Fall 2006

Mentoring Experiences of Sport Management Doctoral Students: A Comparative Study of Men and Women

Tracy L. Morin
Old Dominion University

MENTORING EXPERIENCES OF SPORT MANAGEMENT DOCTORAL STUDENTS:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MEN AND WOMEN

by

Tracy L. Morin
B.S. May 2004, Salem State College

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

SPORT MANAGEMENT

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December 2006

Approved by:

Lynn Kidinger (Director)

Linda Gagen (Member)

Heidi Grappendorff (Member)

ABSTRACT

MENTORING EXPERIENCES OF SPORT MANAGEMENT DOCTORAL STUDENTS:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MEN AND WOMEN

Tracy L. Morin
Old Dominion University, 2006
Director: Dr. Lynn Ridinger

While the number of job openings within the academic ranks of sport management continues to prosper, the number of women filling these positions remains low. Grappendorf and Lough (2003) reported that women represent only 25 % of professors who hold membership in NASSM, and within doctoral sport management programs, Jisha and Pitts (2004) reported that most students are Caucasian males in their early thirties. Likewise, Morin and Grappendorf (2004) found doctoral sport management students to be 65 % men and 62 % Caucasian. With a limited number of females and ethnic minorities amongst sport management doctoral students, the gender and racial gaps do not appear to be closing anytime soon.

This study looked at mentoring as one factor that may influence a student's decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management. Through an online questionnaire, students were asked about their mentoring experiences, or lack thereof, for the purpose of exploring differences in mentoring experiences between female and male doctoral sport management students. Results showed no statistically significant differences between men and women although valuable information about doctoral students' mentoring experiences was obtained.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I would like to extend a sincere thank you to all of the people who contributed to the successful completion of this thesis. A very special thanks goes to my committee members: Dr. Lynn Ridinger, Dr. Linda Gagen, and Dr. Heidi Grappendorf, for their dedication, assistance, and patience throughout the entire research process. I would especially like to thank Dr. Ridinger for her inspiration and motivation over the past several months. I would also like to recognize my family and friends who have supported me and continue to support me throughout all of my academic endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The field of sport management has shown advancement in academics and professional opportunities in recent years. Unfortunately, while the opportunities in sport management continue to prosper, severe gender gaps still exist in the many areas of the industry. Specifically in academia, Grappendorf and Lough (2003) found only 25 % of professors (n = 81) who were members of North American Society of Sport Management (NASSM) were female, and 96.7 % (n=78) of the 81 female professors were American/European Caucasian. Within doctoral sport management programs, Jisha and Pitts (2004) found most doctoral students in sport management to be Caucasian males in their early thirties. Likewise, Morin and Grappendorf (2004) found sport management doctoral students appear to be a like group with 65 % men and 62 % Caucasian. These numbers are consistent with other traditionally male dominated fields such as math, science, economics, and engineering, in which women still earn less than half of all doctoral degrees in the United States (Hoffman & Snyder, 2003).

Morin and Grappendorf (2004) found that 42 % of doctoral sport management students are interested in pursuing a career in academia. This statistic, combined with the findings related to gender, suggests that the relatively homogenous group of professionals currently in academia may not diversify anytime in the near future. In order to increase the number of women in academia, the number of female doctoral sport management students needs to increase first. A better understanding of the factors associated with the decision to enroll in a doctoral sport management program may shed light on why men outnumber women in such programs and could provide information that would be useful in developing strategies to encourage more women to pursue a Ph.D. in sport

management. Jisha and Pitts (2004) identified several factors that influence one's decision to enroll in a sport management doctoral program. These factors included reputation of the institution and of the program, positive interaction with the faculty, and opportunity for assistantship/fellowship. Additionally, they highlight the importance of faculty in the recruiting process of new doctoral students. The discussion Jisha and Pitts provide about positive interaction between faculty and student may also relate to one other key factor: mentoring. Therefore, mentoring may be one additional factor which contributes to a student's decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management. This study will therefore explore and compare mentoring experiences of male and female doctoral sport management students and the extent to which a mentor influenced the decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management.

Statement of the Problem

Within the field of sport management, previous research has revealed that most administrative, academic, and upper management positions are being filled by Caucasian males. In 2002, 83 % of athletic directors were male and only 17 % female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002.) In addition, Grappendorf (2001) found the number of female Division I athletic directors was at 23 and this number declined to 20 by 2004. Head coaches of women's NCAA sports teams were 56 % male and 44 % female, and 72 % of full-time collegiate athletic trainers were male compared to only 27.8 % female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). In sports information, 88 % of full-time sports information directors were male and only 12 % female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). Additionally, 98 % of head coaches of men's NCAA sports teams were male and a mere 2 % female (Acosta & Carpenter). Lastly, within academia, women represent only 25 % of professors who hold

membership in NASSM (Grappendorf & Lough, 2003). Similarly, Street and Smith's Sport Business Journal reported in 2002 that only 32 % of sport marketing professors were female (Larson, 2002). These statistics clearly evidence the need to address the under-representation of women in the upper echelons of sport management. A better understanding of this phenomenon may lead to the development of ideas to increase the number of females pursuing careers in sport administration, coaching, and academia.

While gender imbalances are seen across the sport industry, the focus of this research is to look solely at the academic setting. Research has suggested various reasons why women are not breaking into academia, such as the prevalence of the "old boy's network" and the hurdles women face as a result of gender discrimination (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Etling, 2001). Instead of discussing reasons why women are still under-represented in academia, the current research will focus on only one factor, mentoring. The primary focus of this study is to investigate whether mentoring experiences differ between female and male doctoral students and if students' mentors were the primary influence in the decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine and compare mentoring relationships of female and male doctoral sport management students in the United States. Emphasis is placed on identifying the psychosocial and career enhancing functions of mentoring from which doctoral sport management students experienced personal or professional growth. Additionally, this study will help in understanding the extent to which mentoring influenced the decision of doctoral sport management students to pursue their current degree.

Significance of the Study

The literature focusing on mentoring relationships in academic sport management programs is limited. There is, however, extensive literature on the benefits of mentoring for both mentor and protégé in a variety of other academic and professional settings. The results of this study will not only add to the current body of knowledge on mentoring relationships, but may also provide useful information for developing a successful mentoring program for institutions with sport management programs and for organizations such as Women in NASSM (WIN) in an effort to attract more women to sport management careers in academia.

Research Questions

Research Question 1

Do career-enhancing functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students?

The null hypothesis states there are no statistically significant differences in career-enhancing functions of mentoring between men and women, H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$. The alternate hypothesis states there are statistically significant differences in career-enhancing functions of mentoring between men and women, H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$

Research Question 2

Do psychosocial functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students?

The null hypothesis states there are no statistically significant differences in psychosocial functions of mentoring between men and women, H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$.

The alternate hypothesis states there are statistically significant differences in psychosocial functions of mentoring between men and women H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$.

Research Question 3

Does the influence of mentoring on one's decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management differ between males and females?

The null hypothesis states there are no statistically significant differences in the influence of mentoring on the decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management between men and women, H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$. The alternate hypothesis states there are statistically significant differences in the influence of mentoring on the decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management between men and women, H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$.

Variables

Variables for Research Question 1

Dependent: The dependent variables are the eight individual items in question #28 that specifically relate to the career-enhancing function of mentoring (see Appendix C).

Independent: The independent variable is gender.

Variables for Research Question 2

Dependent: The dependent variables are the twenty one individual items in question #28 that specifically relate to the psychosocial function of mentoring (see Appendix C).

Independent: The independent variable is gender.

Variables for Research Question 3

Dependent: The dependent variable is the influence of mentoring in the decision of doctoral sport management students to pursue their current degree.

Independent: The independent variable is gender.

