



8-2011

Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of NCAA Divisions II and III Athletic Directors

Kaleb Russell Center
kcenter@utk.edu

Recommended Citation

Center, Kaleb Russell, "Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of NCAA Divisions II and III Athletic Directors." Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2011.
http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/956

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Kaleb Russell Center entitled "Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of NCAA Divisions II and III Athletic Directors." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Recreation and Sport Management.

Rob Hardin, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Steven N. Waller, Jim Bemiller

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Kaleb Russell Center entitled "Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of NCAA Divisions II and III Athletic Directors." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Recreation and Sport Management.

Robin Hardin, PhD, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Steven Waller, PhD

Jim Bemiller, JD

Accepted for the Council

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

**Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of
NCAA Divisions II and III Athletic Directors**

A Thesis Presented for the Master's of Science Degree
University of Tennessee

Kaleb Russell Center

August 2011

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the ones at home who have carried me through it all:

Ginny, Sofia, and Phoebe.

Abstract

Athletic directors (ADs) in institutions of higher education are the chief administrators of their respective athletic departments. The purpose of this study is to describe the current demographic, educational, and professional characteristics of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division II and III ADs. Forty-five Division II ADs and 105 Division III ADs responded to a survey of 725 institutions, returning response rates of 15.5% and 24.1% respectively. Findings for social and educational demographics mirror those of previous studies. Subjects in both divisions studied athletic administration in post-graduate work, but studies in education were also common. Experiences in coaching and athletic administration were most frequent for both samples. Division II ADs were notably experienced in compliance, while teaching experiences were common with Division III ADs. Both sets were heavily involved in finance and internal policy, but Division II responses emphasized community relations while Division III responses emphasized campus relations. Limited resources challenged ADs in both groups. In conclusion, NCAA institutions, especially those with athletic administration departments and significant minority populations, should promote NCAA diversity initiatives campus-wide. Students and professionals preparing for a career as a Division II or Division III AD should pursue post-graduate education in an administrative field, preferably in concentrations of sport or education. They should choose a career path involving teaching, coaching, or an administrative specialization within athletics, and they should be familiar with finance and NCAA regulations. Recommendations for future research include detailed analysis of AD job design and investigating whether ADs can be clustered based on their involvement in various tasks.

KEY WORDS: Athletic directors, intercollegiate sport, surveys, career path, job analysis

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Literature Review	6
Demographics	6
Homologous Reproduction	7
Educational Qualifications.....	9
Career Qualifications	10
Isomorphism	12
Job Satisfaction	15
Motivation.....	16
Chapter III: Methods.....	17
Data Collection	17
Analysis.....	18
Instrumentation	19
Chapter IV: Results.....	21
Research Question 1a.....	21
Research Question 2a.....	23
Research Question 3a.....	24
Research Question 4a.....	24
Research Question 5a.....	25
Research Question 1b	26
Research Question 2b	27
Research Question 3b	28
Research Question 4b	29

Research Question 5b	29
Chapter V: Discussion	31
Research Question 1a.....	31
Research Question 2a.....	33
Research Question 3a.....	35
Research Question 4a.....	36
Research Question 5a.....	37
Research Question 1b	39
Research Question 2b	41
Research Question 3b	43
Research Question 4b	44
Research Question 5b	45
Limitations and Delimitations.....	47
Future Research	48
List of References	49
Appendices.....	55
Vita.....	72

List of Tables

Table 1: Athletic Director Demographic Profile	63
Table 2: Areas of Study	64
Table 3: Frequency and Average Length of 24 Previous Career Experiences by Division	65
Table 4: Division II ADs' Involvement in 16 Work Activities	66
Table 5: Division III ADs' Involvement in 16 Work Activities	67
Table 6: Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Rewarding Aspect of AD Position	68
Table 7: Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Troublesome/Challenging Aspect of AD Position.....	69
Table 8: Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Motivation to Pursue AD Position.....	70
Table 9: Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Motivation to Work in College Athletics	71

Chapter I: Introduction

Athletic directors (ADs) are seen as the chief executive officers within the athletic department of the colleges and universities they serve. Consequently, they can be praised for the success – or blamed for the failure – of the organizations they direct (Davis, 2002). Through their leadership and management, athletic programs are built and are equipped with the resources to compete, and student-athletes develop skills for life (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2002). Thousands of young men and women each year earn degrees funded by scholarships distributed by athletic departments (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2009). Under the effective supervision and support of ADs, coaches may develop the skills to motivate athletes to success on and off the field. Championships and individual accolades bring notoriety, respect, and revenue to their institutions.

At one time, the AD role's emphasis on student-athlete development was central to its authority (Cuneen, 1992). Traditionally, ADs were highly involved with the development of coaches and, in turn, student-athletes. Their direct interaction with the sport programs under their responsibility influenced the nature of their qualifications. As experts in the student-athlete experience, ADs were selected from among the most successful teachers, coaches, and former student-athletes for their direct involvement in the developmental process. However, this selection was guided by social constructs in which customary qualifications such as coaching football and men's basketball were significant pre-requisites (Fitzgerald, Sagaria, & Nelson, 1994).

Because of their executive role, however, and the increasing importance of the business aspects of sport, the demands placed on ADs have grown (Copeland & Kirsch, 1995). Responsibilities have increased and become more complex, and in response, AD qualifications have evolved. Many ADs are no longer able to interact directly with sport programs on a regular

basis, due to “big picture” concerns such as budgeting, policy, personnel, and public relations. In addition, peripheral duties, such as compliance and business management, require their frequent attention. ADs are forced to take on the roles they feel are most important or essential, and delegate others (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001). A result is “diverse expectations for the prerequisite experiences” (Fitzgerald, et al., 1994, p. 15).

Institutions in the NCAA are classified into one of three main divisions (I, II, or III), based on the mission of the institution, the athletic scholarships they offer, and the number of sports in which they compete (Fitzgerald et al., 1994). The NCAA has created “separate and sharp contrasts between divisions,” most notably in the area of revenue produced (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001, p. 48). At the highest level of competition, institutions compete on a national level and therefore enjoy the broadest support. This is especially true for the sports of football and men’s basketball, where revenues from live media broadcasts rival those of the professional leagues (Kahn, 2007). At a Division III institution, however, the philosophy of the athletic department more likely regards the campus as its main constituency. By shifting focus from the public to the athlete, maximizing the number of athletic opportunities for students, and integrating athletics and academics, Division III athletics takes on quite a different mission (Robinson, Peterson, Tedrick & Carpenter, 2003; NCAA, 2007).

These differences in size and scope likely influence varied career experiences for the ADs in charge (Fitzgerald et al., 1994). For example, an AD at a Division I intercollegiate athletics program in a major athletic conference is likely to deal with more issues relating to public relations, publicity, or media than one at a small, private, Division III college, based on the respective missions of the two classifications (Ruihley & Fall, 2009). Such variations in job functions may in turn require unique qualifications for positions of equal rank at different levels

of competition. Conversely, the administrators at smaller schools, such as can be found in Division II and III, are more likely to have teaching or coaching duties due to budget constraints or a heightened focus on an academic mission (Robinson, et al., 2003).

Constantly changing tasks such as compliance issues, licensing of college trademarks, and the continuous search for new revenue streams create challenge and complexity for ADs (Copeland & Kirsch, 1995). As Copeland and Kirsch note, “The many hats now required of college ADs could lead to role overload or stress caused from imbalance of work quantity and time” (p. 71). This balancing act is particularly demanding in light of the budget and human resource restraints facing many intercollegiate athletic departments, especially those outside of Division I (Davis, 2002).

Increased involvement by institutional presidents in NCAA Division I schools has led to better understanding of the needs and concerns of athletic directors at that level (Seidler, Gerdy, & Cardinal, 1998). With better understanding, communication, and cooperation, athletic programs may stand to increase their effectiveness and the quality of the sport programs they offer. On the condition that such findings can be generalized to Division II and Division III institutions, an analysis of the challenges, rewards, and motivations of ADs in those settings may provide some context from which college and university presidents can draw in their approach to becoming more involved in athletics.

Results of investigations such as this can inform faculty in sport administration programs who target their lessons to the instructional needs of students (Quarterman, 1992). The findings of Fitzgerald et al. (1994) suggest that the careers of ADs tend to develop within a single division or a set of similar institutions. Since many liberal arts colleges, where teaching practices allow

for more customized attention, are found among the Division II and Division III ranks, this aspect of the study may prove useful.

Racial and gender inequalities have been well documented in previous studies. Despite figures showing athletics departments in general becoming more diverse, athletic director positions have long been dominated by white males (The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport, 2011). Gender equity is especially lacking among Division I ADs, however equity in Divisions II and III still have much room for improvement. The NCAA (2008) claims that in addition to improving workplace performance, diversity increases the number and quality of job applicants for administrative and coaching positions, and attracts a greater number of suppliers and sponsors as resources for sport organizations.

In preparation for this study, the bulk of data found assessing demographic trends among athletic directors were from the 1980s and 1990s. An updated set of data is needed to continue to assess progress in equality measures. Results of ongoing, up-to-date surveys were found measuring gender in athletic administration, but not for such demographics as age, job tenure, ethnicity, income, or marital status.

The purpose of this study is to characterize NCAA Division II and III Athletic Directors, their educational and professional backgrounds, and their job functions. Several research questions guide this investigation:

1. (a) Who holds the title of athletic director at Division II schools, and (b) who holds the title of athletic director at Division III schools?
2. (a) How have Division II ADs become qualified to perform their jobs, and (b) how have Division III ADs become qualified to perform their jobs?

3. (a) Where are Division II ADs most involved in their daily work, and (b) where are Division III ADs most involved in their daily work?
4. (a) Why are Division II ADs satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs or careers, and (b) why are Division III ADs satisfied or dissatisfied with their jobs or careers?
5. (a) What do Division II ADs find most rewarding, challenging, and motivating about their jobs and chosen profession, and (b) what do Division III ADs find most rewarding, challenging, and motivating about their jobs and chosen profession?

The importance of this research lies primarily in its addition to the cumulative bank of knowledge in sport administration. The profession of athletic director deserves research because of the high-profile role it serves within higher education, and because observations made about ADs may be applied to other areas of sport and recreation. Few, if any, studies have previously surveyed ADs about such a wide range of personal characteristics related to their profession. Through this investigation, those pursuing and practicing intercollegiate athletics administration as a profession will be offered objectives that aspiring Division II or III athletic directors may find helpful in their careers. Another significant outcome would be to provide students with insight pertaining to the job functions and qualifications of athletic directors at Division II and III institutions. Finally, the data collected in this study may provide a sketch of the demographic makeup of the profession. With an up-to-date analysis of athletic director characteristics, organizations such as the NCAA, the National Federation of State High School Associations, and the North American Society for Sport Management, as well as professional sport organizations, might improve athletic administration and its perception at all levels of sport.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Demographics

The research on collegiate athletic directors and their careers originates in the 1970s following the formalization of a curriculum for sport administration (Quarterman, 1992), and the passage of Title IX and other civil rights legislation (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; TIDE, 2011). With federal implementation of rules about equal opportunity and public advertisement of vacancies, the 1970s were a decade of new mobility for groups previously overlooked in employment practices (Sagaria, 1988). Legislation meant to enforce gender and racial equality generated interest in demographic disparities in many areas of higher education, yet in physical education and professional sport, these issues often took a back seat (Fink & Pastore, 1999). The theory of homologous reproduction (Lovett & Lowry, 1994) described the tendency of a dominant group to maintain its dominance by selecting successors from within its own kind. Because sport administration needed assessments of the success of its graduates, and information pertaining to demographics in their field, some of the earlier literature on ADs tended to focus on demographic trends among athletic administrators.

Previous research demonstrates a dominant demographic profile in college athletics and higher education in general. Anderson and Gray (1994) surveyed a sample of Division III athletic directors who were 80% male. Their sample was also 89% Caucasian, and 5% African-American (the only significant minority group represented). Out of 200 ADs from among all three NCAA divisions, polled by Fitzgerald et al. (1994), 92.5% were white, 5.5% were African-American, and 1.5% was Hispanic. Of the women (who were intentionally overrepresented in the sample), 31.6% were married or living with a partner, compared with 95.8% of men. Similarly,

in Sagaria's (1988) study, 43.7% of women academic administrators were married, versus 87.8% of men.

Homologous Reproduction

Many have sought to determine why the white, heterosexual male has maintained domination over the field of athletic administration. Sagaria (1988) wrote, "Because characteristics of good administrators are not easily measured, the unwritten standards shared by decisions [sic] makers can be more influential than those set forth in job descriptions" (p. 310). This idea supports the theory of homologous reproduction. Social acceptance is hard to define in objective terms, yet it is often the filter used to determine qualities in a potential job candidate, such as leadership and the ability to work with others (Sagaria 1988). Lovett and Lowry (1994) used an insightful model to describe homologous reproduction. That model is one of a three-sided structure in which opportunity, power, and proportion interact with and sustain each other. Power leads to increased opportunity through hiring practices, which in turn creates a larger proportion of positions held by the dominant group, which confers power back to the group.

Lovett and Lowry (1994) compared the "good old boys" network to the "good old girls" network, and found that although both groups have a tendency to maintain their authority through hiring practices, the opportunity for male-dominated structures to reproduce themselves is more prevalent than those with female authority. This pervasiveness of male culture, which sustains institutional control by keeping a hold on positions of leadership and authority, was part of the framework for Whisenant's (2008) study of high school athletic directors. In researching the background for this study, the author found that in one year, 77% of job the descriptions for athletic director jobs in the state of Texas required the successful candidate to coach boys' high school football, a responsibility which all but a handful of women in the entire country would be

unqualified to take on. Within this cultural framework, Whisenant (2008) extended the conversation about the demographic status quo to include hegemonic masculinity. Together with hegemonic masculinity and homologous reproduction, the concept of role theory – or the idea that certain characteristics such as managerial ability are attributed exclusively to men – was thought to play a part.

Much like the job descriptions for Texas high school athletic directors, certain barriers from exist at all levels of sport, posing challenges to improving diversity and promoting occupational mobility – or changes of position (Sagaria, 1988; Fink & Pastore, 1999). Changes of position are significant, according to Sagaria, in that they are the main vehicle for financial promotion and increased status and authority, as well as serving as a reward mechanism. Sagas and Cunningham (2004) note that “women may have ‘all the right stuff’ in achieving the same criteria for success as men have, but gain lower returns for their investments” (p. 414), and in studying senior athletic administrators they found that women’s investments in social networks yielded lower returns than those of men. Upward occupational mobility, as will be discussed later, also has effects on job satisfaction (Orpen, 1998). Despite initiatives which introduce diversity into the workplace in terms of numbers, the structural advantages of the dominant class are maintained through the hiring of those who will uphold the status quo (Fink & Pastore, 1999).

Merely populating the workplace with different types of faces may count as diversity in some respects, but it is superficial. “Managing diversity” (Fink & Pastore, 1999, p. 313) is a concept from the business literature which relies on diversity as an asset within an organization, using it as a competitive advantage rather than a bureaucratic requirement. Rather than meeting

demographic quotas and tolerating the presence of diverse employees, the diversity manager connects diverse employee values and strengths with the success of the organization.

Ongoing efforts to promote gender equality in higher education athletic administration have achieved only moderate success. There is still much work to be done. A semi-annual study by Acosta and Carpenter (2010) showed female representation among NCAA athletic directors at 19.3%, down from 21.3% in 2008, and more in line with the steady figures from 1994 to 2006. The percentage of female ADs in Division I increased slightly from 2008 to 2010, while Division II and III representation decreased by 4.0% and 3.8%, respectively. The highest percentage (29.9%) of female ADs was found in Division III, followed by Division II (14.9%) and Division I (9.0%). Historically, college athletics has been an area of education overwhelmingly dominated by males (Lovett & Lowry, 1994).

The 2010 Race and Gender Report Card for college sport, published semi-annually by TIDE (2011) reports that 92.7% of Division II ADs, and 96.7% of Division III ADs are white, excluding those at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). In Division II, the largest minorities represented were from African-American (3.1%) and Latino (3.1%) backgrounds. In Division III, African-Americans represented 2.2% of ADs, and no other minority category topped 1.0% of the AD population.

Educational Preparation

Citing the lack of a formalized preparatory curriculum and the collegiate coaching network as the definitive source of knowledge about the field, Cuneen (1992) surveyed athletic directors in Division I and II for their perceptions of graduate-level courses as they relate to intercollegiate athletics administration. An expected outcome of this research was to learn which areas of their education ADs regard as the most important academic qualifications for the

position. The courses recommended by the ADs were found among university graduate catalogs in several academic departments, suggesting that no single existing academic unit or division could provide all of the necessary coursework for an academic discipline of sport administration. However, all 17 courses were based in administrative disciplines, and there were no significant differences between the responses from Division I and Division II administrators. In addition, the number of courses identified as valuable happened to approximate the course load for a doctorate degree.

Career Preparation

While Cuneen's (1992) data strongly suggested the importance of practicum experience as a requisite part of sport administration coursework, the work of Schneider & Stier (2005) provided evidence to the contrary when they surveyed university presidents. Interestingly, field experiences were not regarded as very important by the chief executives of the Division I institutions, while Division II and III presidents believed field experiences to be at least important. Among the formal education requirements, college and university presidents found budget and finance coursework to be most important, and research in sport courses were found to be least important.

In Quarterman's (1992) study of ADs at HBCUs, 36.3% of respondents held a doctorate degree, and 94.5% held at least a master's degree. Those with doctorates were divided nearly down the middle between education and physical education as their area of study. Among Master's degrees, 44.0% were in P.E. versus 34.6% in education. The emphasis on education in this study is explained by the fact that 84.4% of ADs responding had teaching experience, and more than half (50.9%) were actively engaged in teaching at the time of the study. The author

adds the suggestion that ADs of smaller institutions are more likely to be assigned teaching and coaching responsibilities than are those of larger schools.

Quarterman's (1992) research also shows that 89.1% of ADs in HBCUs had participated in high school sports, and that 76.3% participated at the college level. In terms of coaching experience, 49.0% had coached at the high school level, and 82.0% had collegiate coaching experience. Likewise, 47.7% had high school coaching experience, while 76.3% had coached intercollegiate athletics. Cunningham and Sagas (2004) regarded playing and coaching experience as "human capital" (p. 412) for athletic administration, because it relates to the socialization and commitment of the individual. The findings of Fitzgerald, et al. (1994) that 80% of Division I and II ADs had collegiate playing experience, and that 65% had coached a college sport, support this concept.

In contrast to previous studies focusing on other divisional classifications, Quarterman's (1992) respondents were younger at the time of employment, held a higher level of degree (with a higher concentration in the field of education), and were more active in teaching and coaching at all levels throughout their careers. Major conference, Division I ADs had the lowest levels of education, both master's (44%) and doctorate's (15%), of all the classifications. They were also most likely (65%) to have played collegiate football. None of the major conference, Division I ADs was actively engaged in teaching or coaching at the time they were studied.

In Quarterman's (1992) analysis of comparable data, one study reported that 72% of ADs had previous experience as an assistant or associate AD, 58.2% held a graduate degree of some sort, and the most common (33.9%) field studied was physical education. Another showed a 29.3% rate of doctorate-level education and a strong presence (50.4%) of master's degrees in physical education.

Similar results were found in Anderson and Gray's (1994) data, which suggested that 90.2% of ADs in Division III held a graduate degree, including 24.9% with doctoral degrees, and 51.6% were actively coaching. Their respondents were more likely (58.2%) to have studied a sport-related field and also (90.1%) to have played college sports.

Fitzgerald et al. (1994) focused on the process of career advancement from first prerequisite to acceptance of the AD position. In their literature review, the path of "college athlete" to "high school" coach to "college coach" to "college administrator" to "athletic director" was found to be the predominant career trajectory of ADs in Division IA athletics. However, their findings refuted the conventional wisdom found in the literature. Only 12.5% of respondents in Division I, 3.5% in Division II, and 1.3% in Division III, were found to have followed the standard pattern of ascendancy. Still, even though 63% of respondents were missing 2 or more of the career experiences in the pattern, 23% had the two experiences directly prior to athletic director on the path (college coach and athletic administrator) and 39.5% had previous experience in athletic administration. The researchers concluded that Division II and III ADs were most likely to challenge the standardized career path, and that "generalizations from Division I directors' careers may have been carried too far" (Fitzgerald et al., 1994, p. 23). On the topic of career paths, Sagaria (1988) asserted in contrast that the "vast majority" of senior administrators in the higher education labor market came to their position from within their specialty area (p. 39).

Isomorphism

In contrast to the critical theorists' model of homologous reproduction, the functionalist approach taken by Stier & Schneider (2001) provides another lens for viewing the selection of athletic directors. It begins with the following assertion:

Being an athletic director, at any level and in any part of the country, requires one to be able to assume responsibilities and to perform specific tasks and jobs. These tasks and responsibilities of an athletic director are essentially the same, whether one works at a college/university or at a secondary school, whether one works in a large school or at a smaller institution (p. 20).

The notion that the athletic director position can be painted with a broad brush comes in contrast to other research, but it bears mentioning because within this idea comes the possibility that subsets of ADs – rather than all ADs in general – may in fact have similar roles and responsibilities and therefore perform similar sets of tasks and jobs. The findings of Copeland and Kirsch (1995) support this idea. Their discussion of occupational stress among ADs in all three divisions concludes by identifying key areas of responsibility among the divisions that may explain the differences. These include policy making in Division I (due to complex decisions and a higher profile) and fund raising in Division III (due to less emphasis on external relations). Transitioning between jobs within certain subsets, such as the NCAA divisions create, may come relatively easy as a result.

Recent interest in specialization within the workplace has created a focus on job design and organizational structure within athletic departments (Robinson et al., 2003). Specialization of athletic director tasks has been shown to occur when ADs personally took on certain tasks deemed to be most important, while delegating less important ones. When institutional factors determine what tasks are important, and similar institutions follow similar patterns of specialization, this is an example of “isomorphism,” or the tendency of organizations to resemble one another (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001). Three types of isomorphism were the topic of interest to the researchers – competitive, institutional, and strategic choice. Competitive

isomorphism, similar to Darwin's popular theory of natural selection, asserts that organizations with the best practices will survive, while all others who fail to adapt eventually fall extinct. Thus, when the process concludes, all remaining organizations will resemble one another. Institutional isomorphism occurs when external and societal factors are at work on organizations, and they intentionally seek to conform to one another for reasons such as ambiguity of direction, coercion from authorities, or standardization of a profession. The third type of isomorphism, strategic choice, differs greatly from the other two in that top decision-makers, not environmental factors, drive organizational conformity, which is not an inevitable conclusion of the process. In other words, athletic directors acting in unison with a common strategic focus could potentially impact the competitive environment, rather than their behavior alternatively being determined by the environment.

Cunningham and Ashley's (2001) research measured time spent (as a function of importance given) on various activities within athletic departments in Divisions I, II, and III. Then, similarities were sought along divisional lines to form "isomorphic" or similar groups of institutions, and identify "endomorphs" or outlying institutions in each of the three divisions. Variation of such groups between divisions was not found, suggesting no institutional isomorphism was at work. Finally, performance measurements (success in athletic competition) for each school were compared to identify success among isomorphic institutions, but no significant link between competitive success and isomorphic tendencies was found. This finding suggested no competitive isomorphism among successful athletic programs. Results of the study concluded with support for the strategic choice perspective.

Job Satisfaction

Previous research on job satisfaction among athletic directors has shown that administrators of higher education athletics, physical education, and recreation indicate higher levels of job satisfaction than the general population (Copeland & Kirsch, 1995). It is suggested that sport administrators are mostly pursuing personal interests in their professional life, and that this leads to a greater tolerance for disagreeable tasks and responsibilities.

In contrast to ADs in the higher divisions who may devote their entire workday to athletics, Robinson et al. (2003) were concerned that Division III ADs may suffer from job dissatisfaction owing to multiple responsibilities such as teaching, coaching, and chairing an academic department. Their research measured several facets of job satisfaction, as well as job satisfaction overall, between full-time ADs and those with multiple responsibilities. The study concluded that although full-time ADs as a whole were more satisfied in their jobs than those with multiple responsibilities, the time spent on AD duties were not predictive of job satisfaction in any of the facets studied, possibly owing to the nature of the additional responsibilities, rather than the time spent on them. The authors called for further research into the nature of AD responsibilities in Division III.

The sense of control over one's own job is a working condition that has been linked to job satisfaction as well (Robinson et al., 2003). With the current trend pointing toward more institutional control over athletics (Seidler, et al., 1998), an increasing focus on job satisfaction is warranted in research on athletic directors.

Career satisfaction is increasingly distinct from job satisfaction as younger employees exhibit lower levels of job commitment and higher levels of burnout (Allen & Meyer, 1993; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). The increasing transience of the workforce makes career

satisfaction more dependent on career progression and area of practice than on a particular job or organization. Orpen (1998) discusses the effects of organizational centrality, or proximity to power, on career satisfaction. Because authoritative figures within an organization often determine the advancement of employees based on their perceived commitment and trustworthiness, it is suggested that career satisfaction is related to the employee's access to information and influence.

Motivation

Motivation can be defined as the “complex forces, needs, drives, tension states, or other mechanisms within us that will create and maintain voluntary activity directed toward the achievement of personal goals” (Skemp-Arlt & Toupenca, 2007). Within this definition it is implied that motivation takes place internally. It is not something which could be performed on command, but it may develop over time, as personality is developed. Still, the work environment may support or discourage such mechanisms and their intended goals in order to affect motivation. The significance of organizational culture was explored by Sosa and Sagas (2006), who found higher levels of competition, social responsibility, supportiveness, innovation, and stability, among others, in organizations with strong cultures. The presence of a strong organizational culture was linked to performance as well as job satisfaction. Job designs which promote self-efficacy, or the employee's perceived ability to affect the intended result of his or her work, have also been found related to motivation (Burr & Cordery, 2001), suggesting that effective job design may affect the suppression or expression of motivation.

Chapter III: Methods

Data Collection

Participants of this study were athletic directors employed at NCAA Division II and III institutions. Exactly one administrator at each of the schools in these two divisions was offered participation. All participants were informed of the purpose of data collection, and consented to provide data for the study. Age, race, and years of experience were not a limiting factor. No incentives were offered for participation.

Initial contact was made with the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA), and its official directory publisher, Collegiate Directories, Inc., in order to compile a list of Division II and III athletic directors and their e-mail addresses. Once IRB approval was granted, all athletic directors on the list received an e-mail introducing the study, asking for their participation, and containing a hyperlink to the e-survey. See Appendix A for IRB Approval. The initial e-mail informed potential respondents of the purpose of this e-survey. An e-survey was utilized in order to ensure confidentiality of responses. Upon clicking on the hyperlink, the participants' informed consent was determined in the on-screen instructions by stating that complete, submitted responses would serve as such. Each participant who provided data was informed of, and inherently consented to, the use of that data. If the survey user did not consent, he or she was capable of closing the browser window at any time before or during data entry, and any responses entered were ignored. Participants were given 14 calendar days after the initial e-mail to complete the survey. A follow-up e-mail was sent out seven days after the initial e-mail was sent, as a reminder to complete the survey. A total of 45 completed responses from Division II ADs, and 105 from Division III, were collected through MRInterview and imported

into SPSS and Microsoft Excel for analysis. This participation resulted in a response rate of approximately 15.5% of Division II institutions and 24.1% of Division III schools.

Analysis

Frequencies in gender and racial identifications and salary ranges were compiled and graphed. Means were calculated for current age, time spent in pursuit of first AD position, age at time of first AD position, and tenure in current position. Means were also calculated for athletic department characteristics of number of men's and women's sports offered, number of athletes served and total athletic scholarships offered, and total full and part-time staff employed by the athletic department. Areas of AD involvement were tabulated by frequency of response regarding the level of involvement. The study compared frequency of previous occupations and degrees held in order to find the most common work and educational experiences for athletic directors in each division. Finally open-ended responses about reward, discouragement, and motivation were analyzed, coded, and counted.

Because respondents were invited to give open-ended statements on some questionnaire items, a variety of different viewpoints were expressed in many different ways. In order to produce quantifiable and manageable results, the researchers took on the responsibility of categorizing responses according to their content. Categories were determined by comparing the content of similar responses. Responses which contained identical words or phrases, those which were similarly specific or general, and those with common themes were categorized alike. Responses which combined elements of more than one category were assigned to two or more categories, creating multiple responses for some subjects. A few responses were unique enough to be assigned their own category.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire contained in the e-survey (see Appendix B) collected data in five categories. The first section asked subjects to select, from a list of occupational categories, the roles they have held in their careers, and asked when the participant first undertook the goal of becoming an athletic director. Occupational categories included traditional roles in education, coaching, and administration from recreational sport, high school, college, and professional sport, as well as specific departmental functions of intercollegiate athletics. This section also asked subjects to identify which one of those previous occupations the participant performed directly prior to becoming an athletic director, and some other questions about the subjects' career timelines and intentions. Participants were offered the opportunity to add an additional occupational category in an open-ended prompt.

The second section asked participants to rate their involvement, using a Likert-type scale, in various job functions in their position, in order to determine the main areas of responsibility for Division II and III athletic directors. The job functions offered as selections were adapted from a study on isomorphism in NCAA athletic departments, which identified several activities essential to NCAA athletics (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001). An opportunity to provide an open-ended response about other job functions followed.

Next, there was a section composed of some satisfaction measurement items adapted from the Life Satisfaction Inventory (Lounsbury, 2010). The satisfaction measurement items included a seven item scale for job satisfaction and one for career satisfaction, composed of five items. The Life Satisfaction Inventory items were selected because they are self-administered, easy to score, and succinct enough so as not to extend the length of the questionnaire considerably. In addition, this instrument measured both career satisfaction and job satisfaction

in a work setting. Items in the Life Satisfaction Inventory are rated by participants on a five-point Likert-type scale and scored by adding up the total of the ratings for each scale, and dividing by the total number of items. This section of the questionnaire also included open-ended questions about the individuals' motivations to pursue the AD position and the profession of college athletics administration in general.

The fourth section collected demographic data such as age, racial identification, gender, and salary range. The demographic section also asked for data about the number of sports offered, number of athletic scholarships offered and athletes served, and number of employees within the athletic department. These data were expected to provide an indication of the size and scope of the athletic department. Educational backgrounds of participants were collected in the first section of the survey, in an attempt to ensure accurate and complete responses. These responses required participants to list their degrees and areas of study.

Finally, a section composed of two questions collected open-ended responses. The two questions asked what the subjects found most rewarding and what they found most troublesome or challenging about their current position.

Chapter IV: Results

Research Question 1a

The mean age for athletic directors in the dataset was 48.7 years for Division II. The mean age at first employment as an AD was 39.8 years. The length of tenure in the athletic directors' present positions was 7.2 years. Finally, the time spent pursuing the first athletic director position, measured as the difference between the AD's age at first employment as an AD and the age at which they reportedly began pursuing the position, was 10.6 years.

The demographic profile of Division II ADs in the survey is shown (see Table 1). Gender of respondents among Division II ADs was predominantly male (80.0%), as was expected based on the report by TIDE (2011).

Racial identification in the sample of 150 athletic directors was overwhelmingly White/Caucasian (93.3%), as expected based on prior research, with both divisions having equal percentages of White/Caucasian respondents. Only one Division II AD identified as Black/African-American, one identified as Native American/Alaskan/Hawaiian, and one selected Asian/Pacific Islander.

82.9% of the 45 Division II responses reported they were married or living with a partner.

Respondents were asked to select, from a list, a salary range corresponding to their base salary. Ranges started at \$30,000 and increased, in \$10,000 increments, up to \$269,999. The other options were “<\$30,000”, “>\$270,000”, or “No Answer”. Only six respondents chose not to answer, and the other 144 valid responses for Division II and Division III athletic directors fell primarily between the \$60,000 salary range and the \$120,000 salary range. In order to minimize the number of categories represented, the bottom and top ranges were coded into the categories “<\$60,000” and “>\$130,000”, respectively. Salaries for Division II ADs all fell between \$50,000

and \$159,999. Over half of the salaries (54.6%) reported for Division II were within the three ranges starting at \$70,000 and going to \$99,999. The most common salary range for both divisions was the \$80,000 range.

In regards to the degrees earned by Division II and III athletic directors, data was inconsistent. Some respondents chose to list all of their degrees, per the questionnaire instructions, while others appeared to have chosen only to enter their highest degree (i.e., doctorate, master's, etc.) and did not list a bachelor's degree or an associate's. Taking this limitation into account, responses were coded in terms of highest degree reported, with the assumption that all responses were at least valid in that aspect.

All 45 Division II respondents reported holding a bachelor's degree at minimum. Most Division II respondents (93.3%) indicated having earned at least a master's degree. Among the sample of Division II ADs, 6.7% indicated that a bachelor's degree was their highest degree, 77.8% listed a master's degree as their loftiest educational achievement, and an additional 15.6% had earned a doctorate-level diploma.

Several questionnaire items asked for information on sports, athletes, scholarships, and employees. Sponsorship of football, often the most impactful sport on an athletic department's budget, was determined in a separate questionnaire item. Roughly one-half of institutions sampled (74 out of 150) indicated sponsorship of football. In Division II institutions, the mean for the number of men's sports was 7.3, and the average number of women's sports was 8.0. The mean number of athletic scholarships was 95.2, while the mean number of varsity athletes was 311.6. Approximately one full scholarship was available for every 3.2 varsity athletes. An average of 23.3 full-time employees and 15.7 part-time employees served Division II athletic departments.

Research Question 2a

Areas of study were identified by respondents for bachelor's, master's, and doctorate degrees. As mentioned previously, not all degrees were reported. In addition, some respondents held degrees in more than one area of study. Among the degrees reported in Division II, the top areas of study for bachelor's degrees were physical education (27.8%) and business administration (13.9%). The master's degrees held by Division II ADs were mostly in athletic administration (28.6%), education (23.8%), physical education (13.9%), and educational administration (13.9%). Of the five athletic directors in Division II who reported a doctorate degree, two were in higher education administration, two were in athletic administration, and one was in education. Displayed (see Table 2) are the areas of study for bachelor's, master's, and doctorate degrees in Division II.

Subjects were offered a choice of 23 occupational categories from which to select all occupations previously held. An additional selection allowed respondents to add an occupational experience not listed. Respondents were also prompted for the number of years of experience they had for each field selected. The frequency of each career experience and the corresponding average years of experience for those who reported each experience are displayed (see Table 3). The career experience most common to Division II ADs (71.1%) was assistant/associate AD, and the mean length of experience was 7.3 years. Also very common was college coach (66.7%), with a mean of 14.4 years of experience. The career experiences of high school coach and graduate assistantship were equally common (33.3%), with an average length of 4.5 years and 1.3 years, respectively.

In addition to selecting their previous occupational categories, respondents were asked to specify their most recent job title prior to receiving their current position. Some responses

indicated multiple job titles. Nearly all Division II ADs (93.3%) reported coming into their positions from a role as an assistant/associate athletic director, a college coaching position, or a previous AD post. The three who did not were previously a college administrator, a marketing director for the national sport-governing body, and an executive director of a youth sport organization.

Research Question 3a

Participants in the study were asked to rate their involvement in a variety of work activities essential to college athletics. Choices for each area of involvement were “uninvolved”, “slightly involved” (once/week), “involved” (two to three times/week), and “heavily involved” (three or more times/week). The frequencies of responses for each work activity among Division II ADs are shown (see Table 4). For ADs in both divisions, heavy involvement was found most frequently in the areas of finance and internal policy making, while both divisions were least “involved” in recruiting, teaching, and coaching. Six work activities were the focus of heavy involvement for at least half of Division II ADs. Two-thirds of Division II athletic directors reported that they were at least “involved” in 13 or more of the 16 work activities listed. In addition to the categories provided for ratings, Division II ADs reflected involvement in academic support.

Research Question 4a

Respondents to the survey were asked to rate their satisfaction with seven job satisfaction scale items and five career satisfaction scale items. Response choices ranged from “very dissatisfied” (1) to “very satisfied” (5). The scale is designed so that the average of the seven job satisfaction items produces a job satisfaction rating, and the mean for the five career satisfaction items produces a career satisfaction rating. Those ratings are interpreted as a level of satisfaction,

from 1 to 5, with 3 being neutral, for the respondent's job or career, respectively. Division II ADs had a mean satisfaction rating of 4.07 for the job scale, and they had a mean rating of 3.84 for the career scale. Individually, 42 ADs (93.3%) indicated a positive satisfaction rating for their jobs, and 43 (95.6%) indicated positive satisfaction with their careers.

Research Question 5a

Survey respondents were asked to identify the most rewarding aspects of their job. Some responses identified multiple aspects. After responses were coded for ease of analysis, 14 unique rewarding aspects were identified among the data. A full accounting of response categories in both Division II and III is displayed (see Table 6). In Division II, the most frequent rewarding aspect (40.9% of total responses) was "success of teams, players, or coaches", where success, goals, or achievement were more general than specific. Next most frequent (16.7%) was "witnessing personal development", followed by "relationships with students or staff" (13.6%) and "graduation of student-athletes" (13.6%). All 45 survey participants responded to the question, yielding 66 total responses.

As with the rewarding aspects of the job, survey participants were asked what aspects of the job they found most troublesome or challenging about their position. Some responses included multiple aspects. Responses were coded, showing 21 unique troublesome or challenging aspects of the job. All the response categories and their frequencies are listed (see Table 7) by division. In Division II, the troublesome or challenging aspect identified most commonly was "limited resources or financial concerns" (30.1%). "Parental involvement" came in second with 12.9% of responses, and "personnel issues" (10.8%), including hiring, firing, promotion, and discipline of staff, rounded out the top three. "Fundraising" comprised an

additional 7.5% of responses among Division II ADs. All 45 Division II survey participants provided at least one troublesome or challenging aspect of the job, creating 93 responses.

The final survey section began with an open-ended question asking respondents to identify why they pursued a career as an AD. Once again, the data were coded for ease of analysis, and many entries contained multiple responses. A full list of categories is shown (see Table 8). Division II ADs provided the following motivations in their top three most common response categories: “working with student-athletes or coaches” (28.6%), “identification with athletics” (25.4%), and “previous experiences” (14.3%), consisting of references to prior work experiences in college athletics. 41 athletic directors from Division II schools provided 63 valid responses.

Respondents were also asked what motivated them to work in college athletics. All response categories are displayed (see Table 9), along with their frequency of occurrence. Division II athletic directors reported that a “positive impact on people” (22.2%), “student athletes” (20.4%), and a “personal gratification from athletics” (16.7%) motivated them to work in college athletics. An additional 7.4% each referred to “contributing to higher education” and the “motivation or success of others” as motivation.

Research Question 1b

The mean age for athletic directors in the dataset was 51.6 years for Division III. The mean age at first employment as an AD was 40.2 years. The mean length of tenure in the athletic directors’ present positions was 9.4 years. Finally, the average time spent pursuing the first athletic director position was 10.8 years.

Percentages for the Division III AD demographic profile are displayed (see Table 1). In Division III, 38.1% of the 105 athletic directors participating in the survey were female.

While 93.3% of Division III respondents fell into the racial category “White/Caucasian”, the largest minority group represented in this study (4.7%) consisted of Division III ADs identifying as “Black/African-American”. Also, one athletic director in Division III selected “Native American/Alaskan/Hawaiian”, and the only “Latino/Hispanic” AD came from this division.

Out of 105 Division III responses, 88.9% indicated a married status.

For Division III ADs, the minimum salary fell into the \$40,000 range and the \$230,000 range was the maximum. More than two-thirds of salaries for Division III (69.0%) fell between the \$60,000 range and the \$100,000 range.

In the category of education level, 6.7% of Division III ADs owned a bachelor’s degree at most, 75.2% had added a master’s degree, and 18.1% indicated owning a doctorate-level degree.

The average Division III athletic department offered 8.3 men’s sports, and 9.1 women’s sports. A mean of 368.2 varsity athletes participated in those sports. An average 20.4 full time employees and 21.5 part-time employees were on staff at Division III athletic departments.

Research Question 2b

Among the degrees reported in Division III, the top areas of study for bachelor’s degrees were physical education (27.8%) and business administration (13.9%). The master’s degrees held by Division II ADs were mostly in athletic administration (28.6%), education (23.8%), physical education (13.9%), and educational administration (13.9%). Of the 19 athletic directors in Division III who reported a doctorate degree, five were in higher education administration, and three were in athletic administration. Areas of study are given (see Table 2) by percent of total degrees reported.

The frequency of each career experience and the corresponding average years of experience for those who reported each experience are displayed (see Table 3) for each division. The career experience most common to Division III ADs (79.0%) was college coach, and the mean length of experience was 12.7 years. Also very common was assistant/associate AD (64.8%), with a mean of 6.1 years of experience. Other common career experiences included high school coach (42.9%), college professor (39.0%), and high school teacher (37.1%). One career experience, intercollegiate sport operations, was outside the top five in frequency (15.2%), but had the third-longest average length of tenure (9.3 years).

Most Division III ADs (82.9%) reported coming into their positions from a role as an assistant/associate athletic director, a college coaching position, or a previous AD post. Of the 18 ADs who did not, half were administrators at a college or university, four were high school athletic directors, one was previously an assistant director of a fitness club, and one came directly from a position as a graduate assistant.

Research Question 3b

Levels of involvement for Division III ADs in various work activities essential to college are shown (see Table 5) for each area of responsibility. For ADs in both divisions, heavy involvement was found most frequently in the areas of finance and internal policy making, while both divisions were least “involved” in recruiting, teaching, and coaching. Finance, internal policy making, and sport operations were all considered areas of heavy involvement by more than half of Division III ADs. In the Division III sample, more than three-fourths (78.1%) indicated between 8 and 13 areas in which they were at least “involved”. In response to the open-ended prompt for additional work activities, Division III ADs were most forthcoming. Six athletic directors in Division III referred to some sort of executive-level administrative role

within the college or university. In addition three ADs in Division III also indicated involvement in each of the following: academic support, recreation, a Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC), and leadership of an academic department.

Research Question 4b

As with the satisfaction ratings for Division II, the same scales were used to determine levels of satisfaction with job and career for Division III athletic directors. ADs in Division III had an average job satisfaction score of 4.14 and an average career satisfaction score of 3.85. Individually, 101 respondents (96.2%) indicated positive levels of satisfaction with their jobs, and 100 (95.2%) indicated positive satisfaction with their careers.

Research Question 5b

In Division III, the rewarding aspect of the job mentioned most frequently was “relationships with students or staff” (27.0%), followed closely by “success of students, teams, or coaches” (23.8%). Other popular answers were “assisting and helping people” (14.8%), “witnessing personal development” (13.9%), and “leadership of athletic department” (9.0%). 104 of 105 survey participants in Division III provided a valid response to this question, creating 122 total responses. A full accounting of response categories in both Division II and III is given (see Table 6).

Division III athletic directors overwhelmingly cited “limited resources or financial concerns” (45.2%) as the most frequent troublesome or challenging part of the position. 14.0% agreed “personnel issues” were their top concern, and “parental involvement” received 10.8% of the responses. “Student discipline” also was a concern among 5.9% of respondents. 103 Division III athletic directors provided 186 valid responses to this question. A full list for both divisions is displayed (see Table 7) by category.

All Division III athletic directors' responses to the question, "Why did you choose to pursue a career as a collegiate athletic director?" are shown (see Table 8) by category. Among Division III responses, the following were the four most frequently occurring responses: "identification with athletics" (25.0%), "working with student-athletes or coaches" (17.1%), "opportunity to lead" (14.5%), and "previous experiences" (11.2%). A total of 152 valid responses were received from 95 Division III ADs.

Division III responses were varied on the question, "What was or is your motivation to work within college athletics?" Top response categories included "positive impact on people" (13.1%), "student-athletes" (13.1%), "contributing to higher education" (12.6%), "work environment" (12.6%), and "personal gratification from athletics" (10.9%). "Coaching" (9.1%) was also a common response unique to Division III ADs. All categories, along with their frequency of occurrence, are displayed (see Table 9).

Chapter V: Discussion

Research Question 1a

The average time respondents spent pursuing the goal of becoming an AD was 10.6 years, and the average age at which respondents received their first AD position was 39.8. Drawing on these two facts, it appears that many ADs were well into their twenties before deciding to pursue their current job. Since most ADs were previously college or high school coaches, the career path of coaching may have been their original goal after college, and they began to desire greater levels of responsibility as they matured in their careers. The mean age of 48.7 years also indicates a mature career, and the average tenure of 7.2 years suggests that there is not much turnover in the position. A student today aspiring to be an athletic director might expect to spend several years gaining the prerequisite experience, regardless of whether or not coaching is part of that experience. With the proper level of education and student work experience, she might instead take the approach of specializing in a vital function of Division II athletics, such as finance or fund-raising, and seek to gradually add to that role the other responsibilities associated with the position.

Findings related to racial identification mirror those of previously mentioned studies which found that roughly 90% of athletic directors were white, with the largest minority being roughly 5% black (Anderson & Gray, 1994; Fitzgerald et al., 1994). It is disappointing that the findings in the present study were unable to improve upon those published in 1994. However, they are hardly conclusive due to the small sample size of minority respondents. Perhaps non-response error is a distorting factor. It should be noted that the African-American percentages in the present study are not comparable with those from the TIDE (2011) report, due to the inclusion of HBCU's. NCAA Division II institutions offering academic programs in athletic

administration, as well as those serving significant minority populations, could create campus-wide awareness of existing NCAA diversity initiatives such as the NCAA Fellows Leadership Development Program and the NCAA Leadership Institutes for Ethnic Minority Males and Females (NCAA, 2008). Student-athletes are frequently familiar with and committed to college athletics as a profession after graduation, however the pool of potential athletic administrators is much bigger than the student-athlete population.

Unfortunately, the gender gap in the Division II sample echoes the 80/20 disparity once found among Division III ADs (Anderson & Gray, 1994). However the 20.0% female representation in the present sample is higher than the 14.9% reported by Acosta and Carpenter (2010) for Division II, suggesting that a slight bias in response may be at work. Women in the highest athletic administrative position indicated a much lower marriage rate (66.7%) than men (94.4%), suggesting the possibility of foregoing family life in order to achieve higher status. However, these marriage rates for women represent an increase over similar numbers from past studies (Sagaria, 1988; Fitzgerald et al., 1994). Increased access and publicity of programs like the NCAA/NACWAA Institutes for Administrative Advancement may be a positive step for the NCAA to take in resolving gender inequities. Women may also find participation in networking organizations and informal networking to be useful in improving upward mobility.

For those with future aspirations to become a Division II athletic director, it may be useful to note the distribution of salaries among athletic directors. Salaries in general appear to start in the \$50,000-\$70,000 range, based on the sample taken, and would likely be higher if the athletic director spends time in the classroom, on coaching duties, or other peripheral activities. About two-thirds of Division II ADs were paid between \$80,000 and \$119,999. With no readily available comparison, it cannot be determined whether salaries have risen, fallen or held steady

over any period of time. Aspiring collegiate athletic directors should be encouraged that they may earn a substantial income as an AD, but they should be aware that at the Division II level, the compensation is considerably less than executives in the private sector can hope to earn.

Due to some incomplete and invalid responses, it is difficult to say for sure whether education levels of Division II ADs have increased or decreased. However, the 93.4% of ADs with post-graduate degrees speaks to the demand for athletic administrators with a higher level of critical and analytical thinking skills. It also reflects the presence of many former or current college professors and high school teachers among the ranks of Division II ADs. Undergraduate students in sport-related or administrative fields of study wishing to pursue careers in athletic administration should be encouraged to extend their education with post-graduate studies. For some, the extra time on campus should prove helpful in exploring career options and gaining experience performing functions of athletic administrators.

Among the institutional measurements taken in this study, the number of sports offered reflects the opportunities offered by Division II programs. One of the NCAA's minimum requirements for membership in Division II is sponsorship of 10 sports (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2007). On average, 15 sports are being offered, representing 50% more than the minimum required. On the other hand, with only 23.3 full-time athletic department employees (including coaches) serving an average of 311.6 athletes in 15 sports, it is no surprise many of the respondents reported being understaffed to handle the daily demands of the athletic department.

Research Question 2a

The academic discipline of athletic administration appears to have emerged as a leader in preparation for athletic administrators in the field. Athletic administration was the top area of

study for those with a master's degree, and also tied for the lead in doctoral study. Clearly, those who aspire to work in intercollegiate athletics administration are frequently choosing to pursue graduate studies related to the field, although it is not clear whether they are doing so prior to entering the profession, or in response to the educational requirements of the position they desire.

Overwhelmingly, educational and administrative fields make up the educational backgrounds of Division II ADs. Educational disciplines, including physical education help prepare ADs for the developmental aspects of coaching and teaching, while the administrative disciplines provide training in managerial tasks and policy making. Less emphasis on educational fields of study, and more representation of administrative ones, will quite possibly be a response to the low involvement of Division II ADs in teaching and coaching, and the high involvement in financials and policy making.

The career paths of the Division II athletic directors in the present sample seem nearer to the standard career trajectory described by Fitzgerald et al. (1994) than previous studies. Compared with Cuneen (1988), findings show comparable numbers of athletic directors (71.1%) who have been assistant or associate ADs in the past. However, 42.2% of the ADs matched both the standard experiences of college coaching and athletic administration. 15.6% of Division II ADs all three standard professional experiences (high school coach, college coach, college athletics administrator). A majority (51.1%) have held both a coaching position at some level and an administrative job in college or university athletics. While no data were collected on collegiate athletics participation, one could imagine this being the easiest of the four standard experiences to obtain or replicate. An increased number of job opportunities within college athletics over the past 20 years – perhaps a result of increased visibility on athletics, the emergence of women's intercollegiate sport, or the development of revenue streams related to

athletics – could be a possible explanation for the rise in college athletics experiences among its top administrators. Evidently, young professionals hoping to receive appointment as an AD should either pursue a substantial coaching career or be prepared to rise up through more than one level of administration before achieving their goal. Sport administration academic programs may help them obtain this prerequisite job experience by placing students in coaching practicum experiences or internships in administrative departments within athletics.

Research Question 3a

In Division II athletics, institutions compete regionally first, without the revenue that comes from national exposure or affiliation, but with much of the expense associated with funding athletic scholarships. Accordingly, it is not surprising that finance was the Division II athletic directors' number one area of heavy involvement. Internal policy, next on the list, was not strictly defined, but was intended to provide a catch-all for internal governance responsibilities not related to one of the other selections. It could be that the task of athletic events scheduling, a major determinant of travel expenses, was included in these responses. It could also be that the athletic director, as head of a high-profile department within the university, has a large role in external affairs within the governance structure. Community relations were included among the most highly involved activities, and this would possibly reflect the commitment of Division II programs to engage with the local and regional community in lieu of national attention. Most Division II ADs were uninvolved with teaching and coaching, suggesting that the part-time AD, who may run an athletic department while performing a primary responsibility other than administration, is the exception, rather than the rule, in Division II. Those with a career path running through Division II athletic administration would do well to be fully acquainted with financial documents such as balance sheets and income statements, and

a thorough knowledge of NCAA rules and regulations would be helpful as well. The high involvement in community relations among Division II ADs begs the development of interpersonal and written communications skills, as well as a sense of social responsibility.

Professional organizations, such as NASSM and NACDA, should formulate methods for classifying ADs by their areas of greatest involvement. These areas of involvement could be analyzed for isomorphic patterns, and clustered according to similar patterns of responsibility. In doing so, the discipline of sport administration will learn how the job of AD differs with respect to certain institutional factors. The student and practitioners of athletic administration will be provided with clearer understanding of where their choice of career path should lie. Additionally, recruitment of ADs by colleges and university may be expedited.

Research Question 4a

Administrators in Division II appear to be satisfied with their jobs and careers, generally speaking. The two satisfaction scales used in this study both included items related to career progression, where the main source of dissatisfaction lay. It takes little effort to connect the lengthy tenure of athletic directors with the lack of advancement opportunity. For many, there simply are no opportunities to advance their career yet remain in college athletics.

Future sport administrators should be optimistic and anticipate satisfaction should they excel and accept an AD position, however they should understand the potential tradeoffs as well. For one, the ADs in this study saw their careers as stalled. Also, the job presents several challenges outside the AD's area of control, such as lack of institutional funds and student behavior issues, which future practitioners may view as a source of dissatisfaction as well. Finally, the increasing pressure on college and university presidents to exert their influence over intercollegiate sports (Seidler, et al., 1998) may curtail the decision-making authority of ADs in

the future. Sadly, one Division II AD in this study described himself or herself as “an entrepreneur trapped in a college bureaucracy.” An effective job design for ADs will mitigate this potential source of dissatisfaction by raising the administrator’s perception of his own authority in the position.

Research Question 5a

The most rewarding part of the job for Division II ADs was success of students, teams and coaches. The second most common response was witnessing the personal development of others. Both responses speak to the expected outcomes of intercollegiate sport. A quote from one respondent that captured both sentiments was, “Watching students learn the best lessons from participation, and seeing them succeed in all aspects of life, academically, athletically, personally and spiritually.” For many ADs, simply seeing the intended result of their work (self-efficacy) is a rewarding aspect of the job. The position of athletic director would be improved by designing the job with these rewards in view for the person performing the job.

Most discouraging among Division II athletic directors are limited resources or financial issues, parental involvement, and personnel issues. Perhaps budgetary concerns and dealing with various constituencies and stakeholders are challenges inherent to leadership. Yet these challenges are magnified by having little help or control, while ADs bear much of the direct responsibility for results.

Many of the respondents gave answers related to student behavior, but the answers were too dissimilar to code as the same response. Here, one respondent succinctly gave three troublesome or challenging aspects in her or his answer: “Personnel issues, followed by this generation of parents that are too involved, which has led to entitled student-athletes (and non student-athletes).” The challenges described are not likely to disappear soon, however colleges

and universities may ease the burden on ADs by engaging parental and student-athlete concerns on the institution's behalf, rather than forcing the athletic department to deal with them unilaterally.

When asked why they chose to pursue the AD job, the most frequent motivation was working with student-athletes and coaches. Since most ADs in this study come from coaching backgrounds, and many were probably athletes themselves, the shared experiences with coaches and athletes likely form the basis for strong relationships, and sustaining or developing relationships can be a motivating factor. Next in line was identification with athletics. While this motivational factor is derived from many different unique statements, the common theme in these responses is a passion for and a commitment to sports. Both responses were present in the following statement by a Division II AD: "I love the athletics arena at the university level. It is one of the most challenging but fulfilling jobs to have. But you have to love athletics and the student groups we serve."

Finally, the top motivational factors for entering college athletics connect previous experiences in sports – whether as a participant, employee, or onlooker – with the positive outcomes of success in the intercollegiate athletics environment. Consider the following statement, which encompasses the three most common responses: "I love athletics and wanted to be in/around it for a living. As an AD I love being able to contribute to the growth of these young student-athletes into mature, contributing citizens - that makes it all worthwhile."

At the same time, top responses such as "positive impact on people", "contributing to higher education", and "motivation or success of others" speak to a purpose that has more than self-interest in mind. One Division II AD's response, "love for developing physical skills,

character and providing entertainment for the campus community,” is indicative of these motivations.

Research Question 1b

Division III ADs in this study spent an average of 10.8 years with the goal of becoming an athletic director in sight. They were 40.2 years old, on average, when they first became a collegiate athletic director. Taking these two facts into account, many of the ADs in this sample first decided to pursue the position in their late twenties or early thirties. Given that Division III ADs overwhelmingly (84.8%) had experience in either teaching or coaching at the college level, it is possible that many sought out this career path after they were satisfied with their contributions in teaching and coaching and desired a greater challenge. This thought is backed by one respondent who cited “progression from coach” as a motivation to become an athletic director. A student today aspiring to be an athletic director might expect to spend several years gaining the prerequisite experience, regardless of whether or not coaching is part of that experience. With the proper level of education and student work experience, she might instead take the approach of specializing in a function of Division III athletics, such as finance or sport operations, and seek to gradually add to that role the other responsibilities associated with the position.

Findings related to racial identification mirror those of previously mentioned studies which found that roughly 90% of athletic directors were white, with the largest minority being roughly 5% black (Anderson & Gray, 1994; Fitzgerald et al., 1994). It is disappointing that the findings in the present study were unable to improve upon those published in 1994. However, they are hardly conclusive due to the small sample size of minority respondents. Perhaps non-response error is a distorting factor. It should be noted that the African-American percentages in

the present study are not comparable with those from the TIDE (2011) research, due to the inclusion of HBCU's. NCAA Division III institutions, especially those serving significant minority populations would do well to take advantage of existing NCAA diversity initiatives such as the NCAA Division III Ethnic Minority and Women's Internship Grant program, which provides \$23,100 in grants to institutions who provide the required supervision and mentorship of staff (NCAA, 2008).

When compared with Acosta and Carpenter (2010), this sample contained more female ADs. In this case, response bias may be at work. One bit of interesting news is that women in the highest athletic administrative position indicated a much lower marriage rate (60.0%) than men (96.9%), suggesting the necessity of foregoing family life in order to achieve higher career status. However, these marriage rates for women represent an increase over similar numbers from past studies (Sagaria, 1988; Fitzgerald et al., 1994). Increased access and publicity of programs like the NCAA/NACWAA Institutes for Administrative Advancement may be a positive step for the NCAA to take in resolving gender inequities.

For those with future aspirations to become a Division III athletic director, it may be useful to note the distribution of salaries among athletic directors. Salaries in the sample taken seemed to be widely distributed, and may reflect a variety of compensation packages based on job descriptions combining athletic director duties with responsibilities in other areas of higher education. Salaries for those with two or fewer years' experience as an AD, and five or fewer years of tenure at their institution generally ranged from \$60,000 to \$99,999. Aspiring collegiate athletic directors should be encouraged that they may earn a substantial income as an AD, but they should be aware that at the Division III level, the compensation is considerably less than executives in the private sector can hope to earn.

Owing to limitations regarding this study's responses, it is difficult to say anything conclusive about the education levels of the sample. The 18.1% of Division III ADs in the sample who had a doctorate-level degree, and the 93.3% who held a post-graduate degree of some sort, show the division's commitment to academics. While the number of doctorate degrees is lower than the figures provided by Anderson and Gray (1994), the overall number of post-grad degrees is slightly higher, suggesting that the master's degree may be of more importance than it once was. Undergraduate students in sport-related or administrative fields of study wishing to pursue athletic administration should be encouraged to extend their education with post-graduate studies. For some, the extra time on campus should prove helpful in exploring career options and gaining exposure to the administrative side of sports.

To an even greater extent than the Division II sample, the Division III sample was representative of athletic departments which offer far more sports than are required by the NCAA. Totaling the average numbers of men's and women's sports offered by the athletic departments in the study, 17.4 sports are offered to an average 368.2 student-athletes. Since Division III schools do not offer athletic scholarships, the addition of sports is less impactful on their budget than it would be in other divisions. However, the Division III schools in this study only employed an average of 20.4 full-time staff, including coaches. When the athlete-to-staff ratio is considered, the Division III ADs' top reported challenges of "limited resources or financial concerns" and "personnel issues" are easier understood.

Research Question 2b

Looking at the areas of study represented, students earning a master's degree in athletic administration appear to have had great success reaching positions as athletic directors. In fact, the Master's of Science in athletic administration was the highest degree earned for 24.8% of all

Division III respondents, and so it most frequently marked the end of an AD's education. In addition, higher education administration is a common area of doctoral study, reflecting the tendencies of Division III athletics toward integration of students and student-athletes (NCAA, 2011). Clearly, those who aspire to work in intercollegiate athletics administration are frequently choosing to pursue graduate studies related to the field, although it is not clear whether they are doing so prior to entering the profession, or in response to the educational requirements of the position they desire.

The career paths of the Division III athletic directors in the present sample seem much nearer to the standardized career trajectory described by Fitzgerald et al. (1994) than previous studies. The results of this study show that 65.7% have been college athletic administrators in the past. Most (84.8%) have held a high school or college coaching job at some point in their careers. The vast majority (74.3%) has held both a coaching position and a college or university administrative job in athletics, and 30.5% have been a high school coach, a college coach, and a college athletic administrator. While this study did not examine the participation of respondents in college athletics as a student-athlete, one could imagine this first step in the standard career path as the easiest to obtain or replicate.

Young professionals hoping to receive an appointment as an AD should either pursue a teaching or coaching career path, or be prepared to rise up through more than one level of administration before achieving their goal. Sport administration academic programs may help them gain this prerequisite job experience by placing students in coaching practicum experiences or internships in administrative departments within athletics.

Research Question 3b

An area of philosophy where Division III differs from Division II is in seeking to serve its internal constituencies such as students, above the concerns of the general public (NCAA, 2007). Accordingly, Division III athletic directors participating in this study reported lower involvement in the areas of college athletics administration (community relations, development/fundraising, marketing, and communications) associated with seeking and managing public attention for the athletics program. The high involvement in campus relations reflects the institutions' inward focus. The fact that only three activities were areas of high involvement by at least half of the sample indicates that Division III ADs have ownership of many areas, few of which receive daily attention. The following comment exemplifies the wide-ranging responsibilities not offered as selections which some respondents reported: "Currently I am also the Associate Vice President for Student Life so I have additional responsibilities in that area. Athletically, I am involved in Information Technology discussion, Food Service, and overall student recruitment/retention."

All Division II and Division III athletic directors were very involved in the areas of budgetary oversight and internal policy making. This reflects the role of athletic director as chief executive officer of his or her program and senior administrator of the department. ADs are the ones held accountable for the overall success or failure of the athletic department, so it is only expected that resources and strategic guidance – both forces which drive an organization – be left up to them.

Those with an interest in Division III athletic administration should be fully acquainted with financial documents such as balance sheets and income statements, and a thorough knowledge of NCAA rules and regulations would be helpful as well. The high involvement in

campus relations among Division III ADs begs some understanding of student affairs, residence life, and higher education administration. Responsibilities of Division III ADs are wide-ranging, so the more exposure to all areas of college and university affairs, the better for aspiring administrators.

Professional organizations, such as NASSM and NACDA, should formulate methods for classifying ADs within divisions by their areas of greatest involvement. These areas of involvement could be analyzed for isomorphic patterns, and clustered according to similar patterns of responsibility. In doing so, the discipline of sport administration will learn how the job of AD differs with respect to certain institutional factors. The student and practitioners of athletic administration will be provided with clearer understanding of where their choice of career path should lie. Additionally, recruitment of ADs by colleges and university may be expedited.

Research Question 4b

Administrators in Division III appear to be satisfied with their jobs and careers, generally speaking. The main source of dissatisfaction seemed to lie with career progression and advancement in position. It takes little effort to connect the lengthy tenure of athletic directors with job satisfaction, but the average 9.4 of years in Division III ADs' current positions could also mean mobility is scarce. Advancing within college athletics might mean a move to a Division I AD position or a conference commissioner job, and those jobs are fewer in number than the Division III AD positions (NCAA, 2011). Importantly, however, dissatisfaction with opportunities to advance does not necessarily indicate a desire to change positions.

Future sport administrators should be optimistic and anticipate satisfaction should they excel and accept an AD position. Since they are often so intrinsically involved in academics and

administration of higher education, Division III athletic directors' jobs may be more secure. However, those entering the profession should understand the potential tradeoffs as well. One Division III AD who reported a low score in the area of career burnout cited "working with an administrator that does not support the athletic department financially" as a particularly troublesome aspect of the job. The job presents some challenges outside the AD's area of control, notably those inherent to the operation of a Division III athletic department. Financially and administratively, the athletic departments in Division III institutions are funded and governed in the same manner as any other department at the school (Robinson, et al., 2003). There is little emphasis, as there is in other NCAA divisions, on entertainment aspects of sport, other than the entertainment of the students, faculty, and staff (NCAA, 2007). Also, the position of AD in Division III is as much an academic post as it is an athletic one. Those wishing to work exclusively with the business side of sport might reconsider a career in Division III.

Research Question 5b

The most rewarding part of the job for Division III ADs was "relationships with students or staff". In this and other top responses ("witnessing personal development", "assisting and helping people", "leadership of athletic department"), there was a common thread of concern for others. "Working relationships, affecting student/staff development" was the response one Division III AD gave when asked for the most rewarding aspect of her or his job. The position of athletic director would be improved by designing the job with these rewards in view for the person performing it.

Most discouraging to Division III athletic directors by far are "limited resources or financial concerns". Clearly, the lack of expense for athletic scholarships does not translate into freedom from financial woes. These limits on resources may be self-imposed by college

administration, since several responses were on par with what one Division III AD described as the challenge of, “working with an administrator that does not support the athletic department financially.” Perhaps a lack of mutual understanding between college and athletic administration is to blame. More communication and cooperation may be called for in Division III athletics, as Division I has recently undertaken to implement (Seidler, et al., 1998). In this way, expectations on both ends regarding resources and funding will be managed. Limited resources may also refer to the staff available in athletic departments. In this case, institutional support could include the addition of assistantships to help with classroom duties, advising, coaching, and athletic administration.

When asked why they chose to pursue the AD job, the most frequent motivation was “identification with athletics”. While this factor is derived from many different responses, the common theme in these responses is a passion for and a commitment to sports. Next in line was “working with student-athletes and coaches”. Since most ADs in this study come from coaching backgrounds, and many were probably athletes themselves, the shared experiences with coaches and athletes likely prove a strong motivation. A common answer particular to Division III was “opportunity to lead”. This is interesting, because although most subjects were already coaches before becoming an AD, they seemed to identify leadership as something distinct from coaching. However, this comment may offer some insight: “Wanted to remain in collegiate athletics and not be tied exclusively to coaching. My personality is one of a leader and a problem solver.”

Finally, the top motivational factors for entering college athletics demonstrate, perhaps better than any other survey question, the diverse voices of ADs in Division III. No response was received by more than 13.1% of ADs, and eight different motivational factors comprised at least five percent of the response. One of the top factors was “contributing to higher education” which

shows how intercollegiate athletics in Division III is seen as an integral part of the college experience. “Identification with athletics” and “work environment”, other top factors, suggest the subjects’ motivation to make a personal interest a part of their work. One respondent summed up many of the most common motivational factors reported: “I love being around athletics. I’ve seen how it can positively impact the college experience for student-athletes. I’ve seen how it can be a positive factor in the life of an institution.”

Limitations and Delimitations

An overwhelming response rate among Division II ADs was difficult to achieve, given the scope of this project. Undertaking to submit the amount of data sought by the survey instrument in this study required the participant to spend a significant amount of time completing the survey. It is expected that many athletic directors, given the time demands placed on them by their jobs, were unwilling or unable to spend the given amount of time on the survey. For this reason, the survey was conducted by web survey, in order to minimize the intrusiveness of the study on the respondents’ work time. It was taken under consideration, however, that the accessibility of Division II athletic directors may have been less than that of the ADs at fully staffed Division I schools, or Division III ADs. In fact, during the data collection phase of this study, it was observed by the researcher that roughly 3 out of 10 subjects who opened up the questionnaire timed out before completion. There is much data resulting from this survey to digest, and it was not expected that any one aspect of the athletic director position could be thoroughly studied within the scope of this project. In addition, while the findings for Division II and Division III were presented and discussed separately, there was no attempt made to make correlations or measure significant differences between the two samples. It is hoped that the

present study will provide a broad base of knowledge with which to continue in multiple different directions of future research.

Future Research

Some areas of future research include progress in gender and racial disparity during the last 20 years, greater in-depth analysis of job design in Division II and III athletic departments, and the effectiveness of sport administration programs at training collegiate athletic directors. Further examination is needed into not only whether the numbers of women and minority athletic directors are heading towards fair representation, but also whether the selection, job design, and compensation of women and minorities in athletic departments are equitable. Analysis of job design and areas of involvement could prove useful in classifying the roles of athletic directors into different clusters, based on how they are used within the athletic department. This research could inform executive search firms on how to focus their searches. Studies regarding the efforts and successes of higher education systems to introduce knowledgeable and effective sports administrators could be valuable in improving the quality of the overall talent pool. Finally, investigations into the causes and solutions of athletic department dissatisfaction could potentially improve the success and retention rates of college athletics administrators.

List of References

- Acosta, R. V. and Carpenter, L. J. (2010). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study – thirty-three year update (1977-2010). Unpublished manuscript, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY. Retrieved from <http://www.acostacarpenter.org/2010pdf%20combined%20final.pdf>
- Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 49-61.
- Anderson, M. A. and Gray, G. R. (1994). Risk management behaviors in NCAA Division III athletic programs. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 4(1), 78-84.
- Burr, R. & Cordery, J. L. (2001). Self-management efficacy as a mediator of the relation between job design and employee motivation. *Human Performance*, 14(1), 27-44.
- Carodine, K., Almond, K. F., and Gratto, K. K. (2002). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2001(93), 19-33.
- Cejda, B. D. (2008). In their own words: Women chief academic officers discuss the community college and their career experiences. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, 6(3), 171-185.
- Copeland, B. W. and Kirsch, S. (1995). Perceived occupational stress among NCAA Division I, II, and III athletic directors. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9(1), 70-77.
- Cordes, C. L. and Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A review and an integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 621-656.
- Cuneen, J. (1992). Graduate-level professional preparation for athletic directors. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6(1), 15-26.
- Cunningham, G. B. & Ashley, F. B. (2001). Isomorphism in NCAA athletic departments: The

- use of competing theories and advancement of theory. *Sport Management Review (Sport Management Association of Australia & New Zealand)*, 4(1), 47-63.
- Davis, D. J. (2002). An analysis of the perceived leadership styles and levels of satisfaction of selected junior college athletic directors and head coaches. *The Sport Journal*, 5(2). Retrieved from <http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/analysis-perceived-leadership-styles-levels-satisfaction-selected-junior-college-athletic-di>
- Doherty, A. J. & K. E. Danylchuk (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(3), 292-309.
- Fisk, J. S. and Pastore, D. L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest*, 51(4), 310-327.
- Fitzgerald, M. P., Sagaria, M. A. D., & Nelson, B. (1994). Career patterns of athletic directors: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Sport Management*, 8(1), 14-26.
- Kahn, L. (2007). Markets: Cartel behavior and amateurism in college sports. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1), 209–226.
- Lounsbury, J. W. (2010). Life Satisfaction Inventory. Unpublished instrument. Resource Associates, Inc.
- Lovett, D. J. and C. D. Lowry (1994). 'Good Old Boys' and 'Good Old Girls' clubs: Myth or reality? *Journal of Sport Management*, 8(1), 27-35.
- Mitchell, C. (2008). Inside the mind of the CEO: Careful what you wish for. *Executive Action Series*, The Conference Board. September 2008.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2007). What's the difference between divisions I, II,

- and III? Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/About+The+NCAA/Membership/div_criteria.html
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2008). Diversity and inclusion: Enhancing diversity in intercollegiate athletics. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/8c3c29004e0d5ab7abc9fb1ad6fc8b25/diversity_and_inclusion.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=8c3c29004e0d5ab7abc9fb1ad6fc8b25
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2009). Federal graduation rates data archive. [Data set]. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/portal/ncaahome?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/ncaa/NCAA/Academics+and+Athletes/Education+and+Research/Academic+Reform/Grad+Rate/
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011). Differences among the three divisions. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About+the+NCAA/Who+We+Are/Differences+Among+the+Divisions/>
- Orpen, C. (1998). The effects of organizational centrality on employee career success and satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 26(1), 85-88.
- Quarterman, J. (1992). Characteristics of athletic directors of historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6(1), 52-63.
- Robinson, M., Peterson, M., Tedrick, T., & Carpenter, J. (2003). Job satisfaction on NCAA Division III athletic directors: Impact of job design and time on task. *International Sports Journal*, 7(2), 46-57.
- Ruihley, B. & Fall, T. (2009). Assessment on and off the field: Examining athletic directors' perceptions of public relations in college athletics. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 2, 398-410.
- Sagaria, M. A. D. (1988). Administrative mobility and gender: Patterns and processes in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(3), 305-326.

- Sagas, M. & Cunningham, G. B. (2004). Does having “the right stuff” matter? Gender Differences in the determinants of career success among intercollegiate athletic Administrators. *Sex Roles, 50*, 411-421
- Schneider, R. & Stier, W. (2005) Necessary education for the success of athletics directors: NCAA presidents’ perceptions. *The Sport Journal, 8*(1). Retrieved from <http://www.thesportjournal.org/article/necessary-education-success-athletics-directors-ncaa-presidents-perceptions>.
- Seidler, T., Gerdy, J., and Cardinal, B. (1998). Athletic director authority in Division I intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of athletic directors and university presidents. *International Sports Journal, 2*(2), 36-46.
- Skemp-Arlt, K. M. and Toupençe, M. (2007). The administrator’s role in employee motivation. *Coach and Athletic Director, 76*(7), 28-31.
- Sosa, J. and Sagas, M. (2006). Assessment of organizational culture and job satisfaction in National Collegiate Athletic Administration academic administrators [Abstract]. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 77*(1), A-108.
- Stier, W. and Schneider, R. (2001). Expected skills, competencies, and knowledge expected of high school athletic administrators – by their principals. *International Sports Journal, 5*(2), 18-30.
- The College Board. (2010). College matchmaker database. Retrieved from http://collegesearch.collegeboard.com/search/adv_typeofschool.jsp?s_kwcid=college%20search|3097749554
- The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport. (2011). 2010 race and gender report card: College sport. Retrieved from http://www.tidesport.org/RGRC/2010/2010_College_RGRC_FINAL.pdf
- Whisenant, W. (2008). Sustaining male dominance in interscholastic athletics: A case of

homologous reproduction... or not? *Sex Roles*, 58(11), 768-775.

Appendices

Appendix A

FORM A

IRB # _____

Certification for Exemption from IRB Review for Research Involving Human Subjects

A. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(s) and/or CO-PI(s): (For student projects, list both the student and the advisor.)

Kaleb Center
Dr. Robin Hardin

B. DEPARTMENT:

Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport Studies

C. COMPLETE MAILING ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF PI(s) and CO-PI(s):

University of Tennessee
1914 Andy Holt Ave., Room 335
Knoxville, TN 37996
865-974-1281

D. TITLE OF PROJECT:

Characteristics and Professional Qualifications of NCAA Division II and III Athletic Directors

E. EXTERNAL FUNDING AGENCY AND ID NUMBER (if applicable):

N/A

F. GRANT SUBMISSION DEADLINE (if applicable):

G. STARTING DATE: (NO RESEARCH MAY BE INITIATED UNTIL CERTIFICATION IS GRANTED.)

Upon IRB Approval

H. ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE (Include all aspects of research and final write-up.):

May 31, 2011

I. RESEARCH PROJECT:

Objective(s) of Project (Use additional page, if needed.):

The objective of this is to determine collegiate athletic directors' personal characteristics, professional and educational background, and career satisfaction and motivation.

1. **Subjects** (Use additional page, if needed.):

Athletic directors at NCAA Division II and III member institutions

2. **Methods or Procedures** (Use additional page, if needed.):

An e-mail will be sent to collegiate athletic directors describing the purpose of the study and containing a link that will direct them to a Web site where the questionnaire (see attached) is hosted. The e-mails were obtained through the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) Directory. The participants will be assured that all information they provide will be held confidential and presented only in group form. To assure confidentiality, participants' names will not appear on the questionnaires, the completion of which will constitute the respondents' consent to participate. No attempt will be made to identify individual participants on the basis of responses.

3. **CATEGORY(S) FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH PER 45 CFR 46** (see reverse side for categories):

Category 2: Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior.

J. CERTIFICATION: The research described herein is in compliance with 45 CFR 46.101(b) and presents subjects with no more than minimal risk as defined by applicable regulations.

Principal Investigator _____
Name Signature Date

Principal Investigator _____
Name Signature Date

Dept. Review
Comm. Chair _____
Name Signature Date

APPROVED:
Dept. Head _____
Name Signature Date

Rev. 01/97

Appendix B

Collegiate Athletic Directors: An Occupational Study

You are being invited to participate in this study by responding to the following questions about your professional background and career choices. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. The completion and submission of this survey will serve as your informed consent to participate in this study.

Under which NCAA division is your institution classified?

- Division I
- Division II
- Division III

Please select all of your degrees of education attained, and identify your major areas of study and where the degree was obtained.

- Associates
- Bachelor's
- Master's
- Doctorate

In approximately what year (e.g.1990) did you first resolve to become an athletic director and identify this profession as your career goal?

Please check all of the following occupations related to athletics administration that you held prior to becoming an athletic director at a four-year college or university. For each, state the number of years you held the position.

- High school teacher
- High school coach
- High school principal/asst principal
- High School athletic director
- Administration – Community sport/recreation
- Administration – College campus recreation
- Graduate Assistantship
- College professor
- Intercollegiate athletics – Clerical
- Athletic training
- Intercollegiate sport operations
- College Coach
- Community/junior college athletics director
- Collegiate athletic conference administration
- College athletics – Business management
- College athletics – Communications
- College athletics – Compliance
- College athletics – Development/Fundraising
- College athletics – Event management
- College athletics – Facilities/equipment
- College athletics – Marketing
- Administration – Professional athletics
- College athletics – Asst/Assoc athletic director
- Other (please list additional occupations related to athletics administration)

How many years have you worked at your current institution?

How many years have you held the position of athletic director at your current institution?

What job/position did you hold directly before your current position?

How many total years have you held the position of athletic director (at any institutions)?

Do you plan on retiring from your current institution (remaining at your institution for the rest of your career)?

Yes
No

Please rate (Note: slightly involved = once/week, involved = 2-3 times/week, heavily involved = 3 or more times/week to daily) your level of involvement in the following areas of collegiate athletics at your institution.

- Teaching
- Coaching
- Recruiting
- Employment/HR
- Financials/Budgetary Oversight
- Policy Making (Internal)
- Policy Making (External)
- Community Relations
- Campus Relations
- Business Management
- Compliance/Risk Management
- Development/Fundraising
- Marketing
- Communications
- Sport Operations
- Facilities/Equipment

Please list any other activities in which you are “involved to heavily involved” as an athletic director that were not previously mentioned.

Have you received employment for a job within an athletic department in part because of the networking connections you formed with associates within collegiate athletics?

Yes
No

As you read each of the following sets of phrases, think about how you act most of the time or how you most characteristically feel or think when you are at work (on your job). For each item, determine which of the 5 possible responses best describes you and check the corresponding box for that item on the answer sheet.

1 - I am very dissatisfied with my job pay and benefits.
2
3
4
5 - I am very satisfied with my job pay and benefits.

1 -I feel like I don't have good job security.
2
3
4
5 - I feel like I have very good job security.

1 - I don't enjoy the nature of the work I do on my job.
2

3

4

5 - I really enjoy the nature of the work I do on my job.

1 - I don't really like the people I work with.

2

3

4

5 - I really like the people I work with.

1 - There are few, if any, good opportunities for advancement on my job.

2

3

4

5 - There are good opportunities for advancement on my job.

1 - I am very dissatisfied with the supervision I receive on my job.

2

3

4

5 - I am very satisfied with the supervision I receive on my job.

1 - All things considered, I am dissatisfied with my job as a whole.

2

3

4

5 - All things considered, I am very satisfied with my job as a whole.

1 - I feel that I am on a definite career path which leads somewhere.

2

3

4

5 - I do not feel that I am on a definite career path which leads somewhere.

1 - I am not happy with my choice of career and would like to find a new career direction.

2

3

4

5 - I am very happy with my choice of career.

1 - I feel burned out doing the kind of work I have been doing recently.

2

3

4

5 - I do not feel burned out doing the kind of work I have been doing recently.

1 - My career future looks dim.

2

3

4

5 - My career future looks bright.

1 - I am very dissatisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.

2

3

4

5 - I am very satisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.

Why did you choose to pursue a career as a collegiate athletic director?

What was or is your motivation to work within collegiate athletics?

How many varsity men's sports does your institution offer?

How many varsity women's sports does your institution offer?

Does your institution offer football as a varsity sport?

Yes
No

Approximately how many total student-athletes does your athletic department support?

Approximately how many student-athlete athletic scholarships does your department support?

How many full-time employees are currently working in your athletic department?

How many part-time employees are currently working in your athletic department?

What is your age?

What is your gender?

Male
Female

What is your preferred racial identification (Select all that apply)?

White/Caucasian
Black/African-American
Latino/Hispanic
Asian/Pacific Islander
Arabic/Middle Eastern
Native American/Alaskan/Hawaiian
Other
No Answer

Are you married or living with a partner?

Yes
No

What is your base salary range?

< \$30,000
\$30,000 - \$39,999
\$40,000 - \$49,999
\$50,000 - \$59,999
\$60,000 - \$69,999
\$70,000 - \$79,999
\$80,000 - \$89,999
\$90,000 - \$99,999
\$100,000 - \$109,999
\$110,000 - \$119,999
\$120,000 - \$129,999
\$130,000 - \$139,999
\$140,000 - \$149,999
\$150,000 - \$159,999
\$160,000 - \$169,999

\$170,000 - \$179,999
\$180,000 - \$189,999
\$190,000 - \$199,999
\$200,000 - \$209,999
\$210,000 - \$219,999
\$220,000 - \$229,999
\$230,000 - \$239,999
\$240,000 - \$249,999
\$250,000 - \$259,999
\$260,000 - \$269,999
> \$270,000
No Answer

Do you receive a bonus based upon a team's athletic performance (i.e. record, championship, tournament accomplishment)?

Yes
No

Do you receive a bonus based upon a team or teams academic accomplishments/achievement?

Yes
No

What do you find most rewarding as a head athletic director?

What do you find is the most troublesome or challenging part of your job as a head athletic director?

Additional comments (optional):

Thank you for your time and participation. The survey is now complete. You may safely exit and close your internet browser at this point.

Table 1*Athletic Director Demographic Profile*

Data	Division II Percentage	Division III Percentage
Racial ID		
White/Caucasian	93.3%	93.3%
Black/African-American	2.2%	4.7%
Native American/Hawaiian/Alaskan	2.2%	1.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.2%	0.0%
Latino/Hispanic	0.0%	1.0%
Gender		
Male	80.0%	61.9%
Female	20.0%	38.1%
Marital Status		
Married or Living With a Partner	82.9%	88.9%
Unmarried	17.1%	11.1%
Highest Degree of Education		
Bachelor's	6.7%	6.7%
Master's	77.8%	75.2%
Doctorate	15.6%	18.1%
Salary Range^a		
<\$60,000	2.3%	7.0%
\$60,000-\$69,999	4.5%	12.0%
\$70,000-\$79,999	9.1%	14.0%
\$80,000-\$89,999	25.0%	17.0%
\$90,000-\$99,999	20.5%	14.0%
\$100,000-\$109,999	6.8%	12.0%
\$110,000-\$119,999	18.2%	7.0%
\$120,000-\$129,999	2.3%	7.0%
>\$130,000	11.4%	7.0%

Note: 45 total responses for Division II, 105 total responses for Division III

^a44 responses for Division II, 100 responses for Division III; percentage of ADs who responded to salary question is shown

Table 2*Areas of Study*

Degree	Division II Percentage ^a	Division III Percentage ^a
Bachelor's Degree		
Physical Education	27.8%	35.7%
Business Administration	13.9%	10.0%
Psychology	5.6%	7.1%
History	0.0%	8.6%
Education	8.3%	2.9%
Other	44.5%	35.8%
Master's Degree		
Athletic Administration	28.6%	30.1%
Education	23.8%	19.4%
Physical Education	11.9%	15.1%
Educational Administration	11.9%	6.5%
MBA	4.8%	5.4%
Other	19.1%	23.6%
Doctorate Degree		
Higher Education Administration	40.0%	29.4%
Athletic Administration	40.0%	17.6%
Education	20.0%	11.8%
Physical Education	0.0%	11.8%
Sport and Leisure Studies	0.0%	5.9%
Philosophy	0.0%	5.9%
English	0.0%	5.9%
Movement Art	0.0%	5.9%
Law	0.0%	5.9%

Note: Some responses indicated more than one degree per level of education

^aPercentages based on total degrees reported for each level of education

Table 3*Frequency and Average Years (Avg Yrs) of 24 Previous Career Experiences by Division*

Previous experience	Division II		Division III	
	Frequency	Avg Yrs	Frequency	Avg Yrs
College Coach	66.7%	14.4	79.0%	12.7
College athletics – Asst/Assoc athletic director	71.1%	7.3	64.8%	6.1
High school coach	33.3%	4.5	42.9%	5.2
College professor	28.9%	16.7	39.0%	12.8
High school teacher	26.7%	5.3	37.1%	5.1
Graduate Assistantship	33.3%	1.3	28.6%	1.9
College athletics – Event management	20.0%	4.3	20.0%	7.7
College athletics – Compliance	28.9%	4.6	15.2%	6.8
Intercollegiate sport operations	8.9%	6.5	15.2%	9.3
College athletics – Facilities/equipment	6.7%	6.7	16.2%	5.4
Administration – College campus recreation	4.4%	8.5	14.3%	7.6
College athletics – Development/Fundraising	13.3%	8.3	9.5%	6.2
College athletics – Marketing	17.8%	6.5	7.6%	4.4
College athletics – Business management	11.1%	6.8	5.7%	8.7
High School athletic director	4.4%	6.0	7.6%	6.3
College athletics – Communications	4.4%	12.5	7.6%	7.0
Administration – Community sport/recreation	6.7%	4.1	5.7%	4.8
Administration – Professional athletics	2.2%	10.0	3.8%	2.0
Athletic training	2.2%	8.0	2.9%	8.0
Intercollegiate athletics – Clerical	4.4%	N/A	1.9%	4.0
High school principal/Assistant principal	4.4%	N/A	1.9%	6.0
Collegiate athletic conference administration	4.4%	N/A	1.9%	4.0
College/Academic Administration	2.2%	N/A	2.9%	N/A
Community/junior college athletic director	2.2%	7.0	1.9%	4.0

Note: 45 total responses for Division II, and 105 for Division III. Some responses for years were missing.

Table 4*Division II ADs' Involvement in 16 Work Activities*

Work Activity	Uninvolved	Slightly		Heavily
		Involved	Involved	Involved
Finance	0.0%	2.2%	11.1%	86.7%
Policy Making (Internal)	0.0%	0.0%	15.6%	84.4%
Sport Operations	0.0%	6.7%	26.7%	66.7%
Community Relations	0.0%	0.0%	35.6%	64.4%
Campus Relations	0.0%	8.9%	35.6%	55.6%
Policy Making (External)	0.0%	11.1%	33.3%	55.6%
Business Management	0.0%	8.9%	44.4%	46.7%
Employment/Human Resources	0.0%	6.7%	48.9%	44.4%
Development/Fundraising	0.0%	4.4%	53.3%	42.2%
Facilities/Equipment	0.0%	13.3%	48.9%	37.8%
Compliance/Risk Management	0.0%	8.9%	55.6%	35.6%
Marketing	2.2%	17.8%	48.9%	31.1%
Communications	0.0%	13.3%	57.8%	28.9%
Coaching	57.8%	24.4%	8.9%	8.9%
Recruiting	22.2%	44.4%	26.7%	6.7%
Teaching	55.6%	24.4%	15.6%	4.4%

Note: 45 total responses; sorted by last column

Table 5*Division III ADs' Involvement in 16 Work Activities*

Area of Involvement	Uninvolved	Slightly		Heavily
		Involved	Involved	Involved
Finance	0.0%	1.0%	18.1%	81.0%
Policy Making (Internal)	0.0%	2.9%	25.7%	71.4%
Sport Operations	1.0%	8.6%	40.0%	50.5%
Campus Relations	0.0%	4.8%	47.6%	47.6%
Facilities/Equipment	0.0%	16.2%	41.9%	41.9%
Employment/Human Resources	3.8%	15.2%	39.0%	41.9%
Business Management	2.9%	15.2%	41.0%	41.0%
Compliance/Risk Management	0.0%	17.1%	46.7%	36.2%
Policy Making (External)	4.8%	25.7%	34.3%	35.2%
Community Relations	0.0%	17.1%	51.4%	31.4%
Development/Fundraising	3.8%	23.8%	48.6%	23.8%
Communications	1.0%	41.0%	39.0%	19.0%
Coaching	66.7%	10.5%	3.8%	19.0%
Recruiting	20.0%	46.7%	18.1%	15.2%
Marketing	4.8%	45.7%	37.1%	12.4%
Teaching	51.4%	24.8%	15.2%	8.6%

Note: 105 total responses; sorted by last column

Table 6*Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Rewarding Aspect of AD Position*

Response	Division II	Division III
Success of students, teams, or coaches	40.9%	23.8%
Relationships with students or staff	13.6%	27.0%
Witnessing personal development	16.7%	13.9%
Assisting and helping people	6.1%	14.8%
Leadership of athletic department	4.5%	9.0%
Graduation of student-athletes	13.6%	0.8%
Everything	0.0%	3.3%
Work environment	1.5%	1.6%
Developing coaches	1.5%	1.6%
Variety of tasks	0.0%	1.6%
Contributions of staff members	0.0%	0.8%
Positive feedback	0.0%	0.8%
Teamwork	1.5%	0.0%
Coaching	0.0%	0.8%

Notes: 45 total responses for Division II, and 105 for Division III.
Responses sorted by combined total.

Table 7*Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Troublesome/Challenging Aspect of AD Position*

Response	Division	Division
	II	III
Limited resources or financial concerns	30.1%	45.2%
Personnel issues	10.8%	14.0%
Parental involvement	12.9%	10.8%
Student discipline	2.2%	5.9%
Time restraints and secondary responsibilities	5.4%	3.8%
Unrealistic demands of institution	4.3%	2.7%
Compliance	4.3%	2.7%
Competitive expectations	4.3%	2.7%
Fundraising	7.5%	0.5%
Playing politics	4.3%	2.2%
Work-life balance	2.2%	2.2%
Complexity of multiple roles	4.3%	0.5%
Inconsistency of work	2.2%	1.1%
Seeing students make bad decisions	2.2%	0.5%
Pressure to recruit	0.0%	1.6%
Misunderstandings about athletics	0.0%	1.1%
Coach evaluation	0.0%	1.1%
Communication with student-athletes	2.2%	0.0%
Sense of student entitlement	1.1%	0.5%
Event Management	0.0%	0.5%
Relationships with faculty	0.0%	0.5%

Note: 45 total responses for Division II, and 105 for Division III.
Responses sorted by combined total.

Table 8*Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Motivation to Pursue AD Position*

Response	Division II	Division III
Identification with athletics	25.4%	25.0%
Working with student-athletes or coaches	28.6%	17.1%
Previous experiences	14.3%	11.2%
Opportunity to lead	6.4%	14.5%
Contributing to higher education	9.5%	9.9%
Request from administration	4.8%	2.0%
Creating athletic experiences for others	1.6%	3.3%
Combination of athletics and business	0.0%	3.3%
Creating experiences for others	3.2%	2.0%
Role models in athletic administration	0.0%	2.6%
Variety of responsibilities	1.6%	1.3%
Personal talents	0.0%	2.0%
Improving athletics	0.0%	2.0%
Competition	1.6%	0.7%
Addressing inequalities	0.0%	1.3%
Future career aspirations	1.6%	0.0%
Variety of responsibilities	0.0%	0.7%
Having a fun job	0.0%	0.7%
Request of administration	0.0%	0.7%
Increased compensation	1.6%	0.0%

Note: 45 total responses for Division II, and 105 for Division III.

Responses sorted by combined total.

Table 9*Frequency of Response, by Division, for Each Motivation to Work in College Athletics*

Response	Division II	Division III
Positive impact on people	22.2%	13.1%
Student-athletes	20.4%	13.1%
Personal gratification from athletics	16.7%	10.9%
Contributing to higher education	7.4%	12.6%
Work environment	3.7%	12.6%
Coaching	0.0%	9.1%
Motivation or success of others	7.4%	5.7%
Personal experiences	3.7%	5.7%
Competition	5.6%	4.0%
Relationships in athletics	3.7%	2.9%
Variety of challenges	1.9%	2.9%
Teamwork	3.7%	2.3%
Employment prospects	1.9%	2.9%
Student athletes	1.9%	0.6%
Personal talents	0.0%	0.6%
Characteristics of Division III	0.0%	0.6%
Identification with institution	0.0%	0.6%

Note: 45 total responses for Division II, and 105 for Division III.

Responses sorted by combined total.

Vita

Kaleb Center, a native of Murfreesboro, TN, attended Oakland High School where he lettered in wrestling and cross-country and performed in several stage productions and choir performances. He was a National Hispanic Scholar and a National Merit Scholar Semi-finalist. After graduation with honors, he attended Carson-Newman College in Jefferson City, TN, on a Presidential Scholarship. There he met his wife Ginny, performed extensive community service as a leader in the Bonner Scholar Program, participated in the Baptist Student Union Gospel choir, worked for the Carson-Newman Annual Fund Office, and was a sports writer for the local Standard Banner. Kaleb graduated Carson-Newman Magna Cum Laude, with a Bachelor's of Science in Management, with a Marketing emphasis. He was the top graduate in his major, graduating with a 3.86 GPA. After earning a bachelor's degree, he worked full-time for six years in the publishing and finance industries before returning to school to pursue a master's degree. He attended the University of Tennessee for two years, where he served in athletics media relations as a student assistant and sat on the 2010-11 Partners in Sports Student Board. He is graduating in the summer of 2011 with a Master's of Science in Recreation and Sport Management. Kaleb now resides in Knoxville, TN, with his wife, Ginny, and two daughters, Sofia and Phoebe.