To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jessica Michelle Hobart entitled “Exploring the Career Mobility of Women in Campus Recreation.” 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 Leisure Studies.

Steven N. Waller, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Joy T. DeSensi

Angela J. Wozencroft

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

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

Exploring the Career Mobility of Women in Campus Recreation

A Thesis Presented for
the Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jessica Michelle Hobart
May 2010

Copyright © 2010 by Jessica Michelle Hobart
All rights reserved.

Abstract

This thesis is a quantitative research design that examines the upward mobility of women administrators in campus recreation. The purpose of this study is to examine the career mobility of women currently working in the administration of campus recreation. A criterion sampling method was used to select women currently holding administrative level positions in campus recreation as well as solicit participation using the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) Member Database. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 18.0) was utilized to analyze the data. For the quantitative data, basic descriptive statistics were performed which included means, standard deviations, and frequencies. For the research questions Pearson Chi Square tests, ANOVA tests, and Tukey's Post Hoc test were conducted. The respondents' narrative comments were analyzed objectively for common themes. A total of 348 women administrators successfully completed the e-survey, generating a 45.7% response rate. Some significant findings from this study include: (1) The current study supports the literature of previous studies in that women in different sport industry segments are experiencing the same barriers to career mobility; (2) Women still perceive the same challenges as women over 30 years ago; (3) The status of women has increasingly changed as women continue to make inroads into the campus recreation profession, however women's perceived career development remains unchanged.

Keywords: career mobility, women, administration, campus recreation, NIRSA

Table of Contents

List of Tables vii
Chapter 1 Introduction 1
Overview 1
Statement of the Problem 3
Purpose Statement 3
Significance of the Study 4
Research Questions 4
Variables 5
Delimitations 5
Chapter 2 Literature Review 7
Women in Leisure Services 7
History of Women in NIRSA 14
Women in Campus Recreation 17
Theoretical Foundations 24
Career Mobility Theory 24
Definitions 26
Campus Recreation 26
Recreational Sport 26
Career Mobility Theory 26
Career Mobility 26
Downward Mobility 26
Lateral Mobility 26
Upward Mobility 26
Career Path 27
National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) 27
Glass Ceiling 27
Glass Wall 27
Compensation Package 27
Chapter 3 Methods 28
Research Design 28
Instrumentation 28
Sample 30
Data Collection 30
Data Analysis 31
Chapter 4 Results 33
Primary Research Questions 33
Additional Testing 34
Demographic Characteristics 35
Positive and Negative Roles on Career Mobility 35
Currently Seeking an Upward Position 36
Accepted an Upward Position within the Last Year 37
Accepted a Downward Position within the Last Five Years 37
Accepted a Lateral Position within the Last Five Years 37

Continued Education for Career Reasons 37
Left the Profession to Work for an Outside Organization 38
The Role of Gender on Career Mobility of Women Working in the Administration of Campus Recreation 38
Compensation Package 39
Analysis of Common Themes 39
Currently Seeking an Upward Position 39
Accepted an Upward Position within the Last Year 40
Accepted a Downward Position within the Last Five Years 41
Accepted a Lateral Position within the Last Five Years 42
Left the Profession to Work for an Outside Organization 42
The Role of Gender on Career Mobility of Women Working in the Administration of Campus Recreation 43
Statistical Analysis of Research Questions 44
RQ1: What is the Career Mobility of Women Administrators in Campus Recreation? 44
RQ2: Is there a relationship between age and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 45
RQ3: Is there a relationship between highest level of education completed and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 45
RQ4: Is there a relationship between experience in campus recreation and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 45
RQ5: Is there a relationship between mentor(s) and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 46
Supplemental Testing 46
Is there a relationship between race/ethnicity and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 46
Is there a relationship between income and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 46
Is there a relationship between the institutional type where the campus recreation department is located and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 47
Is there a relationship between network and career mobility among campus recreation administrators? 47
Is there a relationship between NIRSA membership and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 47
Is there a relationship between perceived gender discrimination and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators? 47
Chapter 5 48
Discussion 48
Factors Influencing the Career Mobility of Women 48
Organizational Factors 49
Family and Gender Socialization Factors 51
Gender Discrimination Factors 53

Economic Factors 54
Upward Career Mobility of Women Campus Recreation Administrators 55
Theoretical Framework 56
Career Mobility Theory 56
Additional Theories to be Considered 58
Limitations 59
Chapter 6 Recommendations for Future Research and Conclusion 61
Recommendations for Future Research 61
Conclusion 63
List of References 65
Appendix 71
Appendix A 72
Occupation Definitions 72
Director 72
Senior Associate 72
Associate Director 72
Senior Program Director 72
Business Services 72
Aquatics 72
Facilities 72
Fitness 72
Informal Recreation 72
Instructional Programs 73
Intramural Sports 73
Marketing 73
Membership 73
Outdoor Recreation 73
Sport Clubs 73
Student Development 73
Technology 73
Wellness 73
Other 73
Appendix B 74
Vita 76

List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics 74
Table 2: Factors that Play a Role on Career Mobility 36
Table 3: Reasons for Leaving the Profession 39

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 the status of women has increasingly changed as more and more women enter the work force. The U.S. Department of Labor statistics from 2007 stated women comprised 46% of the total U.S. labor force and are projected to account for 47% of the labor force in 2016. Of these women, the largest percentage of employed women (39%) worked in management, professional, and related occupations (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007). Additionally, women have continued to make inroads into nontraditional occupations. A nontraditional occupation for women is one in which women comprise 25% or less of total employment (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007b). Occupations that were once nontraditional for women in 1986 were no longer nontraditional for women as of 2006. These occupations included physicians and surgeons, chemists, judges and magistrates, announcers, lawyers, athletes, coaches, umpires, and postal service mail carriers.

Although women are making huge strides in some areas, there is still concern for the absence of women in traditionally male dominated professions, such as detectives, architects, chefs, barbers, the clergy (U.S. Department of Labor, 2007b), and particularly within upper management ranks. In 2003 Gabriel examined occupational mobility among full-time workers and found that female workers in managerial and the professional and technical fields experience downward occupational mobility

significantly more than men. Some have noted this to be an issue of the "glass ceiling," which the U.S. Department of Labor has defined as "artificial barriers, based on attitudinal or organizational bias, that prevent women and minorities from advancing within their organization and reaching their full potential" (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). This can be seen particularly in the recreation and sport industry which is another traditionally male dominated industry. The recreation and sport industry includes professional sport, intercollegiate sport, health and fitness, recreational sport, and the like. It is believed that in the field of campus recreation, women have not been progressing up the career ladder at the same pace as their male counterparts. Furthermore in a 1999 study conducted by Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold of administrators in parks and recreation, many women reported that women are not adequately represented in top management positions. This lack of women in upper management is often noted as a result of the large prevalence of white men holding these positions as well as gender discrimination.

One area of recreation and sport that is left to be examined is that of recreational sport which is often referred to as campus recreation. The presence of women working in campus recreation has increased with the advancements in higher education institutions hiring practices. Although the presence of women in the field has increased, the rate at which women are gaining status within male dominated professions is still at a slow progression (Bower & Hums, 2003). Even fewer women are seen continuing their career lines within the profession as more and more women leave the field for more career advancement opportunities elsewhere (testimony given by women administrators at

NIRSA conferences). Currently, there are a few studies that address the career paths of women working in campus recreation and limited research on the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation (e.g. Bower & Hums, 2006; Oelling, 2004; White, 2004; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Varner, 1992; Yager, 1983; Carney & Gold, 1978; Buchanan, 1978). Women deserve equal opportunity for advancement within their perspective industry and it should be society's aim to reduce obstacles women encounter in advancing to management in different work environments.

Statement of the Problem

The current body of research related to women administrators in campus recreation and career mobility is lacking (Bower and Hums, 2003). Much of the research is limited and/or outdated that outlines the challenges women face as well as the career mobility more specifically the career advancement of women in campus recreation. More current research on the topic needs to be conducted in an effort to provide validation and more importantly raise awareness that gender roles in the workplace still exist. If women want to strive to attain administrative level positions in campus recreation, then society must be informed of the above information as well as how to implement the information in an effort to move forward.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to measure the upward mobility of women working in campus recreation administration via examination of the subjects' current and first positions held within campus recreation administration. Further this study specifically aims to examine the career mobility of women currently holding administrative level

positions in campus recreation. While previous studies have investigated the challenges women face working in campus recreation administration and the strategies they use to overcome these challenges (e.g. Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Oelling, 2004; White, 2004; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Varner, 1992; Yager, 1983; Carney & Gold, 1978; Buchanan, 1978), there has been limited research on the career mobility of women working within campus recreation administration (Bower & Hums, 2003). This study will contribute new knowledge to the current body of knowledge in campus recreation.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant due to the limited amount of research specifically examining the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation (Bower and Hums, 2003). Further analysis of the topic will aid in the effort to close the gender gap in the administrative ranks of campus recreation. Most importantly this study will help incoming women and women currently in the campus recreation profession to efficiently and effectively achieve an administrative level position within the profession.

Research Questions

This quantitative study will address the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between age and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between highest level of education completed and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between experience in campus recreation and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ5: Is there a relationship between mentor(s) and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

Additional research questions were also investigated among women campus recreation administrators, which include the relationship between race/ethnicity and career mobility, the relationship between income and career mobility, the relationship between the institutional type where the campus recreation department is located and career mobility, the relationship between networking and career mobility, the relationship between NIRSA and career mobility, and the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and career mobility.

Variables

Within this study both independent and dependent variables exist. The independent variable is women holding administrative level positions in campus recreation and the dependent variable is career mobility. For the purposes of this study career mobility is determined by education, experience, mentor(s), age, salary, and institution enrollment.

Delimitations

In order to achieve a sufficient number of respondents, women holding administrative level positions in campus recreation were primarily selected from the

NIRSA Member Database. Women not holding administrative level positions in campus recreation were not eligible to participate. Women who meet the above criteria who are non-members of NIRSA were not excluded from the study.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Women in Leisure Services

The number of female students majoring in recreation, park, and leisure services in higher education institutions has been increasing over the years (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Shinew, Anderson, & Arnold, 1999). Similarly the number of females employed in leisure services has also been increasing (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Shinew, Anderson, & Arnold, 1999; Anderson, 2001). However, there continues to be a lack of research about the experience of women working in the leisure services profession (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995). Research indicates that two models have been heavily utilized as tools for measuring the career development of women in the leisure services industry. Henderson (1992) utilized the complementary-contribution model, which recognizes that women are different than men in terms of what they value in work and what they contribute to the workforce (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). This model suggests women offer the organization something unique that may not fit the traditional male model, but does contribute to the workforce (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Further, Henderson (1992) found that women's career development progression suffered from balancing career and household expectations as well as facing gender discrimination in the form of a glass ceiling (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001).

Building from Frisby & Brown (1991), Frisby (1992) developed a model of career development for women in leisure services (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Frisby found eight categories of factors that influenced women's career development. The eight categories were: current position, professional associations, background factors, socio-economic factors, legislative factors, organizational factors, individual factors, and family factors (Frisby, 1992; Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). Frisby's model more or less offers a comparative of career development between men and women. Traditionally career development has been defined by male standards in that one's career must be in a series of uninterrupted upward career moves with work taking precedence over family obligations (Frisby, 1992; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Further if the differences between male and female career development are not recognized, women will continue to hit a glass ceiling and ultimately may leave the field (Frisby, 1992; Anderson & Shinew, 2001).

Henderson and Bialeschki (1995) utilized the *Complementary Contribution Framework* and Frisby's *Model of Women's Career Development* to analyze women in leisure services and the dimensions of their career development (Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). The career development of women is different than males due to the traditional family and work expectations of women, the cultural and organizational barriers that may affect women's advancement, and the socialization that women experience (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995). Utilizing Frisby's (1992) eight factor model, Henderson and Bialeschki (1995) examined female practitioners working in the areas of recreation, therapeutic recreation, and parks resources. In terms of current

position, it was found that the majority of women working in the three areas held supervisory or mid-management level positions (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). In terms of background factors, it was found that the respondents averaged two upward promotions or job reclassifications that resulted in higher salary (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). Further respondents indicated they had an average of one career interruption which was accredited to maternity leave, travel or moving due to spouse's job, unemployment, continuing education, marriage, resignation, layoff, and employment in another field (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). When looking at professional associations the respondents belonged to an average of 2.6 professional organizations and indicated they had been in a leadership position in 1.3 associations (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). In terms of socio-economic factors respondents made an average salary of $20,000 to $30,000 and indicated encouragement to enter the field came more from family, friends, and colleagues (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). In regards to legislative factors, almost two-thirds of respondents indicated they had been discriminated against in the field of parks, recreation, and leisure services one or more times based on their gender (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). Further, women over the age of 30 encountered more discrimination than women between 20-29 years of age (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). When examining organizational factors, over half of the respondents perceived that women do not have as many opportunities for advancement as men within the leisure service field (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Anderson, 2001). Further, over 70% of respondents indicated they aspired to a senior management level position and that they would need an average

of five years to advance to this position (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). When looking at individual factors, overall the respondents reported a fairly high degree of job satisfaction, however over half of the respondents said they occasionally thought about leaving their jobs (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). In regards to family factors, the average women employed in leisure services worked an eight hour day with an additional 1-2 hours of over-time, 15 hours of housework daily, 3.4 hours of child care, one hour in commuting, and little over one hour per day for leisure (Henderson & Bialieschki, 1995). Henderson & Bialieschki (1995) provided further support to the notions of previous studies as well as identifying the fact that gender discrimination is still very much evident.

Arnold & Shinew (1997) examined the factors that prevent career advancement of professional women working in leisure services; more specifically common promotional barriers, the role of family responsibilities, and the role that barriers have had on the career advancement of women working in leisure services. It has been reported that some common barriers for women include their suitability for leadership positions, stereotyping, lack of networking, lack of management training, lack of advancement opportunities for women, lack of equal compensation, working in a male dominated profession, inability to crack the glass ceiling, lack of female mentors, their gender, gender differences in management styles, and gender discrimination and lack of flexibility between home and work life (Arnold and Shinew, 1997). Some strategies for confronting these barriers include conducting organization self evaluations for discrimination policies and/or attitudes; organizations should take the work-life balance

lifestyle into consideration when developing human resource policies; organizations should examine their recruiting, hiring, and promotion strategies of women; increase management training programs and development programs; increase female mentoring; increase woman support networks; develop co-parenting strategies to balance home and work life; and develop flexible work schedules within the organization. Arnold & Shinew (1997) concluded that it is the responsibility of policy makers, management, and individual employees of leisure services to work together to eliminate barriers for women in the workplace.

Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold (1999) examined equality in the workplace in Illinois park districts to better understand the issues facing women. Data were collected via questionnaires that were mailed to entry-, middle-, and executive-level managers of Illinois park districts over a two year period (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). The questionnaires focused on perceptions of gender discrimination, perceptions of gender inequality, and aspirations for promotion. When respondents were asked questions related to perceptions of gender discrimination, Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold (1999) found that on all levels women indicated they were given fewer opportunities than men to be promoted and felt there was less effort by the profession to promote women than men. Further, women at the middle and executive levels indicated that women with families would be on a slower career track than men. At the entry and middle management levels, women indicated that their organizations were gender discriminatory when it came to task assignments, salary levels, and promotion decisions (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). When asked questions related to perceptions of gender inequality, women felt

they had seen a glass ceiling more than men and that the top management positions within the Illinois public recreation agencies were not equally represented by gender (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). When examining salary and career advancement opportunities, women felt they received less salary compared to their male counterparts and perceived they had less opportunities for advancement than men (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). Further, at the executive level, women indicated less opportunities for advancement, encouragement from superiors, and respect from superiors (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). When asked questions related to aspirations for promotion, women indicated they felt prepared for a top management position in parks and recreation (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). However, only 49% of women compared to 71.4% of men felt prepared for a promotion (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). Additionally, women who did not desire another promotion during their career indicated that family stress, lack of time, work stress, and content in current position were reasons for not wanting a promotion (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). In regards to mentoring, more women had female mentors than men and men had more male mentors than women (Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999). Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold (1999) concluded that unless professionals in the field recognize these issues and work to eliminate any inequitable practices, women will become discouraged and leave the field which ultimately will cause the number of women in top management positions to plateau or decrease further.

Allison (1999) examined diversity issues and programs in park and recreation agencies (Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Diversity was defined to

include gender, race, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, class, and age (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Allison (1999) conducted 18 in-depth interviews with women and people of color. The interviews focused on the organizational climate and the institutional barriers that were perceived and/or experienced in the workplace (Allison, 1999). Allison (1999) found that respondents felt that challenges still exist in terms of hiring, promotion, and job placement practices (Anderson, 2001; Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Additionally, Allison (1999) found that respondents felt that non-minority male administrators continued to surround themselves with those they feel most comfortable with (Anderson & Shinew, 2001), specifically white males (Anderson, 2001). This could also be seen as homophily entering the workplace especially within hiring practices. Allison (1999) stressed that the longevity of community programs may be determined by the ability of organizations to change.

As an extension of previous research, Anderson & Shinew (2001) examined perceptions of workplace equity as well as the impact these perception have on workplace behaviors and attitudes among men and women in public parks and recreation on a national level (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). The behaviors and attitudes studied included organizational citizenship, organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). It was found that women felt they were given fewer promotion opportunities than men in addition to feeling fewer efforts were made to promote women (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Additionally, women felt they had fewer opportunities for advancement than men and that their extent of participation in management decisions was less than men (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Further, women

felt they received less respect from superiors, clients, colleagues, and subordinates; that their performance expectation was higher than men's; and that their salaries were lower than men's (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Overall there were significant differences between men and women in perceptions of equity as well as levels of organizational citizenship and commitment (Anderson & Shinew, 2001). Anderson & Shinew (2001) concluded that unless measures are taken to address inequities, professionals, especially women, as well as agencies, will continue to suffer the negative effects of workplace inequity.

History of Women in NIRSA

In order to truly understand the significance of this study, attention must first be focused on the history of women in campus recreation via National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA) membership. NIRSA originated from the National Intramural Association (NIA), which was founded in 1950 by Dr. William Wasson who organized a meeting of 11 individuals at Dillard University in New Orleans in 1950 (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992). Three women, Annette H. Akins, Dimples Lee and Juanita G. Pierce, were the leading pioneers in the field and of the NIA at the time (Varner, 1992). In 1952, NIA was renamed the National Intramural and Recreation Association for Men and Women (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992). However, in 1959 the name was revised which dropped Recreation from the title (Rooker, 1992) and eliminated women from the membership (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992; Dudenhoeffer, 1997; NIRSA, 2001). Directly following at the 11th Annual Conference in 1960 at Purdue University, women were excluded for the first time since the organization's conception (Varner,

1992). Many women and men were left perplexed as to the reasoning behind the decision. Many stipulated the notion of the 'old boys' club and a sense of fraternity that allowed and accepted more unconventional behavior, while others came to understand the sad reality that women's programming was seen as secondary to men's programs (Varner, 1992; NIRSA 2001). When reflecting on the NIA as it was in the 60s and 70s, one member stated "It was a typical male organization of the times. There was a nucleus of old timers who wanted to keep the organization male." Additionally, another member stated "it was the old boys' club, a restricted fraternity to be continued." (Varner, 1992, p.25)

It wouldn't be until 1966 that women would be brought to the forefront once again. At the 17th Annual Conference in Norman, Oklahoma a vote took place to grant membership to women, but the amendment was not passed (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992; Dudenhoeffer, 1997). The next vote was held at the 21st Annual Conference at the Air Force Academy in 1970, which despite a campaign effort the, amendment lost once again (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992). The irony of the situation at the time was that women continued to be invited as guest speakers, but not as participants much less as members.

As more and more male members took a pro-active approach to the issue, there seemed to be a wider base of support stemming from all efforts. Then finally in 1971 at the 22nd Annual Conference in Blacksburg, Virginia women were voted into full membership in the NIA by a vote of 121 to 35 (Varner, 1992; Rooker, 1992; Dudenhoeffer, 1997; NIRSA 2001). In 1972, women were invited for the first time since

1959 to attend the annual conference at the University of Illinois and to become members; only 29 women attended (Varner, 1992).

Although women were now granted membership into the organization, sexism in programs was still very much evident (Varner 1992; NIRSA 2001). Women's issues were still prevalent within the organization as they were addressed at the annual conference in New Orleans in 1975 (Varner, 1992). For the first time, an attempt was made by the Executive Committee to make the organization more relevant for women (Varner, 1992). Hazel Varner met with the Executive Committee and suggested a ten-point program which included: developing an affirmative action plan for women, encouraging more women to participate on programs and on committees, conducting a study of the field which would include salary and position comparisons of men and women, planning more professional programs and placing a woman on the Executive Committee, until one could be successfully elected (Varner, 1992; NIRSA 2001). Of the ten-point program, the affirmative action committee was approved, appointed, and given the task of developing a plan (Varner, 1992; NIRSA 2001). However, a study of the field was not initiated until 1986 and the appointment of a woman on the Executive Committee failed due to the inequality of travel compensation for women (Varner, 1992; NIRSA, 2001). However, due to extenuating circumstances a woman was appointed to the board in 1976-77 (Varner, 1992).

1975 was a time of heated debate as men's and women's physical education programs were merging, women's athletics had emerged and were asking for equal resources (Varner, 1992; NIRSA, 2001). It was also a time of great transformation where

an important milestone in women's history was Title IX, which was presented at the annual conference in 1975 (Varner 1992; NIRSA 2001). The presentation caused men to feel threatened and young women in their first jobs to become scared (Varner, 1992; NIRSA, 2001). But, the politics of NIRSA soon changed in 1981 as the first woman, Patti Homes, was elected as Vice President of Region I from 1981-82 (Varner, 1992; NIRSA 1999). Finally in 1985, the first woman, Mary Daniels, was elected President of NIRSA (Varner, 1992; NIRSA, 2001). In addition to these great achievements, the NIRSA Honor Award was first presented to a woman, Mary Daniels, in 1991 (Varner, 1992). All in all, by 1992 many members held a different perception of women within the organization, crediting women to have been the driving force behind the organization's progression in new directions through various programming initiatives and research contributions (Varner, 1992).

Women in Campus Recreation

Research regarding the notion of common challenges faced by women within campus recreation was first undertaken by Carney and Gold (1978). After the 1978 Annual NIRSA Convention, the researchers held a breakfast meeting for individuals interested in the extent and involvement of women within the profession (Carney & Gold, 1978). The meeting allowed individuals to share opinions, ideas, and experiences related to women and the field of intramural-recreational sports (Carney & Gold, 1978). Given a 30 minute timeframe all individuals were assigned to 14 separate groups in which they compiled a list of challenges regarding women and NIRSA (Carney & Gold, 1978). Common challenges included a lack of visibility and involvement via publications,

presentations, conferences and state workshops, committee involvement, programs and initiatives; lack of support and professional development via mentors; lack of awareness; lack of unification between men and women; lack of compensation; lack of respect; balancing act between job demands and personal demands; lack of career mobility; lack of representation within organization; lack of management and political skills; and lack of knowledge regarding organization (Carney & Gold, 1978). Carney & Gold (1978) concluded that NIRSA professional members must be supportive of one another without having to be in agreement, but by understanding each other's viewpoint. Further, the researchers felt each professional has an obligation to make a decision as to what one perceives as the challenge and how they are going to pursue it, but the point is something must be done (Carney & Gold, 1978).

Buchanan (1978) examined administrative opportunities for men and women intramural directors/advisors within membership institutions of the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association. Intramural-recreational programming was facing two issues at the time: 1) the male-female dichotomy within physical education and its effect on the administration of intramural-recreational sports and (2) traditional intramural-recreational administration as opposed to current or future changes in the managerial techniques and practices (Buchanan, 1978). Additionally, colleges and universities were combining the men's and women's intramural-recreation departments into one department as well as combating the potential effects of Title IX legislation (Buchanan, 1978). When examining organizational structure, Buchanan (1978) found each of the organizational structures, except for one (within women's physical education), had

significantly more men than women. Further, men do not face any organizational structure limitations, except for within women's physical education (Buchanan, 1978). Overall this structure supports the notion of a combined administrative organizational setup for men and women (Buchanan 1978). When examining percentage assignment, Buchanan (1978) found that a position such as a single all-college/university intramural-recreation directorship position for men and women would most likely be filled with a male rather than a female. Further women would most likely not want to advance without assurance of the retention of their directorship (Buchanan, 1978). When examining the ages of the respondents, Buchanan (1978) found that there were very few women holding directorship positions aged 40 years or older, however almost 40.6% of the male respondents were 40 or older. Buchanan (1978) concluded that these findings warrant further research by anyone who wishes to analyze administrative opportunities for men and women who are considering a career in intramural-recreation within higher education.

Yager (1983) examined women professional intramural-recreational sport administrators in NIRSA based on personal and professional attributes; perceptions of facilitators and inhibitors in the job setting; perceptions of improving professional advancement; and career aspirations and expectations for achievement (Bower & Hums, 2003). Yager (1983) found that based on career aspirations and expectations that nearly half of the respondents expected to leave the IM-Rec Sports field for other employment. Further 57% percent of the non-directors expected a promotion to a higher level IM-Rec Sports position, which the majority desired career advancement opportunities.

Respondents indicated career moves were attractive due to the greater challenge, a sense of achievement, and more money. However, one must have the personal ambition to reach their career goal.

Willer (2002) examined the current profile of women campus recreation directors in an effort to determine barriers that women continue to face in the field of campus recreation, as well as identify leadership behaviors that have aided in the success of women in the field. Additionally, Willer (2002) examined the factors within the professional association (NIRSA) that have contributed to the advancement of women in leadership positions within the field of campus recreation. Willer (2002) utilized a questionnaire to survey women recreation directors and conducted telephone interviews of the women serving on the 2002 NIRSA Board of Directors. Willer (2002) found that the average women campus recreation director was between 40-45 years of age, white, single, with no children, working at an intermediate sized 4 year higher education institution, and earns between $50,000-60,000. The greatest barriers for women campus recreation directors are the lack of female role model and the lack of mentors to teach and give advice about the career (Willer, 2002). Some of the leadership practices noted were challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, encouraging the heart, and giving back to the profession (Willer, 2002). Willer (2002) concluded that a formal mentorship and networking program should be initiated via NIRSA and that a forum for women should be added to future conference agendas so that women can speak honestly about gender issues within the field.

Bower and Hums (2003) established and examined career information of women working in the administration of campus recreation programs. Their study addressed the demographics, career paths, most/least enjoyable aspects of participants' jobs, greatest challenges, career advice for women wanting to enter this profession, short-term and long-term career aspirations, the role of mentors on participants' careers, and how the participants obtained their first/current job in campus recreation (Bower & Hums, 2003). The researchers used the Female Sport Manager Career Survey instrument for this study. Their sample included 386 women listed in the *2000-2001 NIRSA National Sport Recreational Directory* (Bower & Hums, 2003). Analysis of the data for this descriptive study focused on the means and standard deviations being calculated appropriately, and that the answers to the open-ended questions were investigated for recurring themes (Bower & Hums, 2003).

When participants were asked what the least enjoyable aspects were of their job and what the greatest challenges women face working in campus recreation administration, Bower & Hums (2003) uncovered five closely tied gendered themes. The themes are listed in the order of the greatest challenges. First, women indicated a need to prove themselves, which included feeling of lack of respect, lack of recognition and support, not being taken seriously, and being mistaken as the "secretary" within the organization (Bower and Hums, 2003). Second, women indicated a directly nonwoman friendly environment for some women, which included male chauvinism, sexual harassment, and nonequitable division of responsibilities between men and women (Bower and Hums, 2003). Third, women indicated they did not feel a part of the

network, which included feelings of being “left out”, “glass ceiling”, and the “good old boys’ network” (Bower and Hums, 2003). Fourth, women indicated issues with the male’s perceptions of women working in management roles, which included confronting facility users over a variety of policies and procedures, disciplining student employees, and fighting for facility space with athletics (Bower and Hums, 2003). Fifth, women indicated an issue with time spent at the workplace, which included their dislike of balancing long, odd work hours with family commitments (Bower and Hums, 2003). Bower and Hums (2003) asked women working in campus recreation administration what advice they would give to women wanting to work in campus recreation administration. Their responses included not trying to be “one of the boys”, to demand respect of male and female participants and colleagues, expect to work in a male-dominated environment, do not conform to the male culture, and do not be intimidated (Bower and Hums, 2003). Bower and Hums (2003) concluded that future research could include trying to establish what can be done to change the environments to make them more female-friendly, as well as extending this study to examine women working in other areas of recreational sport. As one can decipher, the challenges women face in campus recreation administration have seldom changed.

In addition to the advice listed above, there has been limited research pertaining to the role of mentoring in advancing women in leadership positions within campus recreation. Bower, Hums & Keedy (2006) examined how mentoring plays a role in advancing women in leadership positions within campus recreation. They investigated the individual’s reasons for mentoring women within campus recreation, and they

investigated the organizational factors that inhibited or facilitated mentoring women. They used a phenomenological research design that examined the mentoring relationship from the perspective of the mentor (Bower, Hums & Keedy, 2006). The researchers collected data for this study through three in-depth phenomenological interviews with each participant. Their participants included four directors and one assistant director of university campus recreation programs. The researchers used a constant comparative method of analysis throughout the study. After analyzing the data, a personal life history portrait of each participant was created and thus provided themes for each research question. The results of the study provided valuable information about the perceptions of the mentoring relationship, as well as how mentoring played a huge role in helping women advance into leadership positions within campus recreation. The study also provided valuable information on ways campus recreation directors could successfully mentor women and males entering the campus recreation profession. An interesting finding from the study was that mentors did not provide gender specific data unless discussing the late 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s. This might be in light of the fact that women were banned from NIRSA from 1959 to 1972. The study also uncovered the importance of mentoring styles, professional development opportunities, equal support, reducing barriers, increasing the number of leaders, and an overall understanding of helping students learn and grow when mentoring individuals in the field of campus recreation (Bower, Hums & Keedy, 2006).

Further research has led to investigating career paths and advice for women wanting to work in the management of the health and fitness industry. This knowledge

can be applied due to the relevancy of health and fitness to campus recreation. Bower in 2008, examined career path information and advice to women pursuing a management position within the health and fitness industry. They enlisted the participation of 480 female managers who were asked to fill out the Career Paths of Women in Sports Survey. The survey elicited responses related to their career paths and career advice (Bower, 2008). For the data analysis, means were calculated for the qualitative data and a three-step content-analytic procedure was used to analyze the qualitative data (Bower, 2008). The career path information focused on women climbing the ladder from an entry-level position to the management position they are in today (Bower, 2008). Career advice included continuing education, staying up-to-date on certification, gaining practical experience, networking, and obtaining a mentor, having a role model, building communication skills, being well-rounded, giving accurate information, being diverse in training, and becoming aware of promotional opportunities (Bower, 2008). Bower (2008) concluded that career advice may help women advance to management level positions by planning for the future, choosing an appropriate major, gaining certification in the field, gaining practical experience, networking, and obtaining a mentor. Further the combination of preparing for the future and having the right attitude can provide women advancement opportunities within the field (Bower, 2008).

Theoretical Foundations

Career Mobility Theory

Sicherman and Galor (1990) examined theoretically and empirically the role and significance of occupational mobility of individuals' careers in the labor market.

Sicherman and Galor posed the model of career mobility which focuses on the transferability of skills across occupations and allows for differences in the sequences of occupations that forms the individuals' career path. One's career path can be dictated by either intrafirm career mobility (determined by the employer) or interfirm career mobility (determined by the individual) (Sicherman & Galor, 1990). The career mobility theory poses that an individual's career mobility is a function of education level, abilities, and length of experience (Sicherman & Galor, 1990). Sicherman and Galor found that the higher the probability of promotion, the greater the possibility of quitting if promotion is approved. Further among individuals who are not promoted, those with a higher probability of promotion are more likely to quit the firm (Sicherman & Galor, 1990). Sicherman and Galor found that the more educated the individual the more likely they will advance within their career. Being over-educated allows individuals to start higher on the ladder, however they will have fewer career opportunities long term. At the same time some over-educated individuals are over qualified for the occupation, thus hindering their career upgrading. Additionally, Sicherman and Galor found that the rate of career mobility decreases with time in the labor market, thus individuals with higher levels of experience are more likely to be mobile within the firm than across firms. However, within the firm, tenure has a positive effect on the individuals' career mobility.

This theory played a major role in investigating the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation. Career mobility theory helped explain the career advancement of women working in the administration of campus

recreation, as well as aid in understanding why women leave the field to seek opportunity elsewhere.

Definitions

The following definitions are meant to provide a clear understanding of whom and what are discussed and examined.

Campus Recreation: an environment in which students, faculty, staff and guests can engage in social, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

Recreational Sport: programming sport activity for the sake of participation and fun. It is a diverse area that incorporates five separate program divisions: Instructional Sport, Informal Sport, Intramural Sport, Extramural Sport, and Club Sport. Each of these five definitions represent varying levels of ability and diverse interests in cooperative/competitive activity in the game form. (Mull, et. al., 1987)

Career Mobility Theory: poses that an individual's career mobility is a function of education level, abilities, and length of experience (Sicherman & Galor, 1990).

Career Mobility: an individual's movement either upward, downward, or lateral within an organization's hierarchical structure or to another external organization.

Downward Mobility: a movement from a higher to a lower career position within the hierarchical levels of the organization.

Lateral Mobility: a movement from one career position to a relatable career position within the hierarchical levels of the organization.

Upward Mobility: a movement from a lower to higher career position within the hierarchical levels of the organization.

Career Path: a series of occupations characterized by the transferability of skills and experience from one to another, that form a feasible working career (Sicherman & Galor, 1990).

National Intramural Recreational Sports Association (NIRSA): the leading professional association for students and professionals in college and university Campus Recreation departments. NIRSA pertains to many facets including intramurals, fitness and wellness, facility management, marketing, outdoor adventures, aquatics, club sports, and informal recreation. NIRSA also serves military installations and other entities that provide recreation services.

Glass Ceiling: an intangible barrier within the hierarchy of a company that prevents women or minorities from obtaining upper-level positions (glass ceiling, 2009).

Glass Wall: that which keeps women from moving laterally within an organization to access routes leading to opportunities to move up the ladder and break the "glass ceiling" (Bower & Hums, 2003).

Compensation Package: an individual's salary; excludes all other direct and indirect benefits.

Chapter 3

Methods

The purpose of this study was to measure the upward mobility of women working in campus recreation administration via examination of the subjects' current and first positions held within campus recreation administration. Further this study specifically aims to examine the career mobility of women currently holding administrative level positions in campus recreation.

Research Design

A quantitative research design was used to examine career mobility patterns of women holding administrative level positions in campus recreation. The data was collected via an electronic survey which utilizes a quantitative approach to measure career mobility of the sample population. Upon further analysis themes were analyzed for frequency.

Instrumentation

This study used a modified version of the *Female Sport Manager Career Survey*, which focuses on career paths and concerns of women working in sport management positions (Bower and Hums, 2003). This survey has been used in previous studies involving women working within management of the sport industry (Bower, 2008; Bower & Hums, 2003; Hums & Sutton, 2000; Hums & Sutton, 1999). The survey included questions regarding current and first campus recreation career information, most/least enjoyable aspects of job, greatest challenges, career advice for women wanting

to enter the profession, short-term and long-term career aspirations, the role of mentors on their careers, and demographic information.

For the purpose of this study, the instrument consisted of two separate sections. The first section asked respondents questions regarding personal career information in an effort to measure the career mobility of the respondent. This section asked the respondents questions regarding their occupation title, years worked, position type, institution type, and enrollment for their current position in campus recreation as well as for their first position in campus recreation. Further, this section asked what played both a positive and a negative role in their career mobility based on the following factors: education, years of experience, network, mentor(s), NIRSA, Affiliation with other professional organizations, gender, and other. This section also addressed the respondents' upward, downward, and lateral career moves in addition to their perceptions and experiences as related to career mobility within campus recreation. Further, this section examined respondents leaving the profession based on the following reasons: career advancement, career progression blocked, more money, more job responsibility, family, lifestyle, location, unhappiness with job, interest in new opportunity, and other. The second section consisted of demographic information, which included age, income, racial/ethnic category, and education level. This section also examined respondents' participation in campus recreation during the course of their perspective collegiate education.

Sample

A criterion sampling method was used to select the sampling frame for this study. In order to attain the desired sample size of 256, three methods were used to enlist participation. The primary method involved gaining access to NIRSA Member address lists via the National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association Research Institute. A research request was submitted to the NIRSA Research Institute upon The University of Tennessee Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval. The second method involved contacting and networking with women currently holding administrative level positions in campus recreation via state workshops and the NIRSA National and Regional Conferences. Due to the large number of attendees at the workshops and conferences and the inability to contact every women holding an administrative level position in campus recreation, the third method, snowball sampling was utilized to attain additional participants. The desired sample size was based off the total number of female professional members of NIRSA, which is 761 (Mary Callender, email to researcher, January 20, 2010). The sample was restricted to include women currently holding administrative level positions within campus recreation. While the study focuses on female professional members of NIRSA, women who are non-members of NIRSA and currently holding administrative level positions within campus recreation were eligible to participate. Age, race, and years experience were not limiting factors.

Data Collection

Since the sample population is located nationwide, data was collected via an online survey. The researcher sent the invitation to participate e-mail to the NIRSA

National Center, who disseminated the e-mail to the eligible members in the NIRSA Member Database. Within the e-mail, a hyperlink to the online survey was provided in order to provide convenience to the participants. Once the participant opened the hyperlink a screen appeared asking for the participants consent. If the participant granted consent, the e-survey continued to the next screen, if the participant did not grant consent the e-survey closed. The data collection period was from January 6, 2010 to January 27, 2010. All participants were e-mailed the initial invitation to participate e-mail on January 6, 2010. A follow-up reminder invitation to participate e-mail was e-mailed on January 20, 2010. Once participants completed the e-survey a screen appeared thanking them for their participation in the study. As of January 27, 2010 the online survey was closed and all remaining participants were excluded from the study.

Data Analysis

For the purposes of this study, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 18.0) was used to analyze the data. For the quantitative data, basic descriptive statistics were performed which included means, standard deviations, and frequencies. For the research questions Pearson Chi Square tests, ANOVA tests, and Tukey's Post Hoc test were conducted. The researcher reduced the respondents' narrative comments objectively to reflect common themes. The themes will be discussed further in the results chapter.

To determine the career mobility of women administrators in campus recreation, the researcher compared the job titles of both current and first positions objectively for upward mobility, lateral mobility, downward mobility, or no mobility. There is no one

consistent, or recommended, title for any professional position in campus recreation specific job titles vary from one university to the next. For example, a coordinator level position at one university could have similar job responsibilities as a director at another university (NIRSA & Franklin, 2008). Thus the researcher consulted various experts in the field in addition to utilizing the occupational definitions (Appendix A) as defined in the 2009 NIRSA Salary Census, to determine the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation. The researcher used the above method in conjunction with the following factors: institution enrollment and/or current salary when job titles were the same or similar across work history. The researcher determined 'no mobility' when the respondent's first position was the respondent's current position in campus recreation.

The qualitative data generated from responses to the open ended questions were analyzed to determine common themes within the data. The researcher read the responses for the "please explain" text boxes for the questions regarding seeking upward positions, accepting upward positions, accepting downward positions, accepting lateral positions, and for perceptions of gender discrimination. The researcher read the responses to find key words and then re-read the responses to categorize them into common themes. Where there was a pattern of words the researcher grouped them in categories to form themes.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the career mobility of women campus recreation administrators and the factors that influence career mobility within campus recreation. For the quantitative data, basic descriptive statistics were performed which included means, standard deviations, and frequencies. Five primary research questions were tested using Pearson Chi Square tests, ANOVA tests, and Tukey's Post Hoc test. Additional testing was also preformed to analyze the relationship between different factors and career mobility using Pearson Chi Square tests. All statistical tests were conducted at the .05 level of significance. The qualitative data regarding responses to job title was analyzed objectively to determine the career mobility of women campus recreation administrators. The qualitative data regarding responses to the open ended questions was analyzed objectively to determine common themes within the data.

Primary Research Questions

RQ1: What is the career mobility of women working in the administration of campus recreation?

RQ2: Is there a relationship between age and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ3: Is there a relationship between highest level of education completed and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ4: Is there a relationship between experience in campus recreation and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

RQ5: Is there a relationship between mentor(s) and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

Additional Testing

Additional testing was performed to analyze the relationship between race/ethnicity and career mobility, the relationship between income and career mobility, the relationship between the institutional type where the campus recreation department is located and career mobility, the relationship between network and career mobility, the relationship between NIRSA and career mobility, and the relationship between perceived gender discrimination and career mobility.

Since the sample population of women campus recreation administrators is located nationwide, data was collected via an online survey. The NIRSA National Center disseminated the e-surveys to the eligible participants within the NIRSA Member Database. The data collection period was from January 6, 2010 to January 27, 2010. Of the 761 e-surveys disseminated to the professional female members of NIRSA, 352 were successfully completed yielding a response rate of 45.7%. Riddick and Russell (2008) state that for a given population size of 761 the recommended sample size is 256 yielding a good response rate as 33.6%.

The results below are presented to reflect the questions within the two sections of the instrument. The demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented first then the respondents' career information is presented. The results of the respondents' career information are presented in the order the questions appear in the instrument. The analyses of common themes are presented in the order in which the respective questions

appear in the instrument. The researcher determined the common themes from the respondents' narrative comments that were generated from the question boxes. Discussions of the results are presented in chapter five.

Demographic Characteristics

The majority of the sample (29.3%) was between the ages of 25 and 30 years old. The majority (92.0%) indicated they were white. Over 273 of the respondents (78.4%) reported their highest level of education completed was a masters degree. The majority of the sample (26.3%) indicated their annual income was between $40,000 and 49,999. Over 302 of the sample (86.8%) indicated they have held between 0 and 5 positions in campus recreation. The majority of respondents (97.7%) indicated they worked full time and 74.4% worked at public institutions. The majority of the sample (28.4%) worked at institutions with an enrollment size between 10,000 and 19,999. See Table 1 in Appendix B.

Positive and Negative Roles on Career Mobility

The women campus recreation administrators were asked whether the given factors played a positive role or a negative role on their career mobility. The factors included education, years of experience, network, mentor(s), NIRSA, affiliation with other professional organizations, gender, and other.

The majority of respondents indicated that education (82.2%), years of experience (79.0%), network (62.6%), mentor(s) (49.7%), NIRSA (55.2%), and affiliations with other professional organizations (22.1%) played a positive role on their career mobility. Additionally, the majority of respondents (22.7%) reported that gender played a negative

role on their career mobility. The respondents (11.8%) indicated that other factors played a positive role on their career mobility; which included work experience, work performance, work ethic, skill set, certifications, flexibility, restructure of organization, reputation, race and age. Conversely the respondents reported that lack of opportunity, lack of experience, family, supervisor/campus administration, location, age, lack of fitting in, 'good ol' boys network,' race, size of institution enrollment, salary, and sexuality played a negative role on their career mobility. See Table 2.

Currently Seeking an Upward Position

The respondents were asked if they were currently seeking a position in which they considered to be a career advancement. The majority (77.6%) indicated they are not currently seeking an upward position, while 22.4% are currently seeking an upward position.

Table 2: Factors that Play a Role on Career Mobility

	Positive		Negative	
Factors	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Education	286	82.2	34	9.8
Years of Experience	275	79	64	18.4
Network	218	62.6	22	6.3
Mentor(s)	173	49.7	23	6.6
NIRSA	192	55.2	3	0.9
Affiliation with other Professional Organizations	77	22.1	8	2.3
Gender	24	6.9	79	22.7
Other	41	11.8	183	52.6

Note: Positive and negative percents may not necessarily add up to 100 due to the fact that the respondent can find a factor both positive and negative.

Accepted an Upward Position within the Last Year

The respondents were asked if within the last year they accepted a position that they considered to be a career advancement. The majority (75.0%) within the last year did not accept a position they considered to be a career advancement, while 25.0% did accept a position they considered to be a career advancement.

Accepted a Downward Position within the Last Five Years

The respondents were asked if in the last five years they accepted a position in which they considered to be lower than the one they currently hold. The majority of respondents (86.8%) did not accept what they considered to be a downward position in the last five years, while 13.2% reported they did accept a downward position within the last five years.

Accepted a Lateral Position within the Last Five Years

The respondents were asked if in the last five years if they accepted a position in which they considered to be equal to the only they currently hold. The majority of the respondents (84.5%) did not accept a lateral position within the last five years, while 15.5% did accept a lateral position within the last five years.

Continued Education for Career Reasons

The respondents were asked if they had enrolled in a college, university, or specialized training program for career reasons. The majority of respondents (50.3%) indicated they had continued their education for career reasons, while 49.7% had not continued their education for career reasons.

Left the Profession to Work for an Outside Organization

The respondents were asked since the start of their career in campus recreation, have they left the profession to work for an organization outside campus recreation. The majority of the respondents (79.6%) of the respondents indicated they had not left the field to work an outside organization, while 20.4% reported they had left the field to work for an outside organization.

The respondents who indicated they had left the field to work for an outside organization were asked to indicate their reasons for changing employers. The respondents were provided a list of reasons which included career advancement, career progression blocked, more money, more job responsibility, family, lifestyle, location, unhappiness with job, interest in new opportunity, and other. The majority of respondents (49.3%) reported interest in new opportunity as the leading reason for leaving the field. See Table 3.

The Role of Gender on Career Mobility of Women Working in the Administration of Campus Recreation

The respondents were asked how they felt gender played a role in their career mobility in campus recreation administration. The majority of respondents (60.3%) felt gender played a role in career mobility in campus recreation administration, while 39.7% felt that gender did not play a role in career mobility in campus recreation administration.

Table 3: Reasons for Leaving the Profession

Factors	Frequency	Percent
Career Advancement	24	33.8
Career Progression Blocked	14	19.7
More Money	24	33.8
More Job Responsibility	15	21.1
Family	20	28.2
Lifestyle	16	22.5
Location	29	40.8
Unhappiness with Job	14	19.7
Interest in New Opportunity	35	49.3
Other	21	29.6

Compensation Package

The respondents were asked how they felt their compensation package compares to their male counterparts. Compensation package was identified as the respondent's salary. The majority of respondents (56.9%) indicated they felt their salary is equal to their male counterparts, while 40.8% felt their salary is less than their male counterparts, and 2.3% felt their salary is greater than their male counterparts.

Analysis of Common Themes

Currently Seeking an Upward Position

The data for not seeking an upward position was analyzed for common themes. The most common theme reported was that respondents were not currently looking for positions. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution said "not currently seeking a new position as I just moved into a new position." Other themes included happy in current position, just accepted current position, nearing retirement, waiting to look, lack of opportunity, family, continuing education, location, opportunity

in current position, stability in current position, seeking position outside the field, and no comment.

The data for seeking an upward position was analyzed for common themes. The most common theme indicated was that respondents were selectively looking for career advancement based on either salary or position level. A woman between the ages of 25-30, working at a public institution said "I am currently seeking a position to gain more experiences and hopefully a higher salary." Other themes included respondents are always looking, wanted more challenge/responsibility, lack of opportunity in current position, wanted change, and there was opportunity outside the field

Accepted an Upward Position within the Last Year

The most common theme reported for not accepting an upward position was that respondents did not accept a higher level position within the last year due to the stability of their current position and their current position having been an career advancement from their previous position. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a private institution stated "I have been in this position for the past 3 years. It is a career advancement from my last campus recreation position." Other themes included lack of opportunity, not looking for new position, change within current position, happy in current position, accepted a downward position, plan to accept in the future, nearing retirement, just did not accept, and no comment.

The most common theme indicated for accepting an upward position was that the respondents received an advancement in job title. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution stated "I accepted department director position (previous 5

positions were assistant director/coordinator positions)." Other themes included respondents received more responsibility, promotion in current department, greater perceived benefits with advancement, more experience, had re-entered the field, the advancement was a better fit, and location.

Accepted a Downward Position within the Last Five Years

The data for not accepting a downward position was analyzed for common themes. The most common theme was that respondent stated they simply just did not accept a downward position within the last five years in campus recreation. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution stated "My answer is self explanatory. I have not." Other themes included respondents had only advanced in their career, stability in current position, made lateral moves, were not looking, had left the field, had re-entered the field, financially unable, happy in current position, wanted more responsibility, and no comment.

The data for accepting a downward position was analyzed for common themes. The common themes included respondents received a demotion in their current position, family obligations, worked lower position in outside organization, less responsibility, wanted to gain more experience, relocation, and no comment. A woman between the ages of 31-34, working at a private institution stated "My current job is a step down from the one I held from 2005-2007. We moved due to my husband's job, and the only job open to me was the one I currently hold."

Accepted a Lateral Position within the Last Five Years

The most common theme reported for not accepting a lateral position was that respondents simply did not accept a lateral position within the last five years in campus recreation. A woman between the ages of 25-30, working at a public institution stated "I have not accepted any other positions." Other common themes included respondents had only progressed in their careers, had stability in their current position, wanted a change in responsibility, weren't looking, lack of opportunity, change in current position, accepted a downward position, happy in current position, had accepted a position outside the organization, wanted to gain experience, relocation, lateral move was not the best fit, and no comment.

The most common theme reported for not accepting a lateral position was that respondents simply accepted a lateral position in campus recreation. A woman between the ages of 25-30, working at a public institution stated "my current position and last position were equal." Other common themes included respondents received a change in responsibility, accepted a similar position outside of the field, location, received a change in current position, wanted to gain experience, larger institution enrollment size, new opportunity, and no comment.

Left the Profession to Work for an Outside Organization

The data for other reasons for changing employers was analyzed for common themes. The common themes included respondents wanting to continue their education, the work environment and/or supervisor, family, lack of opportunity, new opportunity, returned to previous position, wanted to use their degree in the specified field, and gender

discrimination. A women between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution stated “When spouse moved, I was able to get a corporate job before a campus recreation position opened up.”

The Role of Gender on Career Mobility of Women Working in the Administration of Campus Recreation

The common themes for believing gender plays a role on career mobility included: ‘good ol’ boys network’; women have more family obligations; dependent upon the campus/department environment; dependent upon specific program areas; more men seen at the top; it is a male dominated field; stereotyping women’s knowledge, skills, and abilities; token female/women meant to represent diversity; lack of opportunity for advancement; salary differences between men and women; lack of respect of women; women must work harder; higher expectations of women; men move up the ranks faster; men are preferred more; gender discrimination is apparent everywhere; old ties to athletics; lack of female mentors; and lack of awareness. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution stated “Woman typically have more restraints with family obligations and have less opportunity to move up as they gain experience...look at the distribution of male directors vs. female across the country.” A woman between the ages of 31-34 stated “I do believe there is a "good ole boys network" still active. i think it is going away, but it is still there. Women are playing a more significant role in NIRSA and in our profession, however, since networking is a major part of advancement in our field, the "good ole boys" still seem to have more control than i would like to see.” Few

women administrators reported they felt it was somewhat apparent or chose not to comment.

The common themes for not believing gender plays a role on career mobility included: more ability/equality based hiring practices; field has progressed; more diversity in the workplace; more women in leadership positions; dependent upon the campus/department environment, program area, and family obligations of the individual; and lack of open positions thus no way to tell. Many women administrators indicated they had not experienced gender discrimination. A woman between the ages of 35-44, working at a public institution stated "i don't believe gender plays a role - it is more about education, knowledge and personality and individual choice." Additionally, many women did not give a reason as to why they believe gender does not play a role in career mobility.

Statistical Analysis of Research Questions

RQ1: What is the Career Mobility of Women Administrators in Campus Recreation?

The majority of respondents (56.6%) reported they have experienced upward mobility. While 3.2% have experienced lateral mobility and 3.4% have experienced downward mobility. Further 36.8% of the respondents have experienced no mobility.

RQ2: Is there a relationship between age and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results indicated there is a significant relationship between age and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 58.91$, df = 15, p = < .05).

RQ3: Is there a relationship between highest level of education completed and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The results of the Chi Square test for independence revealed that there is a significant relationship between highest level of education completed and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 31.22$, df = 15, $p < .05$).

RQ4: Is there a relationship between experience in campus recreation and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The ANOVA test results indicated that there is a significant relationship between experience and career mobility in campus recreation administration ($F = 12.01$, df = 3, $p < .05$). Tukey's Post Hoc test was used to find which means were significantly different from one another. Tukey's Post Hoc test revealed a statistically significant difference between upward mobility and no mobility ($p < .05$). However, there were a number of non significant relationships found via Tukey's Post Hoc test. First, Tukey's Post Hoc test revealed that there is no significant relationship between upward mobility and lateral mobility ($p = 1.000$). Second, Tukey's Post Hoc test revealed that there is no significant relationship between upward mobility and downward mobility ($p = 1.000$). Third, Tukey's test revealed that there is no significant relationship between lateral mobility and

downward mobility (p = .999). Fourth, Tukey's Post Hoc test revealed that there is no significant relationship between lateral mobility and no mobility (p = .128). Fifth, Tukey's Post Hoc test revealed that there is no significant relationship between downward mobility and no mobility (p = .148).

RQ5: Is there a relationship between mentor(s) and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results indicated that there is no significant relationship between mentor(s) and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 6.02$, df = 15, p = .111).

Supplemental Testing

Is there a relationship between race/ethnicity and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results revealed there is no significant relationship between race/ethnicity and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 4.36$, df = 15, p = .996).

Is there a relationship between income and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results indicated that there is a significant relationship between income and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 63.51$, df = 15, $p < .05$).

Is there a relationship between the institutional type where the campus recreation department is located and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results revealed that there is no significant relationship between institutional type and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 6.53$, df = 15, p = .366).

Is there a relationship between network and career mobility among campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results revealed there is no significant relationship between network and career mobility among campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 1.68$, df = 15, p = .641).

Is there a relationship between NIRSA membership and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results indicated there is no significant relationship between NIRSA membership and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = .179$, df = 15, p = .981).

Is there a relationship between perceived gender discrimination and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators?

The Pearson Chi Square test for independence results indicated there is no significant relationship between perceived gender discrimination and career mobility among women campus recreation administrators ($\chi 2 = 2.13$, df = 15, p = .547).

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the career mobility of women campus recreation administrators and the factors that influence their career mobility within campus recreation administration. The current study supports the literature of previous studies in that women in different sport industry segments are experiencing the same barriers to career mobility. The sport industry is an industry where women have traditionally been underrepresented and includes leisure services, campus recreation and intercollegiate athletics (Bower, 2008; Bower & Hums, 2003). A number of studies have examined women working in leisure services (e.g., Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Shinew, Anderson, & Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995, Frisby, 1992; Frisby & Brown, 1991). Women in campus recreation have also been examined (e.g., Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Yager, 1983). Additionally women working in intercollegiate athletics have been investigated (e.g., Acosta & Carpenter, 2010; NCAA, 2008; Wolverton, 2007; Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006).

Factors Influencing the Career Mobility of Women

The perceived factors influencing the career mobility of women in the current study parallel those of women working in leisure services, campus recreation, and intercollegiate athletics.

Organizational Factors

Among the leisure services and campus recreation segments women felt there was a lack of female representation in upper management, this was attributed to the perception that the industry continues to be male dominated (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010; Acosta & Carpenter, 2009; NCAA, 2008; Wolverton, 2007; Quarterman, DuPree & Wills, 2006; Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Allison, 1999; Shinew, Anderson & Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Carney & Gold, 1978). Women in the current study still feel they are competing against males for advancement within the profession. Some women that had in fact received a promotion felt this was due to the department's need for diversity, thus the woman administrator is serving as the token female in the department. Administration should audit their recruitment and selection procedures in addition to their affirmative action policies in order to ensure fair and diverse hiring practices.

Further women who had received promotions within the industry felt they experienced a lack adequate compensation (Acosta & Carpenter, 2009; Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006; Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Allison, 1999; Shinew, Anderson & Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Carney & Gold, 1978). However, the respondents in the current study felt their compensation was equal to their male counterparts, which is accurately reflected in the 2009 NIRSA Salary Census. It should

be noted that perhaps women still perceive inadequate compensation in the field due to the findings of the 2007 NIRSA Salary Census. The 2007 NIRSA Salary Census reflected that women were earning less than their male counterparts (NIRSA, 2007).

Additionally, women's perceptions in the current study mirrored those of the women working in leisure services and campus recreation segments, in that they felt they were receiving less professional development, mentoring, networking, and promotional preparation than their male counterparts (Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Allison, 1999; Shinew, Anderson & Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Carney & Gold, 1978). If women are receiving less preparation for promotion then over time fewer women would be qualified for promotion, thus further reducing the number of women in upper management. When examining the role of mentoring, Frisby and Brown, 1991 found that due to the lack of female mentors in upper management women have more cross sex mentors meaning more men are mentoring females than females are mentoring females. This presents a larger issue at hand in that if women are not receiving adequate professional development via mentoring and networking then they are not climbing the career ladder thus continuing to not be represented in upper management. Administration needs to recognize this discrepancy and provide more professional development and managerial training opportunities for women within the organization in addition to providing funding and support for women to continue their education via college/university degree programs, certification programs, conferences, symposiums, institutes, and workshops.

Women should also be encouraged to join professional associations in addition to holding leadership positions within those associations, the organization, and in the community via boards, committees, and work teams. Women should build a women's support network so as to have a forum to share career interests, ideas, as well as encourage development and growth amongst one another and within the profession. If administration takes steps to provide opportunities for advancement then women could become more prepared for promotion thus having greater career mobility and potentially break the proverbial glass ceiling.

Family and Gender Socialization Factors

Frisby's (1992) *Model of Women's of Career Development* in Leisure Services found that career development is often different for males than for females, due to the traditional family and work expectations of women, the cultural and organizational barriers that many affect women's advancement, and the socialization that women experience. Women often encounter barriers to career development because society is still operating within the traditional male work model. The traditional model does not take into consideration family responsibilities and assumes someone is always at home to tend to the household obligations. The barriers to career mobility found in the current study reflected much of the findings among women in leisure services, campus recreation, and intercollegiate athletics (Acosta & Carpenter, 2009; NCAA, 2008; Wolverton, 2007; Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006; Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Willer, 2002; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Allison, 1999; Shinew, Anderson & Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold &

Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Carney & Gold, 1978). Women continue to face the challenge of balancing home and work expectations and many women commented that they often experience the second shift. The second shift involves work within the home such as child-rearing and household chores (Anderson, 2001). The traditional work model assumes women are the spouse that is staying at home and tending to the family obligations, however once women entered the workforce this model was never modified to reflect women's roles today. Thus, women are now working full time and are still expected to tend to the family when they return home. Further, because of gender socialization many organizations see women's family responsibilities as a hindrance to their commitment to the organization (Anderson, 2001). As a result of women experiencing inequity in family and workplace expectations, their work performance may suffer and therefore affect the success of the organization. Society needs to become aware that the women's career development is different than the traditional man's career and take an active role in changing the traditional work model expectations. Campus recreation departments should look to their professional association, NIRSA, as an example of how to help their staff become more successful in the organization. Currently over 70% of the NIRSA National Center staff are women and are strongly supported by the organization so that they can meet the demands of balancing work and home expectations. Additionally, administration should explore flex-time options, job sharing, as well as teleconferencing and telecommuting options for women experiencing the barriers to work life balance.

Gender Discrimination Factors

In the current study women continue to perceive gender discrimination in the form of gender stereotyping of management styles and work performance expectations; exclusion from network due to good ol' boys network, the glass ceiling, and not fitting in; additionally women perceive a lack of respect from administration, their cohorts, and their subordinates. This is supported by literature examining gender discrimination within leisure services, campus recreation, and intercollegiate athletics. Women are stereotyped to be less committed to their jobs, will leave their positions once they are ready to start a family, not as competent as their male counterparts, as a result women often experience greater work performance expectations (Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Frisby & Brown, 1991). Women perceive gender differences in management styles exist among women and men (Bower & Hums, 2003; Arnold & Shinew, 1997; Arnold & Shinew, 1996) as women are thought to be more democratic and empathetic and men to be more autocratic and controlling (Frisby & Brown, 1991). Women continue to experience the good ol' boys network and women are still experiencing the glass ceiling (Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006; Bower, Hums, & Keedy, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Shinew, Anderson, Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Carney & Gold, 1978). Women feel they have to work harder to prove themselves to gain respect and credibility in the profession (Acosta & Carpenter, 2009; Quarterman, DuPree, & Wills, 2006; Bower & Hums, 2003; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Frisby & Brown, 1991; Carney & Gold, 1978). Women in the current study feel that gender discrimination is apparent everywhere and will continue

to exist as it is deeply rooted within American culture via Title IX and women's struggles for equity in sport and recreation. Although legislation is in place to protect women from discriminatory practices; women still experience unconscious discrimination. Administration needs to recognize that gender discrimination is still apparent and more importantly women's perceptions of gender discrimination could hinder women's drive for advancement. Administration should evaluate where the organization stands with respect to gender equity and work to eliminate gender discrimination from their organization. Administration should also create a forum where women can comfortably express any grievances and develop strategies to overcome them as well as implement policies to ensure they do not happen again within the organization.

Economic Factors

With the instability in the current economy, sport and recreation program have not been immune to the impact of decreased revenues. Many departments within leisure services, campus recreation, and intercollegiate athletics have experienced lay-offs, furloughs, changes to benefits packages, department restructure, and cuts in department budgets including funding for travel to conferences, symposiums, institutes, and workshops. While this is nothing new to recreation and sport organizations