Definition of Terms

1. Mentoring: A complex, interactive one-to-one relationship between two individuals of differing levels of experience. The focus of the relationship is to develop specific competencies in the lesser experienced person through psychosocial and career development (Bouquillon, 2004).
2. Mentor: "A person at a higher level of expertise and experience who agrees to act as a counselor, leader, and role model to a person who seeks to grow and develop professionally (Bouquillon, 2004)."
3. Protégé: "The person who is the recipient of the mentor's interest and the one whose development is the primary concern of the mentor (Bouquillon, 2004)."
4. Psychosocial functions of mentoring: Aspects of the mentoring relationship which recognize the mentor as a counselor, role model, and friend to the protégé (Noe, 1988).
5. Career-enhancing functions of mentoring: Aspects of the mentoring relationship in which the mentor helps to further the protégé's career development. Such aspects of the relationship include sponsorship, coaching, facilitating exposure and visibility, offering challenging work, and protecting a protégé from criticism (Noe, 1988).

Delimitations

1. The study was limited to current sport management doctoral students in the United States.

Limitations

1. The findings of the study cannot be generalized to mentoring relationships of undergraduate or master's sport management students. Additionally, the findings cannot be generalized to other areas of sport management because only sport management doctoral students were surveyed.
2. Data collection relied on the cooperation of faculty members to either provide the researcher with student e-mail addresses or to forward the survey information on to doctoral students in their program. In some instances, the researcher was unable to make contact with a faculty member and thus doctoral students at certain schools were unaware of the online survey and/or research study.

Abbreviations

1. NASSM: North American Society for Sport Management, whose purpose is to provide support for sport management professionals and to promote the study and research of various areas of interest related to sport, leisure, and recreation (NASSM, 2004).
2. WIN: Women in NASSM, which is a group within NASSM that serves to create an environment in which female sport management professionals can receive support and guidance from other female members (H. Grappendorf, personal communication, September 13, 2006).

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Mentoring Relationship

The abundance of literature and research on mentoring suggests that the mentor-protégé relationship offers a unique perspective on career development in a variety of academic disciplines. Numerous studies have examined the influence of mentoring on the development of young professionals across a wide range of fields (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Chandler, 1996; Kartje, 1996; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Mentorships have been shown to have benefits for both the mentor and protégé, and research has revealed there are distinct characteristics and phases of mentoring that lead to a successful mentor-protégé relationship (Chandler, 1996; Kram, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) created a mentoring model based on the literature surrounding mentoring relationships, the functions of mentoring, and the benefits to both the mentor and protégé. They also discussed the usefulness of mentoring relationships in attracting more women to sport and physical education careers. Their model includes four distinct phases of mentoring: initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition. These four phases have been identified in other literature as well (Hunt & Michael, 1983; Kram, 1985). During the initiation phase, the mentoring relationship begins. Typically, this phase lasts 6-12 months (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The second phase, cultivation, generally lasts 2-5 years following initiation and it is during this time that career and psychosocial functions (Kram, 1985) are strongly incorporated into the relationship. Once the cultivation phase peaks as the protégé gains significant knowledge and skills to propel forward into a career, the relationship begins to decline. At this time,

the mentorship moves into the separation phase, in which the protégé displays independence and self-confidence to work alone. Although this phase can be difficult, protégé independence is a key indicator of the success of a mentorship (Kram, 1985). Next, the mentoring relationship enters the redefinition phase. During this final phase, the protégé exhibits competence, independence, and self-confidence without the immediate support of the mentor. When contact between mentor and protégé is re-established in this phase, a long-lasting friendship emerges (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Kram (1985) identified a two-pronged model of developmental functions of mentoring relationships, which is incorporated into Weaver and Chelladurai's (1999) mentoring model. The first function is career-enhancing and includes sponsorship, coaching, facilitating exposure and visibility, offering challenging work, and protecting a protégé from criticism. The second prong identified is the psychosocial function, which recognizes the mentor as a counselor, role model, and friend to the protégé. While these functions have traditionally been applied in a business management context, they may also have significance in mentorships in sport-related fields (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Also within the sport and physical education context, Abney (1991) identified phases of mentoring similar to the mentoring model used by Weaver and Chelladurai (1999). Previous literature has noted that the original bond between mentor and protégé is usually initiated from common interests and psychosocial connections as opposed to strictly similar career pursuits between the mentor and protégé (Chandler, 1996; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, (1997). Once the bond is established, Abney

discussed the nurture stage. During this stage, the mentor provides encouragement and instruction to the protégé and helps the protégé to develop career-related skills. The final phase promotes the camaraderie of the relationship and it is during this phase that the friendship bond between mentor and protégé is fully realized. Abney's stages of mentoring, similar to Weaver and Chelladurai's (1999) model, emphasize both the career and psychosocial development of the protégé as being part of a successful mentoring relationship.

One important variation in mentoring relationships that has been discussed in the literature is whether the relationship begins through formal or informal means. Informal relationships evolve spontaneously, whereas formal relationships occur as a result of an assigned mentor-protégé partnership (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). The previously mentioned models of mentoring focus primarily on informal mentoring relationships. In a recent study, Scandura and Williams (2001) found that protégés involved in informal relationships received more career, psychosocial, and role modeling mentoring than protégés in formal relationships.

Research has found mentoring relationships have several benefits. Most of this research has focused on benefits to the protégés while the literature related to mentor benefits is scarce. In one of only a few studies looking at benefits to the mentor, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) identified intrinsic rewards that may not be available in other areas of the mentor's work. These benefits to the mentor include re-establishing a sense of competence and self-confidence in addition to helping to guide a young professional toward career success. The mentor may also see tangible outcomes resulting from the

mentorship, such as recognized leadership capabilities from superiors and potential promotion opportunities (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

When looking at the benefits of mentoring in the protégé's career, research suggests that mentoring enhances career progress in numerous areas. Advancement outcomes have been identified as higher salaries, higher career success, and more power within the protégé's organization, compared to those individuals who were not mentored (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). Additionally, research has showed that women who did not have graduate school mentors have lower publication rates than those women who were involved in a mentoring relationship during their graduate education (Kartje, 1996).

Recent research, including those studies discussed in this review of literature, supports the case that mentoring can have a positive influence on many areas of a young professional's career development. The models outlined in this discussion may have application to graduate sport management mentorships, although there is limited research related specifically to graduate sport management faculty-student mentoring relationships.

Faculty-Student Mentoring in Graduate Programs

The benefits of mentoring relationships between faculty and graduate students have been well documented in the literature (Hodge, 1997; Knox & McGovern, 1988; Neumark & Gardecki, 1998; Waldeck, Orrego, Plax, & Kearney, 1997). Unlike assigned academic advisors who simply direct students' course of study, mentors provide students with valuable professional and personal guidance.

Waldeck et al. (1997) noted that graduate faculty-student mentoring relationships aid in increasing student publication productivity and help students secure future placement in quality research universities. In their study, Waldeck et al. surveyed 145 graduate students across 12 universities and a variety of disciplines including health sciences, fine arts, education, social/behavioral sciences, natural sciences, business, and the humanities. They found, in general, graduate students experience more psychosocial functions in their mentorships than career functions. As discussed by Kram (1985), psychosocial functions include those aspects of mentoring that enhance the protégé's sense of confidence and self image such as role modeling, friendship, counseling, acceptance, and confirmation. Waldeck et al. also suggested that psychosocial functions are the primary factors which effect the protégé's satisfaction with their mentor. Specifically, results showed psychosocial factors were better indicators of personal satisfaction than career-related factors.

In addition, Waldeck et al. (1997) examined various factors affecting the success of graduate faculty-student mentoring relationships. They also looked at relationship satisfaction and compiled demographic profiles of both graduate students and faculty involved in mentoring relationships. Their data revealed, across various disciplines, more female graduate students than males serve as protégés, although more male faculty members than females serve as mentors. This finding is not surprising since females are underrepresented in academia in numerous disciplines (Hoffman & Synder, 2003).

The models and frameworks cited in numerous studies have been evaluated only within the business context or within graduate programs in general. Few studies look specifically at graduate mentoring relationships in sport-related programs, and in

particular, sport management. In one of the few sport studies-based investigations of graduate student-faculty mentorships, Hodge (1997) found mentoring was a significant contributor to students' success during graduate school. This research supports previous studies in other disciplines that revealed more women than men serve as protégés in mentoring relationships. According to Hodge, most graduate students in physical education programs who were assigned a mentor as part of a formal mentor program still sought additional assistance from faculty members with whom they built a mentoring relationship on their own. Unfortunately, the extent to which these mentoring relationships influenced graduate students' career paths or decision to work toward a doctoral degree has not been well documented in the literature.

Pastore's (2003) Dr. Earle F. Zeigler Lecture from NASSM's 2003 annual conference supported mentoring in sport management, particularly within academia. She suggested several recommendations for faculty-student mentoring relationships at the doctoral level, although these recommendations could be revised for faculty-student mentoring at the master's and undergraduate levels as well. First, Pastore proposed a contract between mentor and protégé which sets up goals and activities that occur outside the classroom. Elements of this contract may include expectations for the protégé such as publishing, presenting, and readings. Pastore noted, however, that in order for this contract to be successful, the mentor must be willing to assist the protégé in reaching the established goals.

Pastore's (2003) second recommendation for faculty-student mentoring relationships was the use of an independent study course during the protégé's first semester of school. The purpose of this course is to expose the protégé to research,

NASSM, the Community of Science Database, the Social Sciences Citation Index, and being a tenure track faculty member, among other possible focus areas.

Thirdly, Pastore (2003) discussed the influence the mentor may have in helping the protégé establish his/her research interests. While this recommendation is perhaps the most difficult to accomplish, it can also be the most rewarding because it may help guide the protégé toward success in the job market and within his/her future research endeavors.

Other significant findings associated with mentoring relationships in graduate programs are related to gender differences in mentoring experiences and outcomes. Within economics doctoral programs, Neumark and Gardecki (1998) found there is a correlation between same-gender female graduate faculty-student mentoring and the number of years it takes for female students to complete graduate school. In general, female graduate students who were connected with a female faculty member completed graduate school in less time than those female students who were not mentored (Neumark & Gardecki, 1998). Interestingly, their study, conducted in 1994, collected data about faculty and female doctoral students from 1973 to the early 1990's. Of the programs surveyed, they collected data on over 700 female doctoral students across nearly three decades. The findings of this study are pertinent not only because they evidence the importance of mentoring in today's doctoral programs, but the authors also provide links to the benefits of female faculty-student mentoring from decades ago.

Gender Differences in Mentoring

In a comparison of same-gender and cross-gender relationships in three organizations, Ragins and McFarlin (1990) found significant differences in gender

interactions related to role modeling and social roles. In cross-gender relationships, protégés were less likely to engage in social activities with their mentors than those protégés who were involved in same-gender mentoring relationships. Also, female protégés with female mentors were more likely to perceive their mentors as role models than male protégés with male mentors. Similarly, Allen (2004) found that female protégés with female mentors experienced the greatest degree of psychosocial mentoring while the least amount occurred between female protégés with male mentors.

In another study looking at gender differences of mentoring relationships, Wiest (1999) addressed issues such as domestic responsibilities and social and intellectual isolation which generally burden more women than men. Time commitments associated with child-bearing and home duties can significantly impact a woman's graduate education. Additionally, since women are the minority in many graduate programs, they experience more feelings of neglect and seclusion than their male counterparts. Wiest also suggested women commonly feel the need to be mentored by other women because they share similar personal and professional experiences and female graduate students can see how their female professors balance their personal and professional lives.

Other research has identified additional aspects of the relationship that are found more with women than with men. Dreher and Ash (1990) reported female protégés found their female mentors to show more empathy for their concerns and feelings than did males in similar mentoring relationships. Additionally, female protégés experienced greater supportive, personal mentoring than males, and female mentors generally provided this kind of support more liberally than male mentors.

The numerous benefits women in particular receive from having female role models and mentors in academia have been well documented in the literature (Carruiolo, 2003; Chandler, 1996; Knox & McGovern, 1988; Neumark & Gardecki, 1998). Female protégés receive counseling in both career development and personal growth as part of a mentoring relationship and oftentimes have more professional opportunities than females who were not mentored. Such opportunities include research collaboration and job placement, professional networking, and increased competence and self-esteem (Chandler, 1996).

Specifically related to female mentoring relationships, Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) discussed barriers female protégés may face, such as limited access to female mentors, fear of initiating a relationship, and willingness of mentors to become involved in a mentorship. Limited access to female mentors may be one of the most prominent barriers female graduate sport management students face since there is still a considerable gender gap between men and women in academia (Grappendorf & Lough, 2003). Additionally, the mentor's willingness to become involved in a mentorship may be a result of other time commitments and responsibilities instead of personal reservations to serve as a mentor (Weaver & Chelladurai, 2002). In mixed-gender mentoring relationships, risks associated with gossip, jealous spouses, and sexual attraction or tension have also been identified as barriers (Wright & Wright, 1987).

Knox and McGovern (1988) investigated faculty and graduate students' perceptions about mentoring women in academia and reported several mentor characteristics that female graduate students believed to be significant. The mentor should be eager to share knowledge, be honest, competent, and willing to give positive

and critical feedback. Other personal traits such as a sense of humor, creativity, and imagination were also important qualities female graduate students looked for in a mentor. Additionally, while the very nature of the mentor-protégé relationships assumes a disproportionate allocation of power, female graduate students indicated they would like to be treated as a colleague by their mentor.

As indicated in this review, the literature on mentoring relationships and gender differences in mentoring is extensive. Additionally, the benefits of mentoring have been researched greatly in various academic and professional settings. Research has shown mentoring provides socialization, support, feedback, coaching, role modeling, and career development, which are essential components for the upward mobility of women in male-dominated fields such as sport management (Chandler, 1996; Ragins, 1989; Scandura & Williams, 2001). Based on the significant literature presented in this review, mentoring may be an important consideration in attracting more women to pursue a career in sport management. Not only have mentoring relationships been shown to be beneficial for young scholars; they may be especially pertinent for attracting and keeping women in the field since research shows mentoring provides significant opportunities for professional and personal growth which may have otherwise been unavailable (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Chandler, 1996; Kartje, 1996; Kram & Isabella, 1985; Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Summary

The professional and psychosocial benefits of mentoring have been well documented in the literature. The most notable findings related to mentoring relationships, specifically mentoring women or graduate students, include the findings of Kram (1985), Waldeck et al. (1997) and Weaver and Chelladurai (2002). There is also

an abundance of research on the professional and personal benefits graduate students receive from mentoring during their academic career (Hodge, 1997; Knox & McGovern, 1988; Neumark & Gardecki, 1998; Waldeck, et al., 1997). Doctoral sport management candidates are certainly one group of students who can experience the professional and personal opportunities that are part of being involved in a mentoring relationship. This study, therefore, explored mentoring experiences of current doctoral sport management for the purpose of examining possible differences between men and women. Additionally, if mentoring shows to be one factor which influences a student's decision to pursue a doctorate, then it may also be necessary to examine mentoring as one tool to help increase the number of women in doctoral sport management programs.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodological procedures for the investigation and testing of the research questions found in Chapter 1. The methodology is described in relation to the following aspects of the study: (a) research design, (b) sample, (c) instrumentation, (d) operational definitions, (f) data collection procedures, and (g) data analysis procedures.

Research Design

The design of this study was a combination of descriptive research and qualitative research using an online questionnaire. The quantitative portion of the questionnaire solicited demographic and psychographic information about students' educational backgrounds, career interests, and most importantly, mentoring experiences. Specifically, career-enhancing functions and psychosocial functions of mentoring are measured using a Likert scale. Two open-ended questions concluded the survey.

Sample

According to the North American Society for Sport Management's (NASSM) website, there are currently fifteen doctoral sport management programs in the United States (NASSM, 2004). The sample for this study was all doctoral sport management students currently enrolled in these programs. Of the fifteen doctoral programs, seven schools provided the total number of doctoral students enrolled, totaling sixty six students. Three other schools agreed to distribute the survey to students, but did not provide a number of students enrolled in the program. Thus, only ten of NASSM's fifteen listed programs were known to participate in this study.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was used in this study. The survey contained both a quantitative/descriptive portion as well as a qualitative/open-ended portion (see Appendix B). Demographic information such as personal and educational background, career interests, and mentoring experiences were asked in the quantitative/descriptive section. A modified version of Noe's (1988) Mentor Function Scale was used to measure the two main functions of mentoring, career-enhancing and psychosocial. Modifications to Noe's (1988) Mentor Function Scale were made only to ensure applicability to the academic setting in which the surveys of this study was distributed. Each item on the scale was measured using a 5-point Likert scale. In the qualitative section, the researcher designed three questions which were intended to solicit greater insight and depth from students' mentoring experiences.

An initial version of the questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of three experts who had proficiency in survey design, statistics, or the subject matter of this study. All three experts provided feedback and revisions were made over several drafts. A final draft version of the questionnaire underwent a field test involving a sample of 5-7 randomly chosen students from Old Dominion University's Master of Science degree in sport management program. Participants in the field test were encouraged to comment on the clarity and content of the survey instrument.

Once revisions were made based on the feedback from the panel of experts and the field test, a pilot test checked for the face validity of the survey instrument. Like the field test, a sample of 5-7 randomly chosen students from Old Dominion University's master's sport management program were asked to complete the questionnaire. This step

was important to ensure questions on the survey were worded appropriately and the sequence of the survey followed a logical order. Feedback from the respondents was taken into consideration and only slight modifications were made to the survey instrument.

Operational Definitions

1. Psychosocial functions of mentoring were measured using a modified version of Noe's (1988) Mentor Function Scale in question #28 (see Appendix B). A total of twenty-one items in the scale were identified as psychosocial functions of mentoring (see Appendix C). Each item was measured individually to compare specific differences, if any, in mentoring experiences of the men and women in this study. Thinking of their mentoring experiences, participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with each item using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).
2. Career-enhancing functions of mentoring were also measured using a modified version of Noe's (1988) Mentor Function Scale in question #28 (see Appendix B). A total of eight items in the scale were identified as career-enhancing functions of mentoring (see Appendix C). Similar to the psychosocial functions, each item was measured individually to compare specific differences, if any, in the mentoring experiences of the men and women in this study. Thinking of their mentoring experiences, participants indicated the extent to which they agreed with each item using 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Additional career-enhancing functions of mentoring were addressed in question #24.

3. The influence of mentoring in the decision of doctoral sport management students to pursue their current degree was measured in questions #18 and #20. Additionally, question #29 in the open-ended section provided further insight into doctoral students' mentoring influence.

Data Collection Procedures

A letter explaining the study, questionnaire, and disclosure form was sent via e-mail to a sport management faculty member at each of the fifteen doctoral programs during the spring 2006 semester. The letter explained the purpose of the study and asked for the cooperation and willingness of the faculty member to either provide the researcher with a list of all doctoral sport management students' e-mail addresses or to provide all doctoral sport management students with the website address for the survey. If the faculty member chose to provide the researcher with students' e-mail addresses, then the researcher sent an e-mail directly to the students to explain the study and to provide a link to the survey website. If the faculty member chose to not disclose students' e-mail addresses, then the researcher e-mailed the same explanation of the study and link to the survey website to the faculty member, who then forwarded the e-mail to his/her doctoral students. A total of twenty five students were e-mailed directly by the researcher. The remaining students were given the survey via the faculty liaison. Students were given one week to complete the survey and then a thank you and reminder e-mail was sent to students and faculty members. After two weeks, another thank you and reminder e-mail was sent, and one final reminder was sent after three weeks. This entire process, from initial contact with faculty members to final reminder e-mail, was repeated in the fall 2006 semester to increase the number of research participants.

In addition, during the summer of 2006, the researcher posted an invitation to doctoral students on both the NASSM and WIN listservs. One week after the first posting, a thank you and reminder e-mail was posted. After two weeks, one final thank you and reminder e-mail was posted. During the three data collection periods, a total of sixteen (n=16) students filled out the survey in the spring collection, eighteen (n=18) completed it in the summer, and one (n=1) student completed the survey in the fall. A total of thirty-five (n=35) completed surveys were collected. The responses of the participants were kept confidential by the researcher and participants were assured anonymity.

Data Analysis Procedures

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 13.0 was used to run quantitative analyses for the descriptive portion of the survey. A *p*-value of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance among the variables. Research questions one and two were analyzed using One-Way ANOVA and research question three was analyzed using independent t-tests. Responses for the qualitative section of the survey were coded in order to find common themes.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of thirty-five (n=35) completed surveys contained the data used in the analyses. The results discussed in this chapter are divided into the following categories: demographic information, educational background and career interests, mentoring experiences, research questions 1, 2, and 3, and one last section for the open-ended responses. Additionally, the findings presented for each category are expanded to compare information found in this study to research discussed in the review of literature.

Demographic Information

The demographic portion of the survey collected information about the doctoral students' sex, age, marital status, and ethnicity. This information is presented in Table 1. Of the thirty-five (n=35) participants, 48.6 % (n=17) were male and 51.4 % (n=18) were female. Over half of those surveyed (51.4 %, n=18) were between the ages of 29 and 34. Additionally, the youngest respondent was 24 years old while the oldest was 63 years old. Lastly, over two-thirds (65.7 %, n=23) of the survey participants were single and 74.3 % classified themselves as white or Caucasian.

Interestingly, the number of men and women who participated in this study does not reflect the representation of women found in previous research. As discussed in the literature review, women have been under-represented in sport management doctoral programs as well as within various other professional areas of sport management (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Morin & Grappendorf, 2004). The sample size for this study may be one explanation for the difference in findings since the sample for this study was only thirty-five students. Either more women are pursuing a doctorate in sport management or the sample for this study does not accurately reflect the overall gender breakdown of

current doctoral sport management students. Also, perhaps women were just more likely to be interested in the topic of this research and therefore more women than men filled out the survey.

Table 1. *Demographic Characteristics of Survey Participants*

Demographic Characteristic	Frequency	% of n (n=35)
Sex		
Male	17	48.6
Female	18	51.4
Age(yrs.)		
24-30	21	60.0
31-37	10	28.5
38+	4	11.5
Marital Status		
Single	23	65.7
Married/Living with partner	12	34.3
Ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	2.9
Asian	4	11.4
Black or African American	3	8.6
Hispanic or Latino	1	2.9
White or Caucasian	26	74.3

Educational Background and Career Interests

The survey respondents indicated several different fields of study for their undergraduate and master's degrees. The most popular field of study for undergraduate degrees was exercise science/physical education/sport management, in which 34.3 % (n=12) of the participants received their bachelor's degree. Other fields of study included communications (11.4 %, n=4), education (11.4 %, n=4) and psychology (11.4 %, n=4). Undergraduate Grade Point Averages (GPA) ranged from 2.2 to 4.0, although 76.9 % had a GPA of at least 3.0. For their master's degree, over two-thirds (68.6 %, n=24) of the respondents received their degree in exercise science/physical education/sport management. Four students (11.4 %) received their master's degree in education and the remaining students (n=4) received degrees in business, communications, or health sciences. Graduate GPAs ranged from 2.8 to 4.0 and most students (87.8 %, n=29) had a GPA of at least 3.5.

When asked how many years there were in between the completion of their master's degree and the start of their current degree, 40.0 % (n=14) began their doctoral program less than a year after receiving their master's degree. Nearly one-third, 31.4 % (n=11) waited more than three years between degrees, while the remaining students (n=10) specified 1-2 years between degrees. Lastly, most respondents, 82.9 % (n=29) indicated they are pursuing a career within the academic side of sport management, which includes teaching and research.

Mentoring Experiences

Most of the doctoral sport management students surveyed (85.7 %, n=30) either had or currently have a mentor. Only 17.1 % (n=6), however, were assigned a mentor as

part of their master's program. Additionally, only 40.0 % (n=14) were assigned a mentor as part of their doctoral program. Based on these statistics, most students appear to have been involved in informal mentoring relationships instead of assigned ones. This finding is similar to the conclusions of previous research which found that the original bond between mentor and protégé is usually formed by common interests and personality similarities rather than strictly through an assigned mentor program (Chandler, 1996; Waldeck et al., 1997). Almost half of those surveyed, however, (45.7 %, n=16) would have preferred an assigned mentor in their master's program and 37.1 % (n=13) would have also liked an assigned mentor in their doctoral program.

Thinking of their current or most recent mentor, 45.7 % (n=16) of those surveyed indicated their mentor is a doctoral professor. More men (66.6 %, n=16) than women (33.3 %, n=8) served as mentors and nearly one-third of students' mentors (31.4 %, n=11) worked in academia for more than ten years. Previous research has supported the finding that more men serve as mentors than do women (Waldeck et al., 1997). In their 1997 study, Waldeck et al. found that across different fields of academic study at twelve different universities, more male faculty members served as mentors than did their female counterparts. Likewise, within sport management, more men are available to serve as mentors compared to women (Grappendorf & Lough, 2003).

When asked in what ways their mentor has helped with career planning and advancement, over half of the respondents (51.4 %, n=18) checked off conference attendance and 57.1 % (n=20) also received help with research/publications/professional presentations. Only four students (11.4 %) received assistance with internship opportunities and 31.4 % (n=11) received resume critique/feedback. Similar to the

findings of prior research, the students who participated in this study agreed that help with research was a key area in which their mentor provided assistance. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) further explained the possible outcomes of the career benefits young professionals receive from their mentors. Specifically, they pointed out higher salary, overall higher career success, and more exhibited power of those who were mentored compared to those who were not mentored.

Additionally, all of those surveyed agreed that dependability and willingness to share knowledge are two qualities they look for in a mentor. These qualities are important to recognize when academic programs are looking to find professors to serve as mentors.

Research Question 1

Do career-enhancing functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students?

The results of a one-way ANOVA for each of the career items in question #28 on the survey support the null hypothesis, Ho: $\mu_f = \mu_m$. There was no significant difference in the career-enhancing functions of mentoring between men and women at a 0.05 level. The mean responses for each of the eight career items and the statistical significance between the two groups are found in Table 2.

While the research discussed in the literature review examined gender differences in mentoring, there is limited research specific to sport management to which the findings of this study can be compared. In a general comparison to studies which looked at gender differences in mentoring of graduate students in other academic disciplines, the results of this study contradict the findings of similar research which found there were differences between mentoring experiences of men and women (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Neumark &

Gardecki, 1998). Most of these differences, however, were related more to the psychosocial function of mentoring instead of the career-enhancing function.

Although there were not significance differences in the career-enhancing functions of mentoring between the men and women who participated in this study, the mean scores of both men and women show that the items used to measure career-enhancing functions were all areas which students could relate to their current or most recent mentoring relationship. Since there were not any items to which students disagreed, it appears that the career-enhancing items were good indicators of the positive benefits of the career-enhancing function of mentoring. All items used to evaluate the career-enhancing function were taken from a modified version of Noe's (1988) Mentor Function Scale.

Table 2. *One-Way ANOVA Gender Comparison of Career-Enhancing Items*

Career-enhancing Item	*n*	Mean*	One-Way ANOVA sig.
My mentor reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of career advancement.			
Male	11	3.73	
Female	12	3.67	0.842
My mentor has helped me to finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete.			
Male	11	3.73	
Female	13	3.54	0.726
My mentor has helped me to meet new colleagues.			
Male	11	3.64	
Female	13	4.08	0.346
My mentor gave me assignments that increased written and personal contact with potential future employers.			
Male	11	3.45	
Female	13	3.23	0.614
My mentor assigned responsibilities to me that have increased my contact with people who may judge my potential for future career advancement.			
Male	11	3.27	
Female	13	3.77	0.314
My mentor gave me assignments or tasks that prepare me for an administrative position.			
Male	11	3.27	
Female	13	3.07	0.692
My mentor gave me assignments or tasks to learn new skills.			
Male	11	4.00	
Female	13	3.38	0.234
My mentor provided me with support and feedback regarding my performance as an educator.			
Male	11	4.18	
Female	12	3.75	0.275

**Range of possible means is from 1 (disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*

Research Question 2

Do psychosocial functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students?

The outcome of a one-way ANOVA for each of the psychosocial items in question #28 on the survey support the null hypothesis, Ho: $\mu_f = \mu_m$. There was no significant difference in the psychosocial functions of mentoring between men and women at a 0.05 level. The mean responses for each of the twenty-one psychosocial items and the statistical significance between the two groups are found in Table 3.

Similar to the first research question, there is limited research focusing on sport management to which the findings of this study can be compared. Looking at previous research that compared mentoring experiences of graduate students in other academic programs, there are some possible differences in the results of this study compared to those of prior studies. Primarily, while several researchers have found women generally receive more psychosocial benefits than men (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Neumark & Gardecki, 1998; Ragins & McFarlin, 1990; Wiest, 1999), this study did not find any statistically significant differences between men and women. Dreher and Ash (1990), for example, found female protégés experienced more support and personal mentoring than did males. Additionally, Ragins and McFarlin (1990) found female proteges were more likely to engage in social activities with female mentors than with male mentors. This type of social interaction is part of the psychosocial function of mentoring and supports the positive benefits women receive from mentoring relationships with female mentors.

The results of the first two research questions suggest there may not be any significant differences in mentoring between women and men in doctoral sport

management programs. Although previous research has cited various aspects of mentoring that may be specific to women, there were not any notable differences in psychosocial and career benefits between the men and women in this study.

Table 3. *One-Way ANOVA Gender Comparison of Psychosocial Items*

Psychosocial Item	*n*	Mean*	One-Way ANOVA sig.
My mentor has shared history of his/her career with me.			
Male	11	4.09	
Female	13	4.15	0.881
My mentor has encouraged me to prepare for advancement.			
Male	11	4.55	
Female	13	4.54	0.980
My mentor has encouraged me to try new ways of behaving in my job.			
Male	10	3.20	
Female	13	3.08	0.827
I try to imitate the work behavior of my mentor.			
Male	11	3.45	
Female	13	3.23	0.614
I agree with my mentor's attitudes and values regarding education.			
Male	11	4.00	
Female	13	4.00	1.000
I respect and admire my mentor.			
Male	11	4.18	
Female	13	4.46	0.161
I will try to be like my mentor when I reach a similar position in my career.			
Male	10	3.70	
Female	13	3.85	0.710
My mentor has demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations.			
Male	11	4.09	
Female	13	4.46	0.196

**Range of possible means is from 1 (disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*

Table 3. *Continued*

Psychosocial Item	*n*	Mean*	One-Way ANOVA sig.
My mentor has discussed my questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers, and supervisors or work/family conflicts.			
Male	11	3.73	
Female	13	4.23	0.292
My mentor has shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems.			
Male	11	3.82	
Female	13	3.77	0.910
My mentor has encouraged me to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract me from work.			
Male	11	2.73	
Female	13	3.62	0.064
My mentor has conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings I have discussed with him/her.			
Male	11	3.82	
Female	13	3.69	0.773
My mentor has kept feelings and doubts I shared with him/her in strict confidence.			
Male	11	4.09	
Female	12	3.92	0.636
My mentor has conveyed feelings of respect for me as an individual.			
Male	11	4.64	
Female	13	4.15	0.129
My mentor suggested specific strategies for achieving my career goals.			
Male	10	3.70	
Female	13	3.85	0.949
My mentor shared ideas with me.			
Male	11	4.55	
Female	12	4.17	0.316
My mentor suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.			
Male	11	3.82	
Female	13	3.46	0.331

**Range of possible means is from 1 (disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*

Table 3. *Continued*

Psychosocial Item	n	Mean*	One-Way ANOVA sig.
My mentor gave me feedback regarding my professional performance.			
Male	11	4.36	
Female	12	3.75	0.053
My mentor has invited me to join him/her for lunch.			
Male	11	3.73	
Female	13	3.92	0.742
My mentor has asked me for suggestions concerning problems he/she has encountered at work.			
Male	11	3.36	
Female	13	3.62	0.228
My mentor has interacted with me socially outside of work/school.			
Male	11	3.64	
Female	13	3.77	0.787

**Range of possible means is from 1 (disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).*

Research Question 3

Does the influence of mentoring on one's decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management differ between males and females?

Like the first two research questions, statistical significance was determined using a 0.05 alpha level. The results of independent t-tests revealed that the influence of mentoring in the decision to pursue a doctorate was not significantly different between the men and women in this study. These results are found in Table 4.

One interesting finding, however, was that more than half of those surveyed (54.2 %, n=19) were either self motivated or most influenced by a family member to enroll in a doctoral sport management program. This statistic suggests that perhaps mentoring is not a primary factor in students' decisions to enter a doctoral program. Additionally, when asked to what extent their mentor influenced their decision to enroll in a doctoral

program, only 17.1 % (n=6) said their mentor was the primary influence. This may be understandable because a relationship with a family member has likely evolved and grown stronger than a relationship with a mentor, especially if the relationship with the mentor is relatively new.

Table 4. *Independent t-test Comparing Responses of Men and Women to Mentoring Questions*

Survey Question	Sig. (2-tailed)
Who is the person that most influenced your decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management?	0.407
Was/is this person you just identified your mentor?	0.535
To what extent did your mentor (past or present) influence your decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management?	0.966

Open-ended Responses

Three open-ended questions were included in the online survey. Responses of the survey participants were reviewed by the researcher and coded to find common themes. This section discusses the answers of each open-ended question.

Has mentoring, or the lack of mentoring you received, encouraged or discouraged you from pursuing a doctorate?

A total of twenty-seven (n=27) students responded to this question. Twelve students (44.4 %) indicated various ways in which mentoring encouraged them to pursue their doctoral degree. An even split of six men and six women made up these twelve responses. Specifically, students pointed out motivation, encouragement, and advice and support which helped to build confidence as they worked their way through their doctoral program. The responses of these students suggest that while mentoring was not the

primary influence in their decision to pursue their degree, it still provided a great amount of encouragement in their academic endeavors.

Five students (18.5 %) said they felt discouraged because they were not mentored. Students expanded on this answer by revealing personal frustrations with the faculty in their doctoral programs which steered students away from wanting to be involved in a mentoring relationship. Specifically, responses highlighted a "lack of guidance, motivation, and support," and feeling like students are "left to sink or swim" within academia. Additionally, four of the five students who felt discouraged were female, compared to only one male.

Lastly, six students (22.2 %) did not think mentoring encouraged nor discouraged them from pursuing their doctorate. For these students, mentoring served more as a way to network and gain knowledge about practical aspects of sport management. Of the six students in this category, most indicated mentoring had "no effect" in their experiences as a doctoral student.

If you were NOT mentored, how do you think it may have helped you?

This question was answered only by students who were not mentored during their academic career (n=14). Since there were so few responses, there is limited opportunity to find common themes among the answers. However, those who did respond to this question discussed research and practical knowledge as two areas in which mentoring may have helped them. Generally, support and guidance in various areas were also cited in the responses. There were no notable differences in the responses to this question between men and women.

What advice or suggestions do you have for developing a successful faculty-student mentoring program within sport management academic programs?

Twenty-nine students (n=29) answered this question and most of them went into great detail within their responses. There were four common themes that emerged from the answers to this question. First, students acknowledged the tremendous work load of faculty members which makes finding time to meet with professors quite hard. Five students (17.2 %) said specifically that more faculty members need to be hired and current professors are overworked. To this end, attaining and building a mentoring relationship is difficult for both mentor and student.

A second common response suggests doctoral students may be frustrated with their assigned mentor since six students (20.6 %) said mentoring relationships should be started with a mutual desire from both mentor and student. Some students felt their mentor was "forced upon" them or "required." More men (n=4) than women (n=2) felt this way. In fact, a few of the male students indicated that assigning mentors to doctoral students is "condescending" or "insulting." Other students whose responses fell into this category did not seem so discontented with their mentor and cited reasons why they would have preferred to choose their mentor instead of being assigned one. These reasons included finding a professor who is a "good fit academically, personally, and socially" and allowing the relationship to "evolve naturally."

The third theme differs greatly from the responses discussed in the previous paragraph. Instead of choosing mentors on their own, some students preferred to place the burden back on professors to seek out students to mentor. Several students said they would like professors to find time outside of "office hours" to meet with them for more

personal interaction. Students would have liked to be invited to dinner or more social events with professors instead of only interacting with them in a professional setting. The responses from these students support the psychosocial function of mentoring discussed in the review of literature.

Lastly, six students (20.6 %) thought professors should be trained on how to be a mentor before a mentoring program is developed for their doctoral program. The desired result of this training would be better relationships between faculty and students and more positive outcomes for both mentor and student. Such training may also provide support to a student that can be optimized for better mentoring experiences. Likewise, Gagen and Bowie (2005) found teachers who have trained mentors are more likely to remain in the academic field than those who were not mentored by trained teachers or professors.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

The results of this study showed there are not statistically significant differences in mentoring experiences of male and female sport management doctoral students. Both genders equally experienced benefits of psychosocial and career-enhancing functions of mentoring. Also, mentoring did not prove to be the most important factor in students' decisions to pursue their doctoral degree. To this end, mentoring may not be the answer to recruit female students in sport management doctoral programs.

Additional findings showed the sport management doctoral students who participated in this study were 48.6 % (n=17) male and 51.4 % (n=18) female, which may suggest a potential decrease in the gender gap within sport management doctoral programs. Previous research found most doctoral sport management students were men, but this study had nearly an equal representation of men and women. Unfortunately, with a sample of only thirty-five students, these percentages may also suggest that simply more women than men filled out the online survey.

While the results discussed in Chapter IV did not support any differences in mentoring experiences of men and women in sport management doctoral programs, valuable information still emerged from the respondents' candor and detail in their open-ended answers. Suggestions and criticisms made by the students in this study may provide helpful information for developing successful mentoring programs within sport management academic programs.

Limitations

The outcome of this study exposed some limitations that reduced the ability to generalize findings. First, because of the methodology used to collect data, an exact number for the population could not be obtained. Because an e-mail was sent to students on two different listservs, the researcher had no way of knowing how many doctoral students were registered on the listserv. Additionally, not all faculty members provided the number of doctoral students enrolled in their program so this again led to an approximation of the total number of students reached. Keeping this in mind, a total of thirty-five (n=35) students filled out the survey and this number may or may not be a representative sample of all doctoral sport management students. This consideration reduced confidence that the findings of this study are an accurate representation of the opinions of sport management doctoral students in general.

Research Questions Examined

Research Question 1

Do career-enhancing functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students? There were no differences in career-enhancing functions of mentoring between male and female doctoral sport management students. **Fail to reject H_o.**

H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$
H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$

Research Question 2

Do psychosocial functions of mentoring relationships differ between male and female sport management doctoral students? There were no differences in psychosocial

functions of mentoring between male and female doctoral sport management students. **Fail to reject H_o.**

H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$
H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$

Research Question 3

Does the influence of mentoring on one's decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management differ between males and females? There were no differences between males and females in the influence of mentoring on the decision to pursue a doctoral degree in sport management. **Fail to reject H_o.**

H_o: $\mu_f = \mu_m$
H_1: $\mu_f \neq \mu_m$

Suggestions for Future Research

Since there is still a limited amount of research related to mentoring in sport management academic programs, there are numerous avenues down which future research could venture. One suggestion would be to conduct a study similar to this one, but survey sport management faculty members who serve as mentors. Then, a comparison of students experiences to what mentors perceive students to experience can be discussed. This type of study could also provide helpful information for understanding how faculty members demonstrate the psychosocial and career-enhancing functions of mentoring.

Another suggestion would be to change the methodology of this study and instead of mostly quantitative, carry out a qualitative study. Interviewing both mentors and students in doctoral programs could reveal more detailed information about how students and faculty feel about mentoring relationships. Because there are a limited number of

doctoral programs, this type of study may be most helpful for a doctoral program that is in the beginning stages of developing a mentoring program. By conducting in-depth interviews with faculty and students at their institution, a greater understanding of expectations may be revealed.

An additional recommendation for future research is to review and evaluate graduate programs that have established mentoring programs. This type of study may be expanded to other academic disciplines such as education and business to understand the extent to which faculty-student mentoring programs are successful across various fields of study. Perhaps administrators and professors in other academic fields have considered mentoring as one way to help sustain or increase student enrollment within their programs. In an exploration of these mentoring programs, information about the successes and downfalls of having assigned faculty mentors may be uncovered. Additionally, this type of study could provide a better understanding of how to develop organized faculty-student mentoring programs in an effort to ensure female representation in sport management doctoral programs.

One final research possibility, and maybe the most important, could focus on retention of female professors within academia. Given the nearly equal percentage of men and women who filled out the survey for this study, one may wonder if more women are in fact pursuing doctoral degrees in sport management but are either losing interest or motivation to continue their careers in academia. If a more extensive list of doctoral students is kept with the NASSM business office, then more accurate information about gender breakdown of students could be easily accessed. Unfortunately, such a list does not exist so gender breakdown information relies solely on individual studies such as this

one. Given the information presented in this study, however, women may be stepping away from academia and moving toward another area of the sport industry. A study focusing on retention of female professors in sport management programs may reveal if and why women are actually leaving the academic field.

References

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2002). *Women in intercollegiate sport.* Unpublished manuscript. Lkd. Women's Sports Foundation. Retrieved August 9, 2003, from http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/binary-data/WSF_ARTICLE/pdf_file/902.pdf

Abney, R. (1991). Recruiting and mentoring sport leaders. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 62(3), 48-50.

Allen, T. (2004). Factors related to mentor reports of mentoring functions provided: gender and relational characteristics. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research.* Retrieved January 25, 2005 from http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2294/is_1-2_50/ai_113419431/print.

Bouquillon, E. A. (2004). *Antecedents associated with mentor functions received and career outcomes reported by protégés and non-mentored employees.* Dissertation: The Pennsylvania State University.

Carriuolo, N. E. (2003). Recruiting and retaining women and minority faculty: An interview with JoAnn Moody. *Journal of Developmental Education,* 27(2), 18-20.

Chandler, C. (1996). Mentoring and women in academia: Reevaluating the traditional model. *NWSA Journal,* 8(3), 79-100.

Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 75(5), 539-46.

Etling, L. (2001). *Missing in management.* Women's Sports Foundation Career Center. Retrieved August 9, 2003 from http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/cgi-bin/iowa/career/article.html?record=11.

Gagen, L., & Bowie, S. (2005). Effective mentoring: A case for training mentors for novice teachers. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 76(7), 40-45.

Grappendorf, H. (2001). *Profiles and career patterns of female NCAA division I athletic directors.* Dissertation: University of New Mexico.

Grappendorf, H. & Lough, N. (2003). *Profiles and career patterns of female sport management/administration professors.* [Abstract]. NASSM Annual Conference, Ithaca, NY.

Hodge, S. R. (1997). Mentoring: perspectives of physical education graduate students from diverse cultural backgrounds. *The Physical Educator*, 54, 181-95.

Hoffman, C. M, & Snyder, T. M. (2003). *Digest of educational statistics, 2002*. The National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved April 13, 2004 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003060.

Hunt, D., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: a career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 475-80.

Jisha, J. & Pitts, B. (2004). Program choice factors of sport management doctoral students in North America. *Smart Online Journal*, 1(1), 2-14.

Kartje, J. (1996). O mentor! My mentor! *Peabody Journal of Education,* 71(1), 114-25.

Knox, P. L., & McGovern, T. V. (1988). Mentoring women in academia. *Teaching of Psychology,* 15(1), 39-41.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life.* Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Alternative to mentoring: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28, 110-132.

Larson, P. (2002, November 11-17). Diversifying classroom a first step. *Street and Smith's Sport Business Journal, p.* 20.

Morin, T., & Grappendorf, H. (2004). *Profiles and future career interests of sport management doctoral students.* Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Salem State College, Salem, Massachusetts.

Noe, R. A. (1988). An investigation of the determinants of successful assigned mentoring relationships. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(3), 457-479.

North American Society for Sport Management. (NASSM). (2004). Universities Database. [Online]. Available: http://www.nassm.org

Neumark, D., & Gardecki, R. (1998). Women helping women? *The Journal of Human Resources,* 33(1), 220-247.

Pastore, D. (2003). A different lens to view mentoring in sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(1), 1-12.

Ragins, B. R. (1989). Barriers to mentoring: The female manager's dilemma. *Human Relations*, 42, 1-22.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 957-971.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1999). Mentor functions and outcomes: a comparison of men and women in formal and informal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 84, 529-550.

Ragins, B. R., & McFarlin, D. B. (1990). Perceptions of mentor roles in cross-gender mentoring relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37, 321-339.

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.

Waldeck, J. H., Orrego, V. O., Plax, T. G, & Kearney, P. (1997). Graduate student/faculty mentoring relationships: who gets mentored, how it happens, and to what end. *Communication Quarterly,* 45(3), 93-120.

Weaver, M., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, 51(1), 24-38.

Weaver, M., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16: 96-116.

Weist, L. R. (1999). Addressing the needs of graduate women. *Contemporary Education*, 70(2), 30-33.

Wright, C. A., & Wright, S. D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations*, 36(2), 204-208.

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO FACULTY

Dear [name of professor]:

I am Master's sport management student at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. For my Master's thesis, I plan to survey doctoral sport management students in the United States using an online questionnaire. Your college is one of the institutions that I hope to work with to make this project a success. I ask for your assistance in contacting students in your program. The purpose of this study is to examine mentoring experiences of doctoral sport management students and to explore differences in mentoring between men and women.

Can you please provide me with a list of e-mail addresses for doctoral students in your program? The identities of the students do not need to be disclosed since the participants in this study will remain anonymous. ***If you are unable to provide an e-mail listing of your students, may I send you the instructions and website URL address that you can then forward to your students?***

I hope you decide to participate in this research. Since there are still a limited number of doctoral programs in sport management/administration, a high response rate is crucial to the success of this research.

Thank you in advance for your time and support. I can be reached at the phone number and e-mail listed below, or you can contact my faculty research advisor, Dr. Lynn Ridinger, at 757-683-4353 or lridinge@odu.edu with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Tracy L. Morin
Sport Management Graduate Student
Old Dominion University
Ph: 978-985-6669
E-mail: TLMorin@hotmail.com

APPENDIX B
MENTORING SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The purpose of this survey is to examine mentoring experiences of doctoral sport management students.

Demographic Information:

1. What is your present age? _____

2. Sex
   a. Male
   b. Female

3. Marital Status:
   a. Single
   b. Married or Living with partner
   c. Other

4. Do you have children?
   a. Yes
   b. No

5. Ethnicity:
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   f. White or Caucasian
   g. Other

Education/Career:

6. What was your undergraduate GPA (on a 4.0 scale)? _____

7. From what department do you have your bachelor's degree?
   a. Business
   b. Communications
   c. Criminal Justice
   d. Education
   e. Exercise Science/Physical Education/Sport Management
   f. Health Sciences
   g. History
   h. Political Science
   i. Other: _____

8. What was your graduate GPA (on a 4.0 scale)? _____

9. From what department do you have your master's degree?
   a. Business
   b. Communications
   c. Criminal Justice
   d. Education
   e. Exercise Science/Physical Education/Sport Management
   f. Health Sciences
   g. History
   h. Political Science
   i. Other: _____

10. How many years/months are there between the time you finished your master's degree and the time you began your doctoral degree?
    a. Less than a year
    b. 1 year
    c. 2 years
    d. 3 years or more

11. In what area of sport management are you pursuing a career?
    a. Academia (Teaching/Research)
    b. Sport Management Practitioner (Marketing, Law, Facilities, Sports Information, etc…)
    c. Other: _____

Mentoring Experiences:

What is a MENTOR?

For the purpose of this study, a mentor is defined as a higher ranking, influential individual in your life or work/school environment who has advanced experience and knowledge, and who is committed to providing upward mobility and support to you, your education, and your career. The relationship you have (or are developing) with this individual may be one that began informally, or you may have been assigned a mentor as part of your master's or doctoral program. Additionally, your academic advisor or dissertation chair is not *necessarily* the same as your mentor, unless you feel your academic advisor or dissertation chair has provided you with the upward mobility and support previously described.

12. Have you had (or currently have) a relationship like the one described above?
    a. Yes
    b. No

13. Were you assigned a mentor as part of your master's program?
    a. Yes
    b. No

14. If not, would you like to have been assigned a mentor in your master's program?
    a. Yes
    b. No

15. Were you assigned a mentor as part of your doctoral program?
    a. Yes
    b. No

16. If not, would you like to have been assigned a mentor in your doctoral program?
    a. Yes
    b. No

17. Who is the person that *most* influenced your decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management?
    a. Undergraduate Professor
    b. Master's Professor
    c. Doctoral Professor
    d. Employer
    e. Self
    f. Family member
    g. Other: _____

18. Was the person you identified in question #17 your mentor?
    a. Yes
    b. No

19. Are you *currently* involved in a mentoring relationship?
    a. Yes
    b. No

If answered No to question #19, continue to open-ended section.
If answered Yes to question #19, continue to question #20.
Note: The online survey automatically directs respondents based on their answer.

20. To what extent did your mentor (past or present) influence your decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management?
    a. My mentor was the primary influence in my decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management.
    b. My mentor somewhat influenced my decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management.
    c. My mentor did not influence my decision to pursue a doctorate in sport management.

Thinking of your *current* or *most recent* mentor, please answer the following questions.

21. How long have you been involved in your mentoring relationship?
    a. Less than 6 months
    b. 6 months to 1 year
    c. 1-2 years
    d. 2-3 years
    e. 3 years or more

22. Who is your mentor?
    a. Undergraduate professor
    b. Master's professor
    c. Doctoral professor
    d. Employer
    e. Internship supervisor
    f. Other: _____

23. What is the sex of your mentor?
    a. Male
    b. Female

24. How much experience does your mentor have working in academia?
    a. My mentor does not work in academia.
    b. My mentor is new to academia.
    c. My mentor has worked in academia for a fewer than 5 years.
    d. My mentor has worked in academia for 5-10 years.
    e. My mentor has worked in academia for more than 10 years.
    f. I do not know.

25. What is the age difference between you and your mentor?
    a. My mentor is approximately my age (+/- 10 years)
    b. My mentor is much older than me (> 10 years)
    c. My mentor is much younger than me (< 10 years)

26. In what ways has your mentor helped you with career planning and advancement? (circle all that apply)
    a. Networking/Meeting people in the field
    b. Attending Conferences
    c. Resume Critique/Feedback
    d. Internship Opportunities
    e. Research/Publications/Professional Presentations
    f. Other: _____

27. What qualities do you look for in a mentor? Please rate the following mentor qualities using the provided scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not Important	Somewhat Important	No opinion/Neutral	Very Important	Essential

a. Dependability	1	2	3	4	5
b. Reliability	1	2	3	4	5
c. Knowledge of sport management	1	2	3	4	5
d. Willingness to share knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
e. Approachability/ Having an "open-door" policy	1	2	3	4	5

28. Please indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements using the provided scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral/No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree

a. My mentor has shared history of his/her career with me.	1	2	3	4	5
b. My mentor has encouraged me to prepare for advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
c. My mentor has encouraged me to try new ways of behaving in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
d. I try to imitate the work behavior of my mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
e. I agree with my mentor's attitudes and values regarding education.	1	2	3	4	5
f. I respect and admire my mentor.	1	2	3	4	5
g. I will try to be like my mentor when I reach a similar position in my career.	1	2	3	4	5
h. My mentor has demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations.	1	2	3	4	5
i. My mentor has discussed my questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers, and supervisors or work/family conflicts.	1	2	3	4	5
j. My mentor has shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
k. My mentor has encouraged me to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from my work.	1	2	3	4	5
l. My mentor has conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings I have discussed with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5
m. My mentor has kept feelings and doubts I shared with him/her in strict confidence.	1	2	3	4	5
n. My mentor has conveyed feelings of respect for me as an individual.	1	2	3	4	5
o. My mentor reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of career advancement.	1	2	3	4	5

p. My mentor helped me to finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete. 1 2 3 4 5

q. My mentor has helped me to meet new colleagues. 1 2 3 4 5

r. My mentor gave me assignments that increased written and personal contact with potential future employers. 1 2 3 4 5

s. My mentor assigned responsibilities to me that have increased my contact with people who may judge my potential for future career advancement. 1 2 3 4 5

t. My mentor gave me assignments or tasks that prepare me for an administrative position. 1 2 3 4 5

u. My mentor gave me assignments or tasks to learn new skills. 1 2 3 4 5

v. My mentor provided me with support and feedback regarding my performance as an educator. 1 2 3 4 5

w. My mentor suggested specific strategies for achieving my career goals. 1 2 3 4 5

x. My mentor shared ideas with me. 1 2 3 4 5

y. My mentor suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

z. My mentor gave me feedback regarding my professional performance. 1 2 3 4 5

aa. My mentor has invited me to join him/her for lunch. 1 2 3 4 5

bb. My mentor has asked me for suggestions concerning problems he/she has encountered at work. 1 2 3 4 5

cc. My mentor has interacted with me socially outside of work/school. 1 2 3 4 5

Open-Ended Section:

29. Has mentoring, or the lack of mentoring you have received, encouraged or discouraged you from pursuing a doctorate?

    a. If you were NOT mentored, how do you think it may have helped you?

30. What advice or suggestions do you have for developing a successful faculty-student mentoring program within sport management academic programs?

APPENDIX C
IDENTIFICATION OF ITEMS IN QUESTION #28

Shaded items identify psychosocial functions of mentoring.
Unshaded items identify career-enhancing functions of mentoring.

a. My mentor has shared history of his/her career with me.
b. My mentor has encouraged me to prepare for advancement.
c. My mentor has encouraged me to try new ways of behaving in my job.
d. I try to imitate the work behavior of my mentor.
e. I agree with my mentor's attitudes and values regarding education.
f. I respect and admire my mentor.
g. I will try to be like my mentor when I reach a similar position in my career.
h. My mentor has demonstrated good listening skills in our conversations.
i. My mentor has discussed my questions or concerns regarding feelings of competence, commitment to advancement, relationships with peers, and supervisors or work/family conflicts.
j. My mentor has shared personal experiences as an alternative perspective to my problems.
k. My mentor has encouraged me to talk openly about anxiety and fears that detract from my work.
l. My mentor has conveyed empathy for the concerns and feelings I have discussed with him/her.
m. My mentor has kept feelings and doubts I shared with him/her in strict confidence.
n. My mentor has conveyed feelings of respect for me as an individual.
o. My mentor reduced unnecessary risks that could threaten the possibility of career advancement.
p. My mentor helped me to finish assignments/tasks or meet deadlines that otherwise would have been difficult to complete.
q. My mentor has helped me to meet new colleagues.
r. My mentor gave me assignments that increased written and personal contact with potential future employers.
s. My mentor assigned responsibilities to me that have increased my contact with people who may judge my potential for future career advancement.
t. My mentor gave me assignments or tasks that prepare me for an administrative position.
u. My mentor gave me assignments or tasks to learn new skills.
v. My mentor provided me with support and feedback regarding my performance as an educator.
w. My mentor suggested specific strategies for achieving my career goals.
x. My mentor shared ideas with me.
y. My mentor suggested specific strategies for accomplishing work objectives.
z. My mentor gave me feedback regarding my professional performance.
aa. My mentor has invited me to join him/her for lunch.
bb. My mentor has asked me for suggestions concerning problems he/she has encountered at work.
cc. My mentor has interacted with me socially outside of work/school.

APPENDIX D
VITA

Tracy L. Morin

Department of Study

Old Dominion University
Department of ESPER
Sport Management
HPE Building
Norfolk, VA 23529

Education

December 2006	Master of Science in Education, *Summa Cum Laude* Old Dominion University Norfolk, Virginia
May 2004	Bachelor of Science, *Summa Cum Laude* Salem State College Salem, Massachusetts

Professional Experience

4/06-12/06	Customer Solutions Coordinator, Fitness Systems, Inc Franklin, Tennessee
12/05-3/06	Fitness Consultant, Gold's Gym Madison, Tennessee
6/04-6/05	Graduate Research Assistant, Old Dominion University Norfolk, Virginia
12/03-5/05	Sport Management Intern, Salem State College Salem, Massachusetts
5/02-6/04	Road Race Co-coordinator, Salem State College Salem, Massachusetts
8/00-5/04	Exercise Technician III, Salem State College Salem, Massachusetts