Advancing Women in Leadership Online Journal
Volume 20, Winter 2006

Factors Influencing the Willingness to Mentor Females in Leadership Positions within Campus Recreation: A Historical Perspective

Glenna G. Bower, Ph.D.; Mary A. Hums, Ph.D.; and John L. Keedy, Ph.D.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine how mentoring played a role in advancing women in leadership positions within campus recreation from a historical perspective. The present study investigated two areas of inquiry within campus recreation: (a) what were the individual reasons for mentoring women within campus recreation? and (b) what organizational factors inhibited or facilitated mentoring women?

A phenomenological research design was chosen to examine the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor. A group of campus recreation professionals from the Midwest were contacted for the study (N = 5, 3 female and 2 male). The participants were four directors and one assistant director of university campus recreation programs. The primary means of collecting data for this study was three in-depth phenomenological interviews with each participant. The researcher used the constant comparative method of analysis throughout the study. Analysis of the data produced personal life history portraits of each participant and provided themes and categories for each research question.

The data produced a number of interesting findings. First, the study provided valuable information about the perceptions of the mentoring relationship. The personal life history portraits of the mentors showed how their trade of mentoring was conceptualized through their experiences during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. These experiences led to the mentors mentoring both male and female protégés. Second, these mentors indicated the females did not have to be mentored any differently than the males within campus recreation after the early 1970s. Mentors did not provide gender specific data unless discussing the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Study findings provided valuable information on how mentoring played an integral part in helping women advance into leadership positions within campus recreation. The study also provided valuable information for campus recreation directors wanting to know ways to successfully mentor not only females, but also males, entering the campus recreation profession.

Of the United States work population, 64.4 million women were employed in 2003 (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 2005b). In terms of leadership positions, females held 38% of the management positions (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 2005b). Although women are making strides across

many different industries as surveyors, space scientists, production helpers, architects, sheriffs, bailiffs, and other law enforcement officers (U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, 2005a), females are still underrepresented in managerial positions within nontraditional occupations. A nontraditional occupation is one in which women comprise 25% or less of total employment (U.S. Department of Labor, 2005). Women are underrepresented in managerial positions within nontraditional occupations such as business (Catalyst, 2002; Oakley, 2000), higher education administration (Henry, 2004), and the sport industry (Acosta & Carpenter, 2005; Bower & Hums, 2003). Often the lack of progress for women has been attributed to barriers which decrease women's chances of advancing within these professions (U.S. Department of Labor, 2002). These barriers include the glass ceiling (Maume, 2004; Ragins, Townsend, & Mattis, 1998), negative stereotypes (Klenke, 1996), leadership style (Oakley, 2000), balancing work and family (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 2005a), old boys network (Jackson, 2000), tokenism (Kanter, 1978; Lyness & Thompson, 2000), and lack of training and career development (Oakley, 2000).

One initiative receiving a considerable amount of attention for helping women break the gender-related barriers in business (Keating, 2002; Oakley, 2000; Ragins et al., 1998), higher education administration (Morris, 2004; Savage, Karp, & Logue, 2004) and the sport industry (Strawbridge, 2000; Weaver & Chelladurai, 2001) is mentoring. According to Kram (1985), a mentor is defined as "an experienced, productive manager who relates well to a less-experienced employee and facilitates his or her personal development for the benefit of the individual as well as that of the organization" (p. 1).

While the mentoring relationship is important in career development for both genders, it is particularly critical for women, especially those in male-dominated professions (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987; Ragins, 1989). Mentoring relationships are important to female protégés by helping them overcome barriers (Ragins & Cotton, 1991). Mentors may buffer the female manager from overt and covert discrimination and help their female protégés circumvent structural, social, and cultural barriers to advancement in the organization (Ragins, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

Although women are underrepresented in leadership positions within nontraditional occupations, some progress has been made for women in leadership positions within the sport industry (Acosta & Carpenter, 2005; Bower & Hums, 2003). One particular segment of the sport industry showing some progress for women advancing to leadership positions is campus recreation.

