sport. I wanted to work in the conference offices. I ended up teaching by being recruited, I didn't apply, they found me. Before I finished my MS, I started applying at a couple schools, couple schools called me-so before I could finish, they called and offered me jobs-so it ended my job search quick. I decided it was somewhere I was comfortable going, so that was that and the hours were great so I didn't turn it down. I was literally walking through the hallway, & a professor said I have to take a sabbatical and I think you would be great to teach five classes. I was like me?, I'm only 21, and he said I think you can do it.

#3 Summer 1999-2003. XXXXXXXX. Unusual type program-went during summers & breaks.

#4 went I went to my Master's program, the Assistant & head A.D. were both female. They were completely different, but both were really good at their jobs and very effective-I had witnessed women administrators before, but they seemed to be more like "puppets". These women were key functionaries and actually were key people in the decision making. I was very young and it was good to see. And it was a very successful athletic program-it was a winning program. It wasn't like it was just slacking along. It was very well-run and well managed. That was very positive for me.

Just completing the degree because I was working. My colleague, Dr. XXXXXXX. We were there together, we were the only two black females and we were kicking everybody's butt. We were pretty proud of that just to see how well we were doing. It was good to see that two AA females could come in and do so well in a PhD program.

We were competitive among ourselves also, but just to come in and do so well was very inspiring. At the time I was also working @ Claflin. It was just inspiring to finish. I had a lot of great professors that taught us a lot and encouraged us, but it wasn't like my Master's program. In that program there was a lot of mentoring, emotionally, spiritually, and mentally. I was in XXXXXXXX and there were no other Blacks there, my best friend was Asian and he barely spoke English! He didn't come back to school after a year because he couldn't take it and I almost cried.

Tina

#2 Received M.S. in SM in two years; plan was intercollegiate admin/athletic development/media relations

Initial interest was in comm, sport broadcasting/journalism-field was too competitive.

Did internship at XXXXXXXXXXXX.

While working in Athletic fundraising as a GA, director/boss placed the idea of getting my PhD in my head.

I thought to myself "Hey I can do that!" Last two years were spent as a TA, showed me that I could fit in the classroom.

#3 Finished MS & PhD in five years- went straight through

Works @ XXXXXXXX in XXX for 3 yrs

1st in immediate family to receive a college degree.

#4 Teaching in Higher education, showed me I do fit in the classroom, and can provide a lot of experience, although I am young and female. I realized that " A college professor doesn't have fit the stereotype, doesn't have to be that older, real wise, Caucasian male. Not just the older males that are professors today.

#5 Kinda that same thing (inspirational & roadblock). Being young, I felt I wasn't as respected because of my age and gender possibly, being a woman teaching predominantly males was very intimidating. I had days where I'd be in the classroom, thinking "that was a horrible lecture" . But I eventually built up my confidence, and decided "Hey you know what, I know what I'm doing, I have the knowledge. Feeling like you had to know it all, and you can't, there's too much to know.

#6 I had a really good advisor. While he was extremely busy w/all his other roles, such as serving as the coordinator for the undergraduate program, I felt really comfortable talking

to him, his door was always open. There were a few other faculty members, I had a really good dissertation committee that really helped me. Whether it was academic or personal support. I also had great student colleagues. We had very similar interests and very similar backgrounds, so we could really relate to each other. I'm still really close to them today. My now husband was also a big support, bf at the time. We went through the process together. We actually defended the same month.

#7 My bf and my colleagues. We were all in the same state of mind, we got burned out. There were only 8-10 of us in the program. We would trade stories and classroom techniques. We were together all the time.

#8 Internally driven, youngest of 3, always been a perfectionist and wanted to do everything right. Always did very well in school. I was a soccer athlete, wanted to continue to play soccer in college, drove me to want to go to college. Being a HS athlete drove me to want to go to college.

Lisa

#1 & 2 Attended XXXXXXXX as Undergrad; RA was majoring in Event Planning through Recreation, helped me decide I was interested in sport, the "business side" of it. I was allowed to take one class as an elective, it was Intro to SM. As a result of that I wanted to obtain an internship, which was required for the major so I volunteered the year before. Going into the internship with the minor league baseball team, at that point I knew I wanted a Master's, but didn't think I needed it-I don't know where that came from intrinsically, I just know I wanted to go with it. It wasn't even that I wanted it in SM, I just wanted a Master's. I had absolutely no desire to get a PhD. I ended up between XXXX, XXXXX, and XXXXX and no one from any of the programs was extremely helpful, but one of my friends at XXXXX told me about the program & I visited, but decided I liked XXXXX facilities better. While looking for a program, no one really tried to "sell their program" to me. It was actually the Admin. Assistant at XXXXX that explained the program to me. I worked w/Dr XXXXXXX as his Research Assistant and he was working on a grant. At this point, XXXXXXX didn't have a program, so the connection for wanting a PhD didn't happen until Dr. XXXXXXX came in. His strategic vision for the program was to move it from one dept. then start a PhD program. He would be talking about it in class, and I would be like "No, that's crazy, why would I want to do that? They would talk to some of us about it & I would be like "more school", I've already been in XXXXXXX for six years! At one point it clicked & I was alright, let's look into it, & I began to talk to Dr. XXXXXXX-I don't even remember applying for the PhD! He finally broke me down!

#2 Event Planning, wasn't necessarily in sport, until the end of my undergraduate program, when I transferred. Then I just had an educational goal of receiving my Master's-just something I wanted for myself. While in class w/several professors, the world of PhD kinda opened up. If I hadn't worked as a Research Assistant w/Dr. XXXXX I would've never thought about it at all.

My profs play very diff roles on how I teach, my teaching styles & techniques. Teaches in a R2 school, just finished 3rd year, tenure track position. I know that this is where I wanted to be although I feel my profs would've preferred I be at a different type

of school, but I wanted to have a life & be in the academic world-it's about BALANCE, & I'm thinking about things other than academia in my future.

Once I started the doctoral program, I knew academia is what I wanted to do.

#3 2002-2006

#4 Dr. XXXXXXXXXX-he was the prof you wanted to do well for, having him as my 1st prof in undergrad to being able to call him by his first name as a Doc student sort of freaked me out. Initially our relationship was strictly based on funding. This was through the undergrad & Master's programs. Dr. XXXXXXXX maintained that mentor role throughout my academic career, I consider him more of a friend than a mentor now. The doctoral program is where the transition from mentor to friend happened. Dr. XXXXXXXX & XXXXXXXX (males) were my mentors in the doctoral programs and have transitioned in to friends now.

The faculty I was working with-they are two of the most successful scholars in the field. Working with them is pretty substantial. Neither will be okay with you not doing your best. My 1st semester in the doc program, Dr. XXXXXXXX had us presenting. Dr. XXXXXXXX was the one making sure you get out there in that aspect (career), while Dr. XXXXXXXX introduced you to the people when you were there (Promotion).

Sandy

#1 Working as an Athletic Trainer, had MS in this area. I enjoyed being involved in sport but felt that AT was going to be a self-limiting career. Only way to move forward was to go to a larger school and meant less time and less of a life. I didn't see that as the way I wanted to move forward. Always wanted to be in Higher Education, and have a "soapbox" to stand on because I always had an opinion about something. My background is biology and athletic training-Sports Medicine and Exercise Science domain; but I had no desire to do a PhD and do research in that area. I definitely had an interest in underrepresentation of women in sport and those kinds of things, so I thought moving into the social science aspects of sport would work. This led me to look at a degree program at XXXXXXXX. I was also from that area, I didn't do a lot of research in programs in general, I really thought more geographically, because that's what I could afford. I wouldn't recommend that as the best way of doing it, but it worked out okay.

I was a first generation college student-no one on either side has a college degree.

Parents own a family business.

#3 Aug. 1998-2002.

#4 It was exciting to have an opportunity to be around people who wanted to talk about ideas and think about things more deeply. I hadn't thought about sport as critically as I started to think about sport when I was in that program. Having the opportunity to read articles by brilliant people, not just in sport but in other areas. And to sit in a group in seminar classes and talk about these things and really engage in that and think about how would you study these things.

#5 **Because I wasn't saavy about how to select a PhD program, I didn't recognize the importance of your major advisor.** I just kinda went about it the way one would choose their undergrad major, just look for a school that offers what you wanted. Now obviously I know you need to look for a good advisor, one who can help develop your line of research. **My advisor was not a very good mentor. He didn't mentor me at all.** After my second year, the dept. chair found out he wasn't providing me research opportunities, I was just basically his teaching assistant and that wasn't the role I was supposed to be in. So my dept chair didn't make me, but strongly advised me to switch. My new major advisor had no interest in my area-she was an exercise physiologist, **so although she was a good mentor, she didn't really help me with the research part of my doctoral degree because she didn't do sport management research.** So this was a constraint for me early as a faculty member, because I didn't have a strong research background. So I floundered my first couple years as a faculty member because I was having a hard time finding a research track. So now I make it a point to advise students to find an advisor who does work, at least remotely related to what you want because I didn't know that at the time.

#6 My second major professor because she did research and understood the process. She was very very bright. I also looked to other female faculty that I had for classes, not just in my area. These were my academic supporters. My parents from a financial standpoint. My friends & sig other at the time were my emotional supporters. I also had fellow grad students who were helpful. It was mostly guys, so it was me & the boys.

#7 My second major advisor for sure. & my entire committee was very helpful in making sure the process was finished and was finished in a timely manner in terms of

reviewing chapters and providing opportunities for support. There can be horror stories about people hanging on to things for a long period of time. Although my Major Prof. wasn't in my content area, she made sure that I was able to move through the process and move through the degree.

#8 It was an intrinsic decision, but I would have to credit a female professor I had while getting my master's. She was brilliant, she was a sport psychologist. We actually had a couple of conversations about moving forward beyond the Master's. She actually introduced the idea that I could obtain a PhD because I had never thought about it before. She actually introduced that idea to me.

& my second advisor definitely was a friend & mentor. We went out, we laughed, I was able to come to her when I was frustrated. We had a very positive peer relationship as well. She was much more than an advisor, she was definitely a friend. I definitely think that's important to have someone like that during the process.

Sarah

#1 & 2 From XXXXX, Athlete. The college or undergrad Sarah would be shocked at me sitting here, because I always wanted to be a lawyer or work in politics. I ended up going to the oldest women's college in the country. Everything that I am and everything that I like about myself, derived from that experience. It was the singular most important experience of my life. It was an academically rigorous, but yet supportive environment. I studied politics there and played XXXXX. This assisted me in having a really incredible mentorship relationship with the Athletic Director, who was one of the most prominent women in collegiate sport. I think she saw something in me that I didn't see in myself because it never occurred to me that women could work in sport. I thought women could either be a player or a coach. It never occurred to me that someone has to run the show. She was incredible, and by sophomore year I became interested in SM, and decided to get a bachelor's at a university near mine because we were able to take classes. I then decided I wanted a Master's in SM. I went to her and said where do I go, she told me where to go-she explained it was difficult to get in but I would get in. She taught me the value of the "Ol Girl's Network", in a way that although men have the advantage, women "have each other". That's a renewable resource. The collective power of women to fight for each other, although we do a lot of crappy things to each other. XXXXXX immediately became my advisor and although I didn't love the univ, I admired who I worked with, she was great, and I think that's why I'm here. I think I'm a professor because I've been afforded great professors my whole life and it's a great quality of life. I worked in baseball and had a horrific experience being a woman in baseball, but I always had the tools to be able to rise above that and I attribute that to my undergraduate college. I worked there for a year. Once I realized that baseball wasn't going to work out, I knew I was going to be a professor.

#2 So once I decided to go and get my Master's, I knew I would be staying there for my PhD as well. There was a part of me that really liked the idea of being a professor and while in undergrad and being involved w/my mentor at the women's college, she often told me how sport management was a growing field. So I never had a fear of not getting a job like some may have today because of the job market shrinking. So I went with the intention to stay for a PhD. Being there I just loved seeing XXXXXX in the classroom

everyday, how she would engage students & how she got men on her side, although she would give them this hard feminist perspective, they would cheer her along. It's such an incredible thing that women can do that. I think between all my undergrad profs & profs I had at the dynamic program I was in, why would I not want to be a professor?

She was such an incredible support structure. She understands that advising is much more than guiding you on the classes you take and the questions you ask. She understands that you are a person-you know when I had broken up w/my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was. She was like you live together, do you need somewhere to stay? She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable. & I don't think I would've gotten that from a man. I think there is something about it and that is so important. When I had a Masters student that wanted to get her PhD, I wouldn't send her to a school that didn't have a woman & I think part of that is because I felt taken care of. So I think she was a Huge support.

APPENDIX D

MICROSOFT® ONENOTE PDF

Themes & Categories

Wednesday, October 07, 2009

6:51 PM

Peer/Traditional Mentoring

Although Teresa had a very strong influence of a traditional mentor, she also benefits about the group of women she was affiliated with while in her program: I had a group of Black women, we were all getting our PhDs in different disciplines. We were called SisterGirls. There were 30-40. At least 4-5 of us would get together at least once a week, on Sundays we would write, on Wed we would meet and write on whatever we had. A lot of it was just about how was your week, how have you been, but then doing some writing and asking "what do you have to work on next week?" We made each other accountable but we also had that support system. We laughed together we cried together. I didn't have a cohort of students. Being with them really helped. We would see each other at different events-a lot of us worked on campus. Every semester one of us was graduating every semester. Three of us actually presented at a multidisciplinary conference together. Positive women. We networked and we still have a listserve-Doza.

While Tina mentions her advisor and committee members as academically and emotionally supportive, she credits her peers and her boyfriend as the people she looked to for primary support. This is an example of both traditional and peer mentoring:

I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him, his door was always open. I had a really good dissertation committee that really helped me. Whether it was academic or personal support. I also had great student colleagues. We had very similar interests and very similar backgrounds, so we could really relate to each other. My now husband was also a big support, boyfriend at the time. We went through the process together. We actually defended the same month. My boyfriend and my colleagues were the most influential factors in my successful degree completion. We were all in the same state of mind, we got burned out. There were only 8-10 of us in the program. We would trade stories and classroom techniques. We were together all the time. I'm still really close to them today.

Kim also alludes to having peer mentoring while in the PhD program: "While in the PhD program I looked to my colleague Dr. Wilks, we were in the same classes and going through it together. We were also working full time teaching and traveling back and forth during the summer and breaks, trying to cram it all in because of the type of program, we had to do a lot. We supported each other and watched out for one another."

Although Monica had traditional mentors while in her undergraduate and master's programs, she states she missed this during her doctoral process. Instead she relied on fellow classmates and colleagues:

During my third year two other African American students joined the program. They became my sister and brother. We were all very far away from home, and the two of them were away from their spouses. We would go out together, study together, and be each other's support system.

She also mentions a cohort she was able to join because of her minor: They immediately accepted me into their group. We would get together and counsel each other. We would actually meet once a month and we would meet at each other's houses, and there was a counseling game that we actually made up in a class, and you would discuss things that were going on in your life. We would sit and we would eat and drink wine and relax and it was the best thing. I used to totally look forward to that. Even now we still talk.

Traditional Mentoring

Although faculty mentoring wasn't available in Monica's own program, it was observed by her when interacting with the cohorts from her minor program: Their instructors were awesome over there. Ours were awesome too, but they were more hands off. Theirs were totally engaged in their classes-they wanted to know everything that they were doing, they wanted to make sure they were graduating, wanted to make sure that they had a job, and I just didn't have that type of support. Like even the department head-they used to call her mom. It was just a whole different dynamic versus my dynamic and my department.

Pamela, Monica, Tina, & Sandy all were first in immediate family to receive a college degree.

Employment: Three participants had full time jobs, while three other participants were on assistantships and/or some form of scholarship.

Sarah: I was working 25 hours a week at the research foundation for recreational sports. I was fully funded for both my MS & PhD, I didn't pay a dime of tuition.

Tina: I was working in Athletic fundraising as a graduate assistant, my last two years were spent as a teaching assistant.

Lisa: I worked with Dr. Fountain as his research assistant.

Mentor Roles: Counselor

Pamela: He is also still my mentor, although I'm gone it hasn't stopped. As a student, I didn't open up, but as a colleague I'm opening up. Sarah: When I broke up with my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was. She was like you live together, do you need somewhere to stay? Tina: I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him and his door was always open.

Mentor Roles: Guide

Sarah: It was my mentor that introduced me to the world of sport management. While in undergrad and being involved why mentor at the women's college, she often told me how sport management was a growing field. Kim: I was in grad school in another area, in education, not sport related, and after one semester, a mentor of mine and myself decided I would move on to something else and I enrolled into a sport management master's program.

Mentor Roles: Motivator

Pamela: This was also during the time he was trying to convince me to get my PhD. I had never had a Black professor my entire time at A&M (BS & MS) and to actually see a Black male with PhD in SM. It created the situation where I was like ok, you know what, NOW I can see myself. Because before I couldn't. Like I said coming from a family background where you just get a HS diploma. And also being in a situation where you don't see any prominent Blacks who are in Higher Education. That was a big turning point for me. It was very important for me and other Black students to see a Black professor coming in and that definitely influenced my decision.

Teresa: Attending the conferences he took me to, I saw a lot of Black PhD's there. That opened my eyes to the possibility of being a professor. I met a lot of Black professors and that gave me an even bigger push.

Mentor Roles: Advice

Monica: I gave her a call first and ran it by her to see if she thought it was a good idea for me to make such a huge move. Pamela: I even took my job offers to him first before deciding anything.

Mentor Roles: Referral Agent

Lisa: Dr. Jones introduced you to the people when you were at the conferences.

Sarah: She taught me the value of the "Ol' Girl's Network", in a way that although men have the advantage, women "have each other". That's a renewable resource. The collective power of women to fight for each other.

APPENDIX E

ONENOTE THEME & CATEGORY SAMPLE

ONENOTE THEME & CATEGORY SAMPLE

(In Microsoft Word)

Pamela, Monica, Tina, & Sandy all were first in immediate family to receive a college degree.

Employment: Three participants had full time jobs, while three other participants were on assistantships and/or some form of scholarship.

Sarah: I was working 25 hours a week at the research foundation for recreational sports. I was fully funded for both my MS & PhD, I didn't pay a dime of tuition.

Tina: I was working in Athletic fundraising as a graduate assistant, my last two years were spent as a teaching assistant.

Lisa: I worked with Dr. Fountain as his research assistant.

Peer/Traditional Mentoring

Although Teresa had a very strong influence of a traditional mentor, she also laments about the group of women she was affiliated with while in her program:

I had a group of Black women, we were all getting our PhDs in different disciplines. We were called SisterGirls. There were 30-40. At least 4-5 of us would get together at least once a week, on Sundays we would write, on Wed we would meet and write on whatever we had. A lot of it was just about how was your week, how have you been, but then doing some writing and asking "what do you have to work on next week?" We made each other accountable but we also had that support system. We laughed together we cried together. I didn't have a cohort of students. Being with them really helped. We would see each other at different events-a lot of us worked on campus. Every semester one of was

graduating every semester. Three of us actually presented at a multidisciplinary conference together. Positive women. We networked and we still have a listserv-Docs. While Tina mentions her advisor and committee members as academically and emotionally supportive, she credits her peers and her boyfriend as the people she looked to for primary support. This is an example of both traditional and peer mentoring:

I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him, his door was always open. I had a really good dissertation committee that really helped me. Whether it was academic or personal support. I also had great student colleagues. We had very similar interests and very similar backgrounds, so we could really relate to each other. My now husband was also a big support, boyfriend at the time. We went through the process together. We actually defended the same month.

My boyfriend and my colleagues were the most influential factors in my successful degree completion. We were all in the same state of mind, we got burned out. There were only 8-10 of us in the program. We would trade stories and classroom techniques. We were together all the time. I'm still really close to them today.

Kim also alludes to having peer mentoring while in the PhD program: "While in the PhD program I looked to my colleague Dr. Willis, we were in the same classes and going through it together. We were also working full time teaching and traveling back and forth during the summer and breaks, trying to cram it all in because of the type of program, we had to do a lot. We supported each other and watched out for one another.

Although Monica had traditional mentors while in her undergraduate and master's programs, she states she missed this during her doctoral process. Instead she relied on fellow classmates and colleagues:

During my third year two other African American students joined the program. They became my sister and brother. We were all very far away from home, and the two of them were away from their spouses. We would go out together, study together, and be each other's support system.

She also mentions a cohort she was able to join because of her minor: They immediately accepted me into their group. We would get together and counsel each other. We would actually meet once a month and we would meet at each other's houses, and there was a counseling game that we actually made up in a class. and you would discuss things that were going on in your life. We would sit and we would eat and drink wine and relax and it was the best thing. I used to totally look forward to that. Even now we still talk.

Traditional Mentoring

Although faculty mentoring wasn't available in Monica's own program, it was observed by her when interacting with the cohorts from her minor program: Their instructors were awesome over there. Ours were awesome too, but they were more hands off. Theirs were totally engulfed in their career-they wanted to know everything that they were doing, they wanted to make sure they were graduating, wanted to make sure that they had a job, and I just didn't have that type of support. Like even the department head-they used to call her mom. It was just a whole different dynamic versus my dynamic and my department.

Themes & Categories

Wednesday, October 07, 2009

8:51 PM

Themes & Categories Page 1

Mentor Roles: Counselor

Pamela: He is also still my mentor, although I'm gone it hasn't stopped. As a student, I didn't open up, but as a colleague I'm opening up. Sarah: When I broke up with my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was. She was like you live together, do you need somewhere to stay?

Tina: I had a really good advisor. I felt really comfortable talking to him and his door was always open.

Mentor Roles: Guide

Sarah: It was my mentor that introduced me to this world of sport management. While in undergrad and being involved w/my mentor at the women's college, she often told me how sport management was a growing field.

Kim: I was in grad school in another area, in education, not sport related, and after one semester, a mentor of mine and myself decided I would move on to something else and I enrolled into a sport management master's program.

Mentor Roles: Motivator

Pamela: This was also during the time he was trying to convince me to get my PhD. I had never had a Black professor my entire time at A&M (BS & MS) and to actually see a Black male w/a PhD in SM. It created the situation where I was like ok, you know what, NOW I can see myself. Because before I couldn't. Like I said coming from a family background where you just get a HS diploma. And also being in a situation where you don't see any prominent Blacks who are in Higher Education. That was a big turning point for me. It was very important for me and other Black students to see a Black professor coming in and that definitely influenced my decision.

Teresa: Attending the conferences he took me to, I saw a lot of Black PhD's there. That opened my eyes to the possibility of being a professor. I met a lot of Black professors and that gave me an even bigger push.

Mentor Roles: Advisor

Monica: I gave her a call first and ran it by her to see if she thought it was a good idea for me to make such a huge move.

Pamela: I even took my job offers to him first before deciding anything.

Mentor Roles: Referral Agent

Lisa: Dr. Jones introduced you to the people when you were at the conferences.

Sarah: She taught me the value of the "Ol Girl's Network", in a way that although men have the advantage, women "have each other". That's a renewable resource. The collective power of women to fight for each other

Themes & Categories Page 2

Mentor Roles: Role Model

Sarah: I just loved seeing her in the classroom everyday, how she would engage students.

Teresa: It was being with him and having him show me the ropes, but also giving me the inside perspective on what it means to be a Black professor at a predominantly White institution was helpful.

Sandy: Now obviously I know you need to look for a good advisor, one who can help develop your line of research

Lisa: I don't think anyone has the exact same experience, everyone has their own weird little journey.

Mentor Roles: Door Opener

Sarah: I then decided I wanted a Master's in SM. I went to her and said where do I go, she told me where to go-she explained it was difficult to get in but she would make some calls and I would get in. I didn't pay a dime of tuition for my MS or PhD. She made sure I was fully funded.

Sandy: She actually introduced the idea that I could obtain a PhD because I had never thought about it before. She actually introduced that idea to me.

Teresa: He just sort of showed me what the possibilities were so I could open my range and open my mindset as to where I could really make an impact and make a difference.

Conclusions and Recommendations-

Mentoring relationships are very integral in the early stages of a protégé's career or during critical turning points. Mentors represent someone who has accomplished the goals to which they aspire, offering both encouragement and support (Daloz, 1990).

Several researchers support the notion of a protégé to actively seeking out a mentor who has expertise and shows a willingness to guide them (Searby & Tripses, 2006).

Two of the participants actually initiated contact with a mentor.

Monica: Towards the end of my PhD, while on the internet, I came across a Black female who I felt I had to meet. I said I have to email this lady! So I emailed her and I told her my whole story, how I saw her bio and how she has done everything I want to do and I told her I think you are awesome, I have to have you in my life. Lucked up and I got the opportunity to meet her and have dinner with her. She really helped steer me on, ok you are about to graduate, we really need to start looking for you a job like yesterday. Sometimes when you are working on your dissertation, you forget there is an after dissertation, so she helped me with the after dissertation. Even when I was involved in the hiring process with the school I'm at, I called and asked her what she thought. She was awesome, she told me it was a perfect fit for me.

Teresa: I actually "found" my mentor. I'm a book collector and one day while in the bookstore, I saw this book entitled "The Black Athlete". The book didn't have a price and no one could help me so I wrote the title down and went online and looked. When I looked further, it said he worked at UGA, then I found out he was still here, then upon further digging, I found out, "he's in the same building, he's upstairs!". I went up to his office and introduced myself and told him I was a collegiate athlete and was working on my master's and worked in campus recreation. So he told me to show him some of my work so I shared with him my piece. I think he saw that potential in me. So from then forward we developed a relationship. We're as thick as thieves. We talk all the time. He's a part of the family at this point.

Mentor Roles: Sponsor

Lisa: My first semester in the doc program, Dr. Smith had us presenting. He was the one making sure you get out there in that aspect [career].

Pamela: My first year he had me presenting at conferences.

Teresa: He had me presenting my second year of my PhD.

Was provided **Career Functions** of mentoring, but looked to peers for emotional support (**Psychosocial Functions**).

Lisa: the people I went through the program with, because no one understands what you're going through like the people going through it. They played different roles-we went through it in different ways. We definitely needed each other to get through the program.

Career and Psychosocial Functions of Mentoring:

Sandy: My second advisor definitely was a friend & mentor. We went out, we laughed, I was able to come to her when I was frustrated. We had a very positive peer relationship as well. She was much more than an advisor, she was definitely a friend. I definitely think that's important to have someone like that during the process.

Sarah: She was such an incredible support structure. She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable.

Perfection (locate quote about women feeling they must be perfect in order to succeed in higher education):

Tina: Being young, I felt I wasn't as respected because of my age and gender possibly, being a woman teaching predominantly males was very intimidating. I had days where I'd be in the classroom, thinking "that was a horrible lecture" . But I eventually built up my

confidence, and decided "Hey you know what, I know what I'm doing, I have the knowledge. Feeling like you had to know it all, and you can't, there's too much to know.

Outsider

Monica: Getting used to the culture was my biggest challenge-I felt like an outsider, I dealt with a lot of racism. Even from other African Americans. It's a very sheltered culture and they are not open to new ideas-so you are treated like an outsider purposefully.

Mentoring Context: Affective

Pamela: It is important to have a supportive mentor who has a personal interest in your success. I know he felt if I wasn't successful, he wasn't successful.

Sarah: She was such an incredible support structure. She understands that advising is much more than guiding you on the classes you take and the questions you ask. She understands that you are a person-you know when I had broken up w/my significant other of five years in grad school, I remember telling her and how concerned she was.

Themes & Categories Page 3

She was like you live together, do you need somewhere to stay? She was so dedicated to me as a person and not just a student and I think that is so remarkable. & I don't think I would've gotten that from a man. I think there is something about it and that is so important.

Sandy: & my second advisor definitely was a friend & mentor. We went out, we laughed, I was able to come to her when I was frustrated. I definitely think that's important to have someone like that during the process.

Kim: In my Master's program there was a lot of mentoring, emotionally, spiritually, and mentally.

Words of advice:

Tina: Don't be intimidated. You may not know everything there is to know. SM is a very male dominated field, it's very encouraging and inspiring to see the growth of women through the years.

Lisa: Being true to yourself is most important. Know what you want-if I had listened to where my advisors wanted me to go, and I wasn't true to myself I wouldn't be happy now. There are goals I have in my life that go far beyond my career, career is a PART of your life. And again that is me being true to me.

Sandy: Seek out an advisor whose work is congruent in what you're interested in. Gender doesn't make a difference, as much as someone whose work is good work and is going to be supportive of your work. It doesn't have to be exactly the same, but within that same area.

Sarah: Don't be afraid of what you want. Don't apologize for who you are. Don't let people make you something you're not. Don't let your advisor decide your research interest based on what he or she is because you'll never do good research. You can't fake it.

Kim: A doctoral program is just running a marathon-it's about just finishing it-completing the program successfully.

Mentoring Context: Same Gender

Sarah: When I had a Masters student that wanted to get her PhD, I wouldn't send her to a school that didn't have a woman & I think part of that is because I felt taken care of. So I think she was a Huge support.

Mentoring Context: Same Race

Teresa: Make sure you go to a school w/a Black professor that you're going to be working with.

It was being with him and having him show me the ropes, but also giving me the inside perspective on what it means to be a Black professor at a predominantly White institution was helpful.

REFERENCES

- Acker, S. (1994). *Gendered education: sociological reflections on women, teaching, and feminism*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Acker, S. & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing good and feeling bad: the work of women university teachers, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 26, 401–422.
- Agogino, Alice M. (2007). “Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Science and Engineering.” Lecture, College of Engineering, University of Oklahoma. April 20, 2007.
- Aitchison, C.C. (2005). Feminist and gender research in sport management: Understanding the social-cultural nexus of gender-power relations. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 422-441.
- Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Allen, T.D., & Eby, L.T. (2007). *The blackwell handbook of mentoring: a multiple perspectives approach*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Allen, W.R., Epps, E.G., Guillory, E.A., Suh, S.A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The Black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education, *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1), 112-127.
- Amis, A., & Silk, J. (2005). Rupture: Promoting critical and innovative approaches to the study of sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 355-366.
- Anda, D.D. (2001). A qualitative evaluation of a mentor program for at-risk youth: The participants’ perspective. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 18(2), 97-117.
- Angelique, H., Kyle, K., Taylor, E. (2002). Mentors and muses: New strategies for academic success. *Innovative Higher Education*, 26(3), 195-209.
- Anonymous. (2008). Only one woman wins tenure at MIT. *Women in Higher Education*, 17(1), 5.
- Annexstein, L. et al. (2002). Title IX at 30: Report card on gender equity, National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education.
- Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation – Non-employer Establishments and Receipts by

- Kind of Business (NAICS Basis): 1997 to 2002, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2004-2005 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau, 2004), Table 1226.
- Aryee, S., Wyatt, T., & Stone, R. (1996). Early career outcomes of graduate employees: The effect of mentoring and ingratiation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(1), 95-118.
- Bagilhole, B. (1994). Being different is a very difficult row to hoe: Survival strategies of women academics, in: S. Davies, C. Lubelska & J. Quinn (Eds) *Changing the subject: women in higher education*. London, Taylor & Francis.
- Bagilhole, B. & Goode, J. (2001). The contradiction of the myth of individual merit, and the reality of a patriarchal support system in academic careers: a feminist investigation. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 8, 161-180.
- Balibar, E., & Wallerstein, I. (1988). *Race, nation, and class. Les identites ambiguës*. Paris: La Decouverte, 207-246.
- Barlow, M. (2005). Abolishing "effortless perfection". *National Education Association*, 23(2), 6-7.
- Baugh, S.G., & Scandura, T.A. (1996). An investigation of the effects of protégé gender on responses to mentoring. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 309-323.
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Beckham, E. (2002). The Collaboration's November 15-16, 2002 conference on "Prizing Diversity."
- Beutler, I. (2008). Sport serving development and peace: Achieving the goals of the United Nations through sport. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 359-369.
- Bloom, G.A., Durand-Bush, N, Schinke, R.J., & Salmela, J.H. (1998). The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 29(3), 267-281.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bona, M.J., Rinehart, J., & Volbrecht, R.M. (1995). Show me how to do like you: Co-mentoring as feminist pedagogy. *Feminist Teacher*, 9, 116-124.
- Bower, G.G. (2007). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor 1st-year faculty in physical education departments. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 15(1), 73-85

- Brinson, J., & Kottler, J. (1993). Cross-cultural mentoring in counselor education: A strategy for retaining minority faculty. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 32, 241–253.
- Bruhn, J.G. (1996). Creating an organizational climate for multiculturalism. *Health Care Supervisor*, 14(4), 11-18.
- Brush, S., & McCormack, E. (2005). The Highest Paid Leaders and Employees at 33 Higher-Education Associations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(22), A20-37.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2006). The Carnegie classification of institutions of Higher Education. Available online at: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications> (accessed 15 April 2008).
- Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C.F. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83, 331-336.
- Cawyer, C., Simonds, C., & Davis, S. (2002). Mentoring to facilitate socialization: the case of the new faculty member, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15, 225–242.
- Chao, G. T. (1997). Mentoring phases and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51,15-28.
- Chao, G.T., Walz, P.M., & Gardner, P.D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: a comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts, *Personnel Psychology*, 45(3), 619-636.
- Chepyator-Thomson, R.J., Templeton, C., Spencer, R., & St. Pierre, P. (1998, January). Human diversity in physical education: Where do we stand? Symposium presented at the National Association of Physical Education in Higher Education annual conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Clark, R.A., Harden, S.L., & Johnson, W.B. (2000). Mentor relationships in clinical psychology and doctoral training: Results of a national study. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27, 61-71.
- Clift, E. (2007). *United States: More Power to Women*, Women's Feature Service. New Delhi.
- Cohen, G. L. (1993). *Women in sport: Issues and Controversies*. London: Sage Publications.

- Cose, E. (1993). *The Rage of a Privileged Class*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Costa, C.A. (2005). The status and future of sport management: a delphi study, *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 117-142.
- Cox, T.H., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness, *Academy of Management Executive*, 5, 45-56.
- Cox, T. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Crampton, S.M., & Mishra, J.M. (1999). Women in management, *Public Personnel Management*, 28, 87-107.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Research Designs*. California: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publications .
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.
- Cunningham, G.B. (2007). Opening the black box: the influence of perceived diversity and a common in-group identity in diverse groups, *Journal of Sport Management*, 58-78.
- Cunningham, G.B., & Fink, J.S. (2006). Diversity issues in sport management, *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(4), 455-465.
- Daloz, L.A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling, N., Hamilton, S., Toyokawa, T., & Matsuda, S. (2002). Naturally occurring mentoring in Japan and the United States: Social roles and correlates, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 245-270.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research* (Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage).
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand

- Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillian.
- Digh, P. Coming to terms with diversity. (2001). Human Resource Magazine.
- Dittmore, S.W., Mahoney, D.F., Anrew, D.P.S., & Phelps, S. (2007). Is sport management research diverse? A five-year analysis of dissertations. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 8(1), 21-31.
- Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experience of recently minted Ph.D.s. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34, 12-27.
- Dodds, P. (2005). PETE women's experiences of being mentored into post-secondary faculty positions. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 344-367.
- Doherty, A.J., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). Managing cultural diversity in sport organizations: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13(4), 280-297.
- Dubois, D.L., & Karcher, M.J. (2005). *Handbook of youth mentoring*. Sage Publications.
- DuBois, D.L., Holloway, B.E., Valentine, J.C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 157-197.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. New York: Rutledge.
- Eby, L.T., McManus, S.E.; Simon, S.A.; & Russell, J.E.A. (2000). The protégé's perspective regarding negative mentoring experiences: The development of a taxonomy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57, 1-21.
- Eisen, G. (1990). Sport, culture, and the status of social sciences: Intellectual reflections. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 14(2); 119-131.
- Ellis, E. M. (2001). The impact of race and gender on graduate school socialization, satisfaction with doctoral study, and commitment to degree completion. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25(1), 30-45.
- Emmerik, I.J. (2004). The more you can get the better: Mentoring constellations and intrinsic career success. *Career Development International*, 9(6), 578-594.
- Ensher, E.A., Grant-Vallone, E.J., & Marelich, W.D. (2002). Effects of perceived attitudinal and demographic similarity on protégés' support and satisfaction from their mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(7), 1407-1430.

- Ensher, E.A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S.E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Technology*, 15(3), 419-438.
- Fagenson, E.A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 309-320.
- Fagenson-Eland, E.A., Marks, M.A., & Amendola, K.L. (1997). Perceptions of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 29-42.
- Fagen, A. P., & Suedkamp Wells, K. M. (2004). The 2000 national doctoral program survey: An on-line study of students' voices. In D. H. Wulff & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty* (pp. 74-91). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Farrington, E.L. (2007). Check your internal messages about women leaders. *Women in Higher Education*, 16(8), 6-8.
- Fideler, E.F., & Haselkorn, D. (1999). *Learning the ropes: Urban teacher induction programs and practices in the United States*. Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc.
- Finkelston, L.M, Allen, T.D., & Rhoton, L.A. (2003). An examination of the role of age in mentoring relationships. *Group and Organization Management*, 28 (2), 249-281.
- Fink, J.S., Pastore, D.L., & Reimer, H.A. (2001). Do differences make a difference? Managing diversity in Division IA intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 10-50.
- Fischer, K. (2006). Elite Colleges Lag in Serving the Needy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 52(36), 1-11.
- Fiore, C. (2007). Gender Equity: Strengthening the Physics enterprise in universities and national laboratories. *CSWP Gazette*, 26 (2).
- Flaxman, E., Ascher, C., & Harrington, C. (1988). *Youth mentoring: Programs and practices*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Fogg, P. (2004). How one woman defied the odds in a male-dominated discipline. *Women in Higher Education*, 51(15), 12-14.
- Foldy, E.G. (2002). 'Managing' diversity: Identity and power in organizations. In I. Aaltio & A.J. Mills (Eds), *Gender, identity and the culture of organizations*.

- London: Routledge, pp. 92-112.
- Fontaine, D.K. (1998). Lessons from a mentor: A dance for two. *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, 12(2), 29-32.
- Fox, M.F. (2005). Gender, family characteristics, and publication productivity among scientists. *Social Studies of Science*, 35, 131-150.
- Fox, M.F. (2000). Organizational environments and doctoral degrees awarded to women in science and engineering departments. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 28, 47-61.
- Fox, M.F., & Faver, C.A. (1985). Men, women, and publication productivity: Patterns among social work academics. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(4), 537-549.
- Frisby, W., Reid, C.J., Millar, S., & Hoerber, L. (2005). Putting "participatory" into participatory forms of action research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 367-386.
- Frisby, W. (2005). The good, the bad, and the ugly: Critical sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 1-12.
- Gardiner, M., Enomoto, E., & Grogan, M. (2000). *Coloring outside the lines*. State University of New York Press.
- Gardner, S.K., & Barnes, B.J. (2007). Graduate student involvement: Socialization for the professional role. *Journal of College Student Development*, 48(4), 369-387.
- Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (2008). *Managing Diversity*. Conference in Atlanta, GA. Available at <http://www.gardenswartzrowe.com>. (Accessed 30 May 2008).
- Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (2003). *The global diversity desk reference: Managing an international workforce*. Jossey-Bass.
- Garland, S. (1991). For American business: A new world of workers. *Business Week*, 5, 24-30.
- Gaskin, L.P., Lumpkin, A., & Tennant, K.L. (2003). Mentoring new faculty in higher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 74, 49-55.
- Gavora, J. (2002). *Tilting the Playing Field: Schools, Sports, Sex and Title IX*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.
- Geiger-DuMond, A.H., & Boyle, S.K. (2006). Mentoring: A practitioner's guide. *Training & Development*, 49(3), 51-54.
- Genero, N.P., Miller, J.B., Surrey, J., & Baldwin, L.M. (1992). Measuring perceived

- mutuality in close relationships: Validation of the Mutual Psychological Development Questionnaire. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6, 36-48.
- Gehrke, N. (1998). Mentoring teachers. *Theory into Practice*, 27(3), 190-194.
- Gertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gherardi, S. (1994). The gender we think, the gender we do in our everyday organizational lives, *Human Relations*, 47(6), 591–610.
- Gibson, S.K. (2004). Being mentored: The experience of women faculty. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(3), 173-188.
- Gibson, S.K. (2004). Mentoring in business and industry: the need for a phenomenological perspective. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnerships in Learning*, 12:2, 259-275.
- Gilbert, J., Stead, B.A., & Ivancevich, J. (1999). Diversity management: A new organizational paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21, 61-76.
- Gill, E. L. (2007). The prevalence of Black females in college sports: It's just an illusion. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 24(8), 65.
- Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology.
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-607.
- Golde, C.M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 669-700.
- Goldstein, J., & Leopold, M. (1990). Corporate culture and ethnic culture. *Personnel Journal*, 69(11).
- Green, S.G., & Bauer, T.N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisors: Relationships with doctoral student potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 537-561.
- Greene, K. A. I. (2002). In the minority in graduate school. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(11).
- Griffin, L.L., & Ayers, S.F. (2005). Introduction: The roles and process of mentoring. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 297-301.
- Grossman, J.B. (1999). Contemporary issues in mentoring. *Public Private Ventures*,

- Philadelphia, PA. Available at <http://www.ppv.org/content/mentoring.html>. (Accessed 8 November 2008).
- Grossman, J.B. & Rhodes, J.E. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 199-219.
- Guttman, A. (1978). *From Ritual to Record*, Columbia University Press.
- Hamilton, B.A., & Scandura, T.A. (2003). E-mentoring: Implications for organizational learning and development in a wired world. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31(4), 388-402.
- Hamilton, S.F., & Darling, N. (1989). Mentors in adolescents' lives. In K. Hurrelman & S. Hamilton (Eds.), *The social world of adolescents* (pp.199-215). New York: DeGruyter.
- Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 6, 227-241.
- Harris, B.J. (2007). Women's future in Higher Education: Directions for future research. *NWSA Journal*, 19(3), 15-22.
- Healy, C.C., & Welchert, A.J. (1990). Mentoring relations: a definition to advance research and practice, *Educational Researcher*, 19, 17-21.
- Henninger, M.L., & James, A. (2005). Navigating the mentoring process in a research-based teacher development project: A situated learning perspective. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, 24(4), 302-325.
- Hickok, E.W. (2006 March 10). Higher education needs reform too. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(27).
- Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) (2004a) All students by institution, mode of study, level of study, gender and domicile 2002/03. Available online at: <http://www.hesa.ac.uk/holisdocs/pubinfo/student/institution0203.htm>. (Accessed 11 June 2007).
- Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) (2004b) All students by institution, mode of study, level of study, gender and domicile 2002/03. Available online at: <http://www.hesa.ac.uk/holisdocs/pubinfo/student/subject0203.htm>. (Accessed 11 June 2007).
- Hill, S.E. K., Bahniuk, M.H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial

- support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication Education*, 57, 399-415.
- Hite, L. M., & McDonald, K. S. (2001). Career goals of non-managerial women: An adaptive approach. *Proceedings of the Academy of Human Resource Development*. Tulsa, OK: AHRD. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No ED 453-424).
- Homer, F. (1878). *The Odyssey*. Clarendon Press: Oxford.
- Hurte, V. J. (2002). Mentoring: The forgotten retention tool. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 19, 18.
- Inglis, S. (2007). Creative tensions and conversations in the academy. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 1-14.
- Jacobson, J. (2003). Professors are finding better pay and more freedom at community colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(26).
- Jacovy, L. (2002). *Measuring the Quality of Mentor-Youth Relationships: A Tool for Mentoring Programs*. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Portland, OR. Available at <http://www.nwrel.org/mentoring/pdf/packeight.pdf>. (Accessed 8 November 2007).
- Janasz, S.C., & Sullivan, S.E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in the academe: Developing the professorial network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 263-283.
- Janssens, M., & Zanoni, P. (2005). Many diversities for many services: Theorizing diversity (management) in service companies. *Human Relations*, 58(3), 311-340.
- Johnson, W.B. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Johnson, W.B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 88-96.
- Johnston, W.B., & Packer, A.H. (2000). *Workforce 2000-Work and workers for the 21st century*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.
- Kalbfleisch, P.J. (2002). Communicating in mentoring relationships: A theory for enactment. *Communication Theory*, 12(1), 63-69.
- Kalbfleisch, P.J. (2000). Similarity and attraction in business and academic environments: Same and cross-sex mentoring relationships. *Review of Business*, 21, 58-61.

- Katz, L. (1987). *The Experience of Personal Change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate College, The Union Institute, Cincinnati, OH.
- Kaye B., & Jacobson, B. (1995). Mentoring: A group guide. *Training & Development*, 49(4), 22-27.
- Keeley, S.M., & Parks, J.B. (2003). Thinking critically about sport management. In J.B. Parks & J. Quarterman (Eds.), *Contemporary Sport Management* (pp. 79-92). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Keogh, D. (1996). *Money for Jam: Sport, Big Business, the Media and Me*. St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Kian, E. M., Noland, M. A., & Phelps, S. P. (2004). Missing in action: Qualitative research in sport management. Presented at the 2004 Florida State University Annual Sport Management Conference. October 28-October 30, 2004. Tallahassee, Florida.
- Kidd, B., & Donnely, P. (2000). Human rights in sports. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 35(2), 131-148.
- King, C. R. (2005). Cautionary notes on Whiteness and sport studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22, 397-408.
- King, C.R., Leonard, D.J., & Kusz, K.W. (2007). White power and sport: an introduction. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 31(3), 3-10.
- Kochan, F.K., & Trimble, S.B. (2000). From mentoring to co-mentoring: Establishing collaborative relationships. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(1), 221-235.
- Kolodny, A. (1998). *Failing the Future: A Dean Looks at Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Konrad, A.M., & Linnehan, F. (1995). Formalized HRM structures: Coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices?. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(3), 787-820.
- Kovar, S.K., & Overdorf, V.G. (1996). Changing contexts in the professoriate. *Quest*, 48, 211-220.
- Kram, K.E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Kram, K.E., & Isabella, L.A. (1985). *Mentoring alternatives: the role of peer*

- relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.
- Kram, K.E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship, *Academy of Management Journal*, 4, 1-21.
- Kurtz-Costes, B., Helmke, L.A., & Ulke-Steiner, B. (2006). Gender and doctoral studies: the perceptions of Ph.D. students in an American university, *Gender and Education*, 18(2), 137-155.
- Kurtzman, J. (2005). Economic impact: sport tourism and the city, *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 10(1), 47-71.
- Laird, Bob. (2002). Bending Admissions to Political Ends. Available at <http://chronicle.com>. (Accessed 26 May 2008).
- Lapchick, R. (2008). The 2006-2007 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport. Available at <http://www.BUS.UCF.EDU/SPORT>. (Accessed 31 May 2008).
- Leemann, R. J. (2002). Transitions into research careers in Switzerland. *Education & Training*, 44, 186–198.
- Leonard, D. (2001). *A Woman's Guide to Doctoral Studies*. Philadelphia: Open University.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1979). *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Liang, B., Tracy, A.J., Taylor, C.A., & Williams, L.M. (2002). *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 271-288.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Sage Publications.
- Lister, R. (1988). From equality to social inclusion: New labour and the welfare state, *Critical Social Policy*, 18(55), 215-225.
- Little, J.W. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. In C. Cazden (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (pp. 297-351). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Litvin, D.R. (1997). The discourse of diversity: from biology to management. *Organization*, 4(2), 187-209.
- Lomax, M.E. (1999). The African American experience in professional football, *Journal of Social History*, 33(1), 163-179.
- Long, J., Robinson, P., & Spracklen, K. (2005). Promoting racial equality within sports

- organizations, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 29, 41-59.
- Long, J.S., & Frank, M.F. (1995). Scientific careers: Universalism and particularism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 45-71.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: the causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lucas, C. (1994). *American Higher Education: A History*. NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Maher, M.A., Ford, M.E., & Thompson, C.M. (2004). Degree progress of women doctoral students: Factors that constrain, facilitate, and differentiate, *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 385-408.
- Mahoney, D.F. (2008). No one can whistle a symphony: Working together for sport management's future, *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 1-10.
- Margolis, E. & Romero, M. (1998). The department is very male, very white, very old, and very conservative: the functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments, *Harvard Educational Review*, 68, 1-32.
- Marshall, M.N. (1996). *Sampling for Qualitative Research*. Family Practice. Oxford University Press.
- Masteralexis, L.P., Barr, C.A., & Hums, M.A. (2008). *Principles and practice of sport management* (3rd ed.), Boston, MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishing.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: an interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maynard, M. (1994). Race, gender, and the concept of difference in feminist thought. In M. Afshar, and M. Maynard's *the Dynamics of race and gender*. London, Taylor and Francis.
- McCaughy, N., Kulinna, P.H., Cothran, D., Martin, J., & Faust, R. (2005). Teachers mentoring teachers: a view over time, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 326-343.
- McDonald, M. (2005). Mapping whiteness and sport: an introduction, *Sociology of Sport*, 22, 245-255.
- Meier, A., & Bracey, J. Jr. (1993). The NAACP as a reform movement, 1909-1965: to reach the conscience of America, *Journal of Southern History*, 59, 26-27.
- Mehlman, E., & Glickauf-Hughes, C. (1994). Understanding developmental needs of

- college students in mentoring relationships with professors. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 8, 39-53.
- Mellott, R.N., Arden, I.A., & Cho, M.E. (1997). Preparing for internship: Tips for the prospective applicant. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28, 190-196.
- Merle, C. (2006). Diversity management: from a “one size fits all” to a more inclusive approach, *Rural Development News*, 2, 48-51.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, D.W. (1999). A Ghetto childhood inspires the research of a Yale sociologist, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Mistretta, L.H. (2004). Who comes out to play? Opportunity and interest in college sports: a critical analysis of Title IV and its effect on intercollegiate sports. Available at <http://www.colby.edu>. (Accessed 25 May 2008).
- Mitchell, H.J. (1999). Group mentoring: Does it work? *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 7(2), 113-120.
- Mitchell, M.F., & Ormond, T. (1989). Transition to teacher education: Alien perspectives. In M. Carnes (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth Curriculum Theory Conference in Physical Education* (pp. 123-138). Athens, GA: The University of Georgia.
- Moore, M.E., Parkhouse, B.L., & Konrad, A.M. (2001). Women in sport management: Advancing the representation through HRM structures, *Women in Management Review*, 24, 51-61.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murdaugh, C.L. (1998). The value of mentors and facilitators in the pursuit of excellence, *Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing*, 12(2), 65-72.
- Napper-Owen, G., & Phillips, A. (1995). A qualitative analysis of the impact of induction assistance on first-year physical educators, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 305-327.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2008). *Digest of Education Statistics 2008*. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Education, March 2009.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). Doctors’ degrees, by sex of recipient, with projections. Available online at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/proj01/tables/table29.asp> (Accessed 3 June 2007).

- National Center for Education Statistics. (1995). *The Educational Progress of Women*. Washington, DC, U.S. Department of Education.
- National Science Foundation. (2001). *Characteristics of doctoral scientists and engineers in the United States*. NSF 03–310. Arlington, VA, Division of Science Resources Statistics.
- National Science Foundation (NSF). (2001)a. *ADVANCE*. Program Solicitation. Arlington, VA. Available at <http://www.nsf.gov/advance>. (Accessed 20 April 2007).
- Nielson, T.R., Pate, L.E., & Eisenbach, R.J. (2000). Not all relationships are created equal: Critical factors of productive mentoring relationships. Presented at the National Academy of Management, Chicalgo, IL.
- Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph.D.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Nkomo, S., & Cox, T. (1996). Diverse identities in organizations. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nords (eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (p. 338-356). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Noe, R.A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring Relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 457-479.
- Noe, R.A. (1988b). Women and mentoring: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 65-68.
- Nyquist, J., & Woodford, B. (2000). Seven propositions from 2000 conference. Available at http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/project_resources/metathemes.html. (Accessed 21 July 2003).
- Oakley, A. (2001). Foreword, in: A. Brooks & A. Mackinnon (Eds). *Gender and the Restructured University* (Buckingham, SRHE).
- Olafson, G.A. (1995). Sport management research: Ordered change, *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 338-345.
- Olson, G. A., & Ashton-Jones, E. (1992). Doing gender: (En)gendering academic mentoring, *Journal of Education*, 174, 114–127.
- Ostroff, C. and Kozlowski, S. W. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42(2), 170-183.
- OSullivan, M. (1989). Failing gym is like failing lunch or recess: Two beginning

- teachers' struggles for legitimacy, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 8, 227-242.
- Owens, J.K., & Patton, J.G. (2003). Take a chance on nursing mentorships, *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 24(4), 198-205.
- Park, P. (2001). Knowledge and participatory research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp.81-90). London: Sage.
- Parkhouse, B.L., & Pitts, B.G. (2001). In B.L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The management of sport: Its foundation and application* (3rd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Patton, K., Griffin, L.L., Sheehy, D., Arnold, R., Gallo, A.M., Pagnano, K., Dodds, P., Henninger, M.L., & James, A. (2005). Navigating the mentoring process in a research-based teacher development project: a situated learning perspective, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 24, 302-325.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peluchette, J.V., & Jeanquart, S. (2000). Professionals' use of different mentor sources at various career stages: Implications for career success, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140, 549-564.
- Phillip, K., & Hendry, L.B. (1996). Young people and mentoring-Towards a typology. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19, 189-201.
- Priola, V. (2007). Being female doing gender. Narratives of women in education management, *Gender and Education*, 19(1), 21-40.
- Putnam, R.T., & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning?, *Educational Researcher*, 29(1), 4-15.
- Quarterman, J., Jackson, E.N., Yoo, E., Pruegger, B., & Koo, G.Y. (2003). An Assessment of statistical data analysis techniques employed in the *Journal of Sport Management: 1987-2002*. Presented at the 2003 Florida State University Annual Sport Management Conference. October 28-October 30, 2003. Tallahassee, Florida.
- Quatman, C., & Chelladurai, P. (2008). Social network theory and analysis: a complementary lens for inquiry, *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 338-360.
- Raabe, B., & Beehr, T.A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and co-worker relationships: Differences in perceptions and impact, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 271-293.

- Raddon, A. (2002). Mothers in the academy: positioned and positioning within discourses of the 'successful academic' and the 'good mother', *Studies in Higher Education*, 27, 387–403.
- Ragins, B.R., & Cotton, J.L. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: a comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 529-550.
- Rayle, A.D., Bordes, V., Zapata, A., Arredondo, P., Rutter, M.C., & Howard, C. (2006). Mentoring experiences of women in graduate school: Factors that matter. *Current Issues in Education* [On-line], 9(6). Available: [http://cie.ed.asu.proxy.lib.fse.edu/volume 9/number 6](http://cie.ed.asu.proxy.lib.fse.edu/volume%209/number%206).
- Rhodes, J.E., Reddy, R., Grossman, J.B., & Lee, J.M. (2002). Volunteer mentoring relationships with minority youth: An analysis of same-versus cross-race matches, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(10), 2114-2133.
- Rice, R.E., Sorcinelli, M.D., & Austin, A.E. (2000). Heeding new voices: academic careers for a new generation (Washington, DC, American Association for Higher Education).
- Ricer, R.E. (1998). Defining preceptor, mentor, and role model, *Journal of Family Medicine*, 30(5), 328.
- Richard, O.C., Kochan, T.A., & McMillan-Capehart, A. (2002). The impact of visible diversity on organizational effectiveness: Disclosing the contents in Pandora's black box, *Journal of Business and Management*, 8, 265-291.
- Riley, S., & Wrench, D. (1985). Mentoring among women lawyers, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 374-386.
- Rhode, D.L. (Ed.). (2003). *The difference "difference" makes*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Robst, J. (1996, May). Female role models: The effects of gender composition of faculty on student retention. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Albuquerque, NM.
- Roche, G.R. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 14-28.
- Rose, G.L. (2005). Group differences in graduate students' concepts of the ideal mentor. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 53-80.
- Rossmann, G.B., & Rallis, S.F. (2003). *Learning in the Field: an Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rosser, S.V. (2007). Leveling the playing field for women in tenure and promotion. *NWSA*, 19(3), 190-198.
- Russell, J.E.A., & Adams, D.M. (1997). The changing nature of mentoring in organizations: an introduction to the special issue on mentoring in organizations, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 1-14.
- Safrit, J. (1984). Women in research in physical education: a 1984 update, *Quest*, 36, 103-114.
- Scandura, T.A., & Williams, E.A. (2001). An investigation of the moderating effects of gender on the relationships between mentorship initiation and protégé perceptions of mentoring functions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59, 342-363.
- Scandura, T.A. (1998). Dysfunctional mentoring relationships and outcomes, *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 449-467.
- Scandura, T.A., Tejada, M.J., Werther, W.M., & Lankau, M.J. (1996). Perspectives on mentoring, *Leadership and organization Development Journal*, 17(3), 50-56.
- Scandura, T. A., & Ragins, B. R. (1993). The effects of sex and gender role orientation on mentorship in male-dominated occupations, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 251–265.
- Scandura, T.A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: an empirical investigation, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 169-174.
- Scandura, T. A., & Schriesheim, C . A. (1991). Effects of structural characteristics of mentoring dyads on prote'ge' career outcomes. In D. F. Ray & M. E. Schnake (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association* (pp. 206–208). Mississippi State, MS: Southern Management Association.
- Schackelford, W.G. (2005). The changing definition of workplace diversity, *The Black Collegian*, online. Available at www.black-collegian.com. (Accessed 15 July 2007).
- Schauber, A.C. (2003). Effecting extension organizational change toward cultural diversity: a conceptual framework. Available at <http://www.joe.org/joe/2001june/al.html>.
- Schauber, A.C. (2001). Talk around the coffeepot: a key to cultural change toward diversity, *Journal of Extension*, 39(6). Available at <http://www.joe.org/joe/2001june/al.html>.
- Schempp, P. (2005). The dynamics of human diversity in sport pedagogy scholarship, *Sociology of Sport Online Journal*.

- Schmidt, P. (2006). ETS Accused of Squelching New Approach on Racial Bias, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(12), A1-7.
- Schmidt, P. (2004). Not Just for Minority Students Anymore, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(28), A17-27.
- Schuld, K., & Cantu, N.V. (1998). Does government require 'proportional representation' for women in college sports? - Symposium - Panel Discussion. *Insight on the News*.
- Searby, L., & Tripses, J. (2006). Breaking perceptions of "Old Boys' Networks": Women leaders learning to make the most of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 4(3), 179-195.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1994). Organizations or communities? Changing the metaphor changes the theory, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 214-226.
- Shaw, Ines S. (2005). "Wanted: Women in Higher Education." Unpublished paper presented at the Roundtable on Women's Rights, March. Oxford University, England.
- Silverman, S. (2003). The role of teaching in the preparation of future faculty, *Quest*, 55, 72-81.
- Smigell, S.R.A. (2005). Mentoring: How experienced teacher mentors help beginning physical education teachers learn new curriculum, ETD Collection for Wayne State University.
- Smith, T.M., & Ingersoll, R.M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover?, *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 681-714.
- Smyth, D.M. (1995). First-year physical education teachers' perceptions of their workplace, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 14, 198-214.
- Solmon, M., Worthy, T., & Carter, J. (1993). The interaction of school context and role identity of first-year teachers, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 313-328.
- Soonhwan L., & Hyosung C. (2002). Economic Values of Professional Sport Franchises in the United States, *Sport Journal*, 5(3).
- Sorcinelli, M.D., & Jung, Y. (2007). From mentor to mentoring networks: Mentoring in the new academy, *The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(6), 58-61.

- Sosik, J.J., & Lee, D.L. (2002). Mentoring in organizations: a social judgement perspective for developing tomorrow's leaders, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 8(4), 17-32.
- Soucie, D., Doherty, A. (1996). Past endeavors and future perspectives for sport management research, *Quest*, 48, 486-500.
- South Carolina Diversity Council (SCDC). (2008). Available at <http://www.scdiversitycouncil.org>. (Accessed 30 May 2008).
- Staudohar, P. D., & Mangan, J. A. (1991). *The Business of Professional Sports*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Stern, G.M. (2005). Straight talk about race, gender, and college sports, *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 16(6), 40-44.
- Stroot, S., Faucette, N., & Schwager, S. (1993). In the beginning: the induction of physical educators, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 12, 375-385.
- Sumsion, J., & Patterson, C. (2004). The emergence of community in a pre-service teacher education program, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 621-635.
- Surrey, J. (1985). The "self-in-relation": A theory on women's development. *Works in Progress*, 84(02). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.
- Terrion, J.L., & Leonard, D. (2007). A taxonomy of the characteristics of student peer mentors in higher education: Findings from a literature review, *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 15(2), 149-164.
- The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language (4th ed.), (2007), Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Time is Right to Include Sport in Work to Reach Millennium Development Goals. Press Release. (2005). Available at <http://chronicle.com>.
- Thomas, D.A. & Ely, R.J. (1996). Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity, *Harvard Business Review*, September-October, 79-90.
- Thomas, J.R. (1997). Vision and leadership for selecting and mentoring new faculty in higher education, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 68(5), 41-46.
- Thomas, R. (1992). *Beyond Race and Gender*. AMACOM.
- Thompson, L.A., & Kelly-Vance, L. (2001). The impact of mentoring on academic

- achievement of at-risk youth, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23(3), 227-242.
- Thompson, P.E. (2000). Mentoring power. *Reflections on Nursing Leadership*, 26(3), 6.
- Tripses, J.S. (2004). Redefining the voice of women administrators. *Advancing Women in Leadership On-line Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/spring2004/Index.html>.
- Ülkü-Steiner, B., Kurtz-Costes, B. & Kinlaw, C. R. (2000). Doctoral student experiences in male– dominated and gender–balanced graduate programs, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 296–307.
- Unesco Institute for Statistics. (2003). Gross enrollment ratio at tertiary level of education by country and gender for the academic years 1998/1999, 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. Available online at: <http://portal.unesco.org/uis/ev.php> (Accessed 8 June 2006).
- United States Census Bureau. (2008). Racial and Ethnic Classifications Used in Census 2000 and Beyond. Available online at <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/race/racefactcb.html>. (Accessed 11 June 2008).
- Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. New York: State University of New York.
- Wallace, J. (2001). The benefits of mentoring for female lawyers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58, 366-391.
- Weaver, M.A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration, *Journal of Sport Management*, 16, 96-116.
- Whitely, W., Dougherty, T.W., & Dreher, G.F. (1991). Relationship of career mentoring and socioeconomic origin to managers and professionals' early career progress, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 331-351.
- Whitely, W., Dougherty, T.W., & Dreher, G.F. (1992). Correlates of career-oriented mentoring for early career managers and professionals, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 141-154.
- Wickman, F. (1997). *Mentoring*. New York: Irwin Professional Group.
- Williams, J., & Schwiebert, V. L. (2000). Multicultural aspects of the mentoring process. In V. L. Schwiebert, *Mentoring: Creating connected, empowered relationships* (pp. 57–70). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Williams, C. (2001). "The Angry Black Woman Scholar." *NWSA Journal*

13(2), 87–97.

Williamson, K.M. (1993). A qualitative study on the socialization of beginning physical education teacher educators, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 64, 188-201.

Wilson, R. (2004). Where the elite teach it's still a man's world, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(15).

Wilson, P. F. (2001). Core virtues for the practice of mentoring., *Journal of Psychology & Theology*, 29, 121–130.

Wright, C., & Smith, D.E. (2000). A case for formalized mentoring, *Quest*, 52, 200-213.

Young, D. (1990). Mentoring and networking: Perceptions by athletic administrators, *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 71-79.

Young, A.M., & Perrewe, P.L. (2000). The exchange relationship between mentors and protégés: The development of a framework, *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(2), 177-209.

Young, A.M., Perrewe, P.L. (2004). The role of expectations in the mentoring exchange: an analysis of mentor and protégé expectations in relation to perceived support, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16(1), 103-25.

Zachary, L.J. (2000). *The mentor's guide: Facilitating effective learning relationships*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Zey, M.G. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Zimmerman, M.A., & Bingenheimer, J.B. (2002). Natural mentors and adolescent resiliency: A study with urban youth, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 221-243.

Zirkel, S. (2002). Is there a place for me? Role models and academic identity among white students and students of color, *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 357-376.

<http://www.dol.gov/oasam>. (Accessed 18 February 2008).

<http://www.bls.gov>. (Accessed 18 February 2008).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Melissa A. Noland

Melissa Noland is the daughter of Cheryl Terrell and Leroy Noland and is a native of Daytona Beach, Florida. She has two maternal sisters and two paternal sisters and is a first generation college graduate. In the spring of 1998, Melissa completed her Bachelor's degree in Secondary Physical Education at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU). Immediately upon receiving her Bachelor's, she began pursuing her Master's degree in the summer of 1998. Melissa obtained her Master's degree in Sport Administration from FAMU in the summer of 1999. After completing her Master's degree she taught elementary school for one year in Orlando, Florida.

After teaching for one year, Melissa returned to Tallahassee, Florida and became an adjunct professor at her alma mater. While at FAMU, her former professor and mentor Dr. Joseph P. Ramsey advised her to consider obtaining her doctoral degree. Instead of pursuing her degree she decided to pursue her entrepreneurial interests and subsequently opened a convenience store and restaurant named One Stop Shop in 2002. While owning and managing her own business and working as an adjunct professor, the consistent advice and tutelage of Dr. Ramsey convinced her to pursue her doctorate in the fall of 2003. In the fall of 2007, Melissa sold her business and pursued her degree on a more consistent basis and completed her doctorate in 2010. Melissa's research interests include the socio-cultural aspects in Sport Management such as race and gender inequities in sport and academia. She also has research interests in the area of youth sports.

Melissa is currently an Assistant Professor and the Coordinator of the Sport Management Program at Grambling State University in Grambling, Louisiana. She is married to Dr. Albert D. Chester II and they are awaiting the birth of their first child, Tré.