The National Intramural Recreation Sports Association (NIRSA) was the first nationally recognized organization supporting campus recreation. Women played a limited role in leadership and administrative positions in campus recreation during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s due to the history of the organization. Women's involvement in NIRSA began in 1950 when the organization held its first meeting at Dillard University in New Orleans. Twenty individuals were present, including three women (Yager, 1983). However, in 1959, women were barred from NIRSA membership, a ban which lasted until 1971 (Varner, 1992). In the last 30 years, women gradually began playing an integral part in the overall development of the organization. For example, between 1981-1992, 11 elections were won by women. These included the first woman elected to a national office serving as Vice President (Patti Homes) in 1981 and the first woman President of NIRSA (Mary Daniels) in 1986 (Varner, 1992).

Yager (1983) examined career patterns of women in NIRSA prior to 1983. One implication of her study was that more mentors were needed to help facilitate the professional advancement of women in campus recreation. With limited research on mentoring females in campus recreation, the purpose of the present study was to examine how mentoring played a role in advancing women in leadership positions within campus recreation. The study focused specifically on the history of the participants as protégés from the late 1950s through the early 1970s (when women were not NIRSA members) followed by the history of the

participants as mentors from 1972 to present (when women were NIRSA members).

Research Questions

The present study focused on the following research questions:

1. What were the individual reasons for mentoring females within campus recreation during the late 1950s to the early 1970s and from early 1970s to the present?

2. What organizational factors inhibited or facilitated mentoring females within campus recreation during the late 1950s to the early 1970s and from the early 1970s to the present?

Methodology

Participants and Procedures

The campus recreation professionals identified for this research study were chosen on the following criteria: (a) the campus recreation professional worked as a director or assistant director, and (b) were identified through two purposeful sampling techniques. The two types of purposeful sampling techniques used to select the participants for this study were "criterion" and "snowball/chain sampling". The criterion sample was identified in a previous study by Bower and Hums (2003). The "snowball/ chain sampling" was identified by the criterion sample identifying additional participants for the study. A group of campus recreation professionals from the Midwest were contacted for the study (N = 5). The participants consisted of four directors and one assistant director of university campus recreation programs.

Instrument

This research study relied on three in-depth phenomenological interviews as the primary means of collecting data. Demographic information was also collected from each participant.
Demographic Data. The researchers used a background data collection form to determine the gender, age, race, highest level of education obtained, current job title, number of years in campus recreation, and number of years at current university of each participant.
Phenomenological Interview. The initial mentoring interview procedures for this study were developed and used in a prior study (Allen, Poteet, & Burroughs, 1997). A pilot study was performed resulting in a revised interview protocol. Each interview ranged from 45 to 90 minutes.

The first interview focused on the late 1950s to the early 1970s, asking the participants about their personal life histories as protégés. The researcher asked the participants to discuss their lives up until the time they became mentors, going as far back as possible. Demographic data were also collected during this interview. The second interview brought the narrative to the present (early 1970s to present), asking participants about their personal life histories as mentors. The participants situated their experiences within the context of their social settings. Finally, the third interview focused on integrating the two previous interviews in reflecting on the meaning of their experiences about how mentoring helped them advance as protégés and influenced their decisions to mentor females today.

Analyses

A categorical strategy of analysis was used for the research study (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). The reduction of interview data was done by using Lincoln and Guba's (1985) organization, familiarization, generating categories/themes, and coding. First, HyperResearcher 2.0 was used to organize the data. Second, the data was read and re-read to begin the process of coding and categorizing the data. Third, an inductive analysis was used to identify categories within the data. The constant comparative approach was used throughout the

study, allowing each interview to build on the next to further confirm or modify pre-existing categories. Themes began to emerge during intensive analysis and categorization of data. Finally, by coding the data, the researchers discovered a clear understanding of the meaning of words and/or phrases and elaborated on key concepts.

Results

Personal Life History Portraits

Personal life history portraits gathered information about the experiences of the mentor as a protégé. The information gathered for the personal life history portraits included the following: (a) demographic information, (b) the mentor as a protégé, and (c) personal histories as mentors. The demographic data included a detailed analysis for each mentor including, gender, age, race, educational background (including graduate assistantship information), official job title, number of years in campus recreation, number of years in current position, and number of years at current university. The demographic information can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Data

Data	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Gender	M	F	F	F	M
Age	46	49	52	59	36
Race	White	White	White	White	White
Undergrad degree	Education	Physical Education	Physical Education	History/ Political Science	Broadcast Journalism
Masters degree	Education	Recreation Management	Physical Education	Education	Recreation Administration
Official job title	Director	Director	Director/ Associate Dean	Director	Associate Director
Number yrs in campus recreation	24	25	29	32	17

Number yrs at current university	24	23	29	26.5	7.5
Number yrs at current position	21	23	12	5.5	3.5
Number of mentors	3	3	1	1	3

The results of the mentors' experiences as protégés included number of mentors, gender of the mentors, initiation of the mentoring relationship, structure of the mentoring relationship (formal/informal, meeting place, times a week, etc), mentoring style of their mentors, mentoring characteristics of their mentors, and sustaining the mentoring relationship. The mentors' experiences as a protégés are found in Table 2.

Table 2

Portraits of the Mentor Experiences as a Protégé

Indicators	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of significant mentors	3	3	1	1	3
Gender of mentor(s)	M/F	M/F	M	M	M/F
Mentoring initiation	Both	Mentor	Mentor	Hiring Process	Protégé
Structure of relationship	Formal	Both	Formal	Informal	Informal
Mentoring style	Empowering	Nurturing/ Caring	Assertive/ Aggressive	Authority	Authority
Mentoring character	Listening/Leadership	Comm. Skills	Emotional Control	Organize Tasks	Work Ethic

relationship
sustained

The mentors' personal life histories as mentors included information such as number of "significant" protégés, the structure of the mentoring relationship, number of years in the mentoring relationships with protégés, the initiation of the mentoring relationship, successful features of the mentoring relationship, advice about the mentoring relationship, and characteristics of the ideal mentor. The mentors' personal life histories as mentors are found in Table 3.

Table 3

Personal Histories as a Mentor

Indicators	Doug Ray	Rachel Sizemore	Kelly Bond	Carmen Stellar	Ted Vister
Number of significant protégés	6	30	4	8	20-25
Gender of protégé(s)	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
Length of relationship (yrs)	12-15	2-20	22-28	5-30	7.5
Mentoring initiation	Mentor	Both	Mentor	Both	Mentor
Ideal characteristics of Mentor	Listening	Listening Compassion Interested	Caring Emotional Intelligence	Sincere Caring Patient	Listen Caring

The Research Questions

The responses to the research questions were revealed through themes. The data findings for the research questions are displayed in a matrix in Table 4. Each research question was divided into pre and post women's NIRSA membership responses to better reflect the historical aspect of women being mentored during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, followed by the early 1970s to present.

Table 4

Themes for Each Research Question

Research Question One: What were the individual reasons for mentoring women within campus recreation?

1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s

Theme One: Struggling times for women in leadership positions

Theme One: Struggling times for women in leadership positions

Early 1970s to Present

Theme One: Helping both female and male students to learn and grow

Research Question Two: What organizational factors inhibit or facilitate mentoring women within campus recreation?

1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s

Theme One: Barriers to women advancing within campus recreation

Theme Two: Mentoring style of the mentor

Theme Three: Support for women

Early 1970s to Present

Theme One: Professional development opportunities

Research Question One: What Were the Individual Reasons for Mentoring Women Within Campus Recreation?
1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s

The response to Research Question One, individual reasons for mentoring females in campus recreation, revealed two general themes that were conceptualized during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s when the mentors were protégés. The mentors as protégés utilized their experiences in describing reasons why women needed to be mentored in the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Those two themes consisted of *struggling times for women in leadership positions and lack of female leaders*.

Theme one was the mentors describing *struggling times for women in leadership positions*. The mentors described struggling times for females within campus recreation during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. K. Bond (personal communication, August 18, 2003) illustrated the struggling times by explaining how women went through a period which was truly a "pioneering time." This distinctive set of experiences motivated women to mentor other women:

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

Theme two was the mentors describing *the lack of female leaders*. The mentors described a male-dominated

field where women were not seen as leaders and mentoring was crucial. R. Sizemore (personal communication, October 24, 2003) indicated there was a different perspective on mentoring women to help them advance in leadership positions in the late 1950s, 1960s, and/or early 1970s as she illustrates:

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

Early 1970s to the Present

One theme was conceptualized in Research Question One through the experiences of the mentor as a protégé during this era. The theme was *helping students to learn and grow* and was an excellent example of the protégé experience leading to the development of a mentoring philosophy. The mentors described having the desire to help students regardless if they were male or female. The mentors expressed ideas about how people in this profession need to be committed to working with students. They need to have a genuine interest in helping students develop and mature.

K. Bond (personal communication, August 18, 2003) mentioned, "You do need to commit the time to try and help influence these kids. You know if you don't, I think you're doomed." K. Bond (personal communication, August 18, 2003) proceeded to describe how important it was to give back to the profession, "I think anyone who is going to be in a leadership position you need to give back to the profession. One of the best ways you can do that is being a mentor."

Research Question Two: What organizational factors inhibited and/or facilitated mentoring women in campus recreation?
1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s

The responses to Research Question Two, organizational factors which inhibited and/or facilitated mentoring women in campus recreation, revealed three general themes conceptualized during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s when the mentors were protégés. Those three themes consisted of *barriers to women advancing within campus recreation, mentoring style of the mentor, and support for women*.

Theme one was the mentors describing barriers women experienced in the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s as organizational factors which inhibited mentoring relationships. More specifically, the barriers in this study included the "old boys network," "lack females in the field due to lack of training and development," and "discrimination." This lack of acceptance in the field was an inhibiting factor to mentoring relationships during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. K. Bond (personal communication, October 17, 2003) explained how it was a pioneering time for women because campus recreation was initially male dominated:

> We [women] had nowhere to go but up because there wasn't a systematic involvement of women. It was a response to male interest for the sport experience not how do we allow for, cultivate, even determine what women wanted out of a recreational sports experience. . . . So I know that initially it [campus recreation] was very gender driven and it was difficult to overcome the obstacles and history of discrimination.

Although mentors indicated these barriers are not as prevalent today, the mentors indicated they can still

inhibit the mentoring relationship.

Theme two describes how the *mentoring style of the mentor* can be an organizational factor inhibiting the mentoring relationship. The mentors used their experiences as protégés during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s to conceptualize a mentoring style that was not intimidating but rather was supporting, encouraging, nurturing, guiding, and invested in the potential protégés within their organizations. T. Vister (personal communication, October 21, 2003) reiterated the need for a mentoring style which is caring within the organization:

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

Theme three illustrated the need for organizational *support of women in campus recreation* especially in the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Bond illustrated the need to show organizational support for women through her experience as a protégé. She indicated support from her boss as a key component for women to advance within campus recreation. K. Bond (personal communication, August 18, 2003) described the importance of her boss helping her through difficult challenges in this male-dominated field:

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

According to these participants, the need for support is not specific only to women. Support is needed for males as well as females within the organization.

Early 1970s to the Present

One theme was conceptualized through the experiences of the mentor as a protégé for Research Question Two. The theme was professional development opportunities, and the mentors spoke more in terms of late 1970s to present when women were a part of the NIRSA organization again. During the late 1970s through the 1980s, the mentors illustrated how important it was for females to have professional development opportunities within campus recreation. R. Sizemore (personal communication, October 24, 2003) indicated that professional *development opportunities* in the late 1970s and 1980s were targeted toward women:

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

Finally, the mentors expressed how important it was for the mentors to offer professional development opportunities to their protégés whether they were male or female. These professional development opportunities were geared toward helping the protégés obtain leadership positions regardless of gender.

Discussion

Personal Life History Portraits

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

professionals during the late 1950s - early 1970s. These were difficult times for women since campus recreation was extremely male-dominated during those years. The years 1950-1975 represented a period of time which was truly pioneering for women in campus recreation. K. Bond (personal communication, October 17, 2003) explained her protégé experience was a pioneering time for women because campus recreation was initially male dominated:

> Women had nowhere to go but up because there wasn't a systematic involvement of women. It was a response to male interest for the sport experience, not how do we allow for, cultivate, even determine what women wanted out of a recreational sports experience. . . . So I know that initially campus recreation was very gender driven and it was difficult to overcome the obstacles and history of discrimination.

The only national organization for campus recreation professionals, the National Intramural Association (NIA), held its first meeting in 1950 at Dillard University. During that meeting only three women were present. In 1959, women were banned from the organization, not returning until 1971. It was not until 1987 that a woman took office as president. Up to that point 28 men held the president position within the NIA which eventually became the National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA). This was a time when mentoring was especially important for women in the field, but there were limited opportunities. If opportunities for mentoring did occur, they were with male campus recreation administrators.

The personal life history portraits and research questions provided valuable information about the perceptions of the mentoring relationship. The personal life history portraits of the mentors showed how their trade of mentoring was conceptualized through their experiences during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. The majority of the mentors in this study were mentored by males. This is understandable since the mentoring experience happened mostly during the late 1950s to the early 1970s and the mentors mentioned a "lack of female leaders" and "struggling times for women in leadership positions." Females were banned from the national campus recreation organization (NIRSA) and had to survive in a male-dominated field with a lack of female mentors. Mentors stressed the importance of "support" for women during this time as a factor which facilitated the mentoring relationship.

These experiences led to the mentors mentoring both male and female protégés. These mentors indicated the females did not have to be mentored any differently than the males within campus recreation after the early 1970s. The majority of the mentors did not provide gender specific data unless discussing the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. The information revealed significant factors which influenced the willingness to mentor females in campus recreation during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, but not today. This was a significant finding because it contradicted the findings of Bower and Hums (2003) which clearly established gendered responses for women in campus recreation today. During the 2003 study, women in campus recreation indicated a lack of respect. They were frustrated by needing to continually prove themselves, lack of recognition and support, not being taken seriously, and being mistaken as the "secretary" within the organization. Women did not feel like a part of the network. The respondents often felt "left out," as evidenced by comments related to lack of female representation, "the glass ceiling," and the "good old boys network."

Research Questions
What are the Individual Reasons for Mentoring Females within Campus Recreation?

The themes for Research Question One included: (a) struggling times for women in leadership positions, (b) lack of female leaders, and (c) helping students learn and grow.

First, the mentors as protégés described *struggling times for women in leadership positions* as an individual reason for mentoring. When talking about struggling times for women, the mentors as protégés were

referring to the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s when it was difficult for women to be in campus recreation. As illustrated in the introduction, the late 1950s through the early 1970s were difficult times for women in campus recreation because it was a male-dominated field (Varner, 1992). The National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) organization was formed in 1952 by a group of 17 men and three women (Varner, 1992). By 1959 women were banned from organizational membership, only to return ten years later in 1969. During the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, campus recreation was a typical male-dominated organization (Varner, 1992). This supports the literature on women having fewer formal and informal opportunities than men for developing mentoring relationships (Kram, 1985). During this time, women in campus recreation did not have opportunities to participate in important projects. Often mentors selected protégés partially on the basis of their involvement in such projects (Hunt & Michael, 1983). Thus, the mentors had limited work experience with women, and this supported the "barriers" (old boys network, lack of trained females, and discrimination) to women advancing in campus recreation."

Second, the mentors described the *lack of female leaders* in campus recreation during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s as an individual reason for mentoring women in campus recreation during that time. Due to the lack of females in leadership positions, the mentors described the importance of mentoring females specifically to help them advance within campus recreation administration. The lack of female leaders equated to a low number of female mentors within campus recreation. Women were often denied an opportunity to develop a mentoring relationship with either a female or a male. This may be related to the reasons why there was a lack of female leaders in campus recreation. Since there was a lack of mentors for females during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, and mentoring has been linked to professional advancement (Kram, 1983, 1985), women in campus recreation were faced with a lack of upward mobility within their organizations. Thus, mentors described the lack of female leaders in campus recreation as an individual reason for mentoring during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s; however, the study indicated very few gender related responses when the mentors reflected on the 1980s to the present. This seems unusual considering there is still a lack of females in leadership positions within campus recreation. According to the *2004 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory*, only 17% of all NIRSA members are female (Bower & Hums, 2003). This perception also contradicted the study conducted by Bower and Hums (2003) which illustrated an under-representation of females in leadership positions within campus recreation. This would suggest an even smaller number of women in leadership positions compared to men. It seems the mentors in this study had a different perception on the reality of the current situation for women in campus recreation. Although the *2004 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory* indicated a lack of female leaders, the majority of mentors in this study believed there currently was equal representation within campus recreation. This may be due to the fact the majority of the mentors were older and experienced the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s where leadership positions for females were scarce. The mentors believed the females have come a long way in campus recreation since the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, and therefore have a perception of women not being underrepresented in the field.

Finally, the third theme developed as a result of the mentors' protégé experience. The mentors described *helping students to learn and grow* as an individual reason for mentoring when talking about the early 1970s, 1980s, and today. This theme supports the literature linking the willingness to mentor to altruism (Allen et al., 1997; Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1996). The mentors in this case are mentoring both male and female students, and thus their response to helping students to learn and grow is a motivating factor for them in their job. This is supporting evidence of mentoring being related not only to improving the welfare of others but related to improving the welfare of the self (Allen et al., 1997).

What Organizational Factors Inhibited or Facilitated Mentoring Females within Campus Recreation?

The themes for Research Question Two included, (a) inhibiting factors and (b) facilitating factors. The first theme, inhibiting factors, included two categories (1) *barriers to women advancing within campus recreation* and (2) *the mentoring style*. The first category included the mentors describing *barriers to women*

advancing within campus recreation as an organizational factor which inhibited mentoring relationships during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. This was a time when women were not accepted by their peers within campus recreation. Token women were placed in the organizational limelight and faced high levels of performance pressure and stereotypical expectations. This was predominately in the 1950s when women were allowed to attend a business meeting hosted by the National Intramural Association (NIA), and there would be primarily men administrators and one female. K. Bond (personal communication, October 17, 2003) explained, "So you were just trotting along your own ground. Sometimes the men would make you feel inferior." This increased visibility for the "token" woman within the organization created barriers for women to advance within the organization, such as an "old boys network," lack of training and development to allow additional females in leadership roles, and discrimination. These barriers are illustrated in the research conducted by Ragins (1996), which indicated women faced barriers within their organization because supervisors and co-workers disapproved of women working in the field. More specifically, the barriers in this study included the "old boys network," "lack of trained females," and "discrimination."

The second category included the mentors describing the *mentoring style* as an organizational factor which inhibited the mentoring relationship during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. This may be due to the number of males in the profession at the time. Males often are associated with an authoritarian style of mentoring which is characterized by competitiveness, assertiveness, and hierarchical control (Van Engen, Leeder, & Willemseen, 2001). This type of authoritarian mentoring style may be intimidating to the protégés, especially women, and often leads to conflicts between the superior and the employee. Women are associated with transformational or charismatic mentoring styles which are characterized by nurturing and being sensitive to the needs to others (Van Engen et al., 2001). Since there was a lack of female mentors in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s, the only mentoring came from men, which may have been predominately authoritarian, thus a factor which inhibited the mentoring relationship for women.

Although the authoritarian style could carry a negative connotation, the mentors also mentioned it may be necessary to take responsibility for the decision making process in order to control the performance of the employee. In this case the mentor stresses the values of obedience, loyalty, and strict adherence to rules. Some employees, regardless of their gender, need this type of style (Smither, 1991).

The second theme, facilitating factors, included two categories (a) *support for women* and (b) *professional development opportunities*. The first category included the mentors describing the need for support for women during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. The mentors described how their mentors guided, encouraged, and supported them. The mentors referred to support from supervisors, co-workers, and others within the organization. If the supervisor had a transformational or charismatic "mentoring style" which was supportive of women, the male co-workers were more likely to also be supportive of women. In some cases, however, male co-workers still created problems for women in the early late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s due to the low acceptance rate of women within this field. Research indicates support from others is a precursor to developmental activity (Allen et. al, 1997). The present study suggests that perceived support for women within the organization facilitates mentoring.

The second category included the mentors describing *professional development opportunities* for women and men as organizational factors which influenced the mentoring relationship. This is important for both females and males within campus recreation because mentoring is how young professionals become prepared or socialized to accept powerful leadership positions (Scanlon, 1997). The mentoring relationship is used frequently in organizations as an informal means of providing employees with guidance on how to develop within their profession (Scanlon, 1997).

Implications

This study has several implications for campus recreation professionals. First, the personal life history portraits and the research questions provided valuable information about the perceptions of the mentoring relationship. The personal life history portraits of the mentors showed how their trade of mentoring was conceptualized through their experiences during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. These experiences led to the mentoring philosophy used to mentor both male and female protégés today. These mentors indicated the females did not have to be mentored any differently than the males within campus recreation following the late 1970s. This may be due to the historical event of allowing females to be a part of the NIRSA organization again in 1971.

Second, gender related responses to mentoring females in campus recreation were voiced by the participants more so in terms of the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. During this time period women struggled to enter the campus recreation field. The mentors believed the lack of female leaders was a reason for mentoring women in campus recreation. However, the mentors in this study also believe there is not a shortage of women in leadership positions today. A study by Bower and Hums (2003) and the *2004 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory* would contradict this statement. Professionals in this field need to be aware there is still a lack of female representation in leadership positions. Without this awareness, women would continue to be stagnant and in possible jeopardy of helping other young women trying to get into the field of campus recreation. Therefore campus recreation professionals should more actively seek to initiate mentoring relationships with women entering the field.

Third, helping the protégé to learn and grow was an individual reason for mentoring both females and males. In order to help the protégé to learn and grow, professional mentors need to be aware that more mistakes are made in the field of campus recreation by students who may not have the developed the skills necessary to do the job right away (Bower & Hums, In press). While this may require a larger time commitment on the part of professionals in campus recreation, the time commitment is necessary to help students learn and grow.

Fourth, barriers (old boys network, lack of trained women, and discrimination) were displayed in gendered responses to women advancing within campus recreation during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. This was the time when women were not accepted within the field of campus recreation, and therefore were not rewarded with the same opportunities as men. This lack of acceptance into the field was an inhibiting factor to mentoring relationships during the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Although participants indicated they believed the barriers are not as prevalent today, the mentors indicated the barriers can still inhibit the mentoring relationship. Finally, organizational support for women was especially needed in the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. Today, according to the participants, the need for support is not specific only to women. Support is needed for females as well as males within the organization.

Fifth, mentoring style may be important to consider in the field of campus recreation. The mentors recommended mentoring females and males with a style that was supporting, encouraging, nurturing, and instilled strength and confidence within the protégé. The mentors also recommended awareness of when protégé needs to be taken under control and stressing the values of obedience, loyalty, and strict adherence to rules.

Sixth, professional development opportunities were important for females and males within campus recreation. Since professional development is so important, campus recreation professionals who are mentoring need to be aware of the trends of the various segments in the field. Students need to be encouraged to attend professional conferences such as the NIRSA National Convention, Student Lead On, State workshops, and/or the Annual EMSL Emerging Student Leaders Conference.

Future Research

The study revealed some interesting areas for future research in campus recreation administration. First, this study focused on mentoring as an initiative for improving the representation of women in leadership positions. However, the majority of the mentors in the study believed there currently was equal representation in terms of leadership between females and males in the campus recreation field. Since the *2004 NIRSA Recreational Sports Directory* and a study by Bower and Hums (2003) would not support such a statement, future research needs to focus on the representation of women in leadership positions within campus recreation. Additional research in this area will provide awareness needed to bring the situation into reality.

Second, this study included four campus recreation directors or associate directors whose experiences as a protégé were predominately in the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. A future study needs to focus on campus recreation directors or associate directors with work experience from the early 1970s to the present. Will there still be non-gendered responses in terms of factors influencing the willingness to mentor females in campus recreation, or will there be gendered responses?

Third, this study may be duplicated in other industries such as business, higher education administration, or other segments of the sport industry. Did mentoring play a role in helping women to advance in leadership positions within these industries? What were the individual reasons for mentoring females within these industries? What organizational factor inhibited or facilitated mentoring in these industries? All these topics for future research reveal that mentoring in campus recreation can be a complex and rich arena.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the historical perspective of mentoring to advance women in leadership positions within campus recreation. The research questions and personal histories of the mentors generated rich data on the mentoring relationship for both females and males in campus recreation. Mentoring was a powerful tool for helping some of the female mentors in the study during the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s to overcome barriers and become leaders in campus recreation today. The lack of gendered responses during the 1980s, 1990s, and the present contradicted what women voiced in a study by Bower and Hums (2003). The 2003 study clearly identified gender discrimination such as needing to continually prove themselves, lack of recognition and support, and not being taken seriously, all of which was not a problem for the male population. With the lack of conclusive evidence to support that mentoring helped to advance women within leadership positions within the 1980s, 1990s, and the present, it is hoped that numerous related studies on this topic will be conducted to further examine mentoring in campus recreation.

References

Acosta, V., & Carpenter, L. (2005). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study-Twenty-third year update*. West Brookfield, MA: Carpenter/Acosta.

Allen, T. D., Poteet, M. L., & Burroughs, S. M. (1997). The mentor's perspective: A qualitative inquiry and future research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 70-89.

Aryee, S., Chay, Y. W., & Chew, J. (1996). The motivation to mentor among managerial employees. *Group and Organization Management, 21*, 261-277.

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (in press). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor students in campus recreation. *NIRSA Recreational Sports Journal*.

Bower, G. G., & Hums, M. A. (2003). Women working in the administration of campus recreation: Career paths and challenges. *NIRSA Recreational Sports Journal, 27*(2), 21-35.

Catalyst. (2002). *2002 Catalyst census of women business directors of the Fortune 1000*. New York: Sara Lee Corporation.

Dreher, G., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 539-546.

Henry, C. M. (2004). Advancing women. *Chemical & Engineering News, 82*(10), 37

Hunt, D., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *Academy of Management Review, 8*, 475-480.

Jackson, J. C. (2000). Women middle managers' perception of the glass ceiling. *Women in management review, 16*, 30-41.

Kanter, R. M. (1978). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Keating, L. (2002). *Women mentoring women: The rewards of giving. Women in Business, 54*(1), 28.

Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership: A contextual perspective*. New York: Springer.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scot, Foresman.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lyness, K. S., & Thompson, D. E. (2000). Climbing the corporate ladder: Do female and male executives follow the same route? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 86.

Maume, D. J. (2004). Is the glass ceiling a unique form of inequality? Evidence from a random-effects model of managerial attainment. *Work and Occupations, 31*(2), 250.

Morris, L. V. (2004). Changing institutions and changing faculty. *Innovative Higher Education, 29*(1), 3-6.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Oakley, J. G. (2000). Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics, 27*, 321-334.

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

Ragins, B. R. (1996). Jumping the hurdles: Barriers to mentoring for women in organizations. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 17*, 37-41.

Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. (1991). Easier said than done: Gender differences in perceived barriers to gaining a mentor. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 939-951.

Ragins, B. R., Townsend, B., & Mattis, M. (1998). Gender gap in the executive suite: CEO's and female executives report on breaking the glass ceiling. *Academy of Management Executive, 12*, 28-42.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Savage, H. E., Karp, R. S., & Logue, R. (2004). Faculty mentorship at colleges and universities. *College Teaching*, 52(1), 21-24.

Scanlon, K. C. (1997). Mentoring women administrators breaking through the glass ceiling. *Initiatives, 58,* 39-48.

Smither, R. (1991). The return of the authoritarian manager. *Training, 28*(11), 40-45.

Strawbridge, M. (2000). The professional preparation of women in leadership of sports. *Women in Sports Leadership, 4*, 46-53.

U.S. Department of Labor. (2002). *A report on the glass ceiling initiative*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau (2005a). Quick facts on nontraditional occupations for women. Retrieved on February 13, 2005 from *http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/Qf-nontra.htm*.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau (2005b). Women in the labor force in 2003. Retrieved on February 13, 2005 from *http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/Qf-laborforce.htm*.

Van Engen, M. L., Leeden, R. V. D., & Willemseen, T. M. (2001). Gender, context and leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74*(5), 581-599.

Varner, H. S. (1992). Women in the NIRSA. *NIRSA Journal, 17*(1), 26-30.

Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2001). Mentoring in intercollegiate athletic administration. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*, 96-116.

Yager, G. M. (1983). Career patterns of women in NIRSA. *Personnel, 1*, 113-124.

Authors

Glenna G. Bower, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
University of Southern Indiana
8600 University Blvd
Evansville, IN 47714
(812)461-5269 (Office)
(812)461-5273 (Fax)
gbower@usi.edu

Mary A. Hums, Ph.D.
Professor
110 HPES/Studio Arts Building
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
(502)852-5908 (Office)
(502)852-6683 (Fax)
mhums@louisville.edu

John L. Keedy, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Room 336, Education Building
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
(502)852-0619 (Office)
(502)852-4563 (Fax)

keedy @ louisville.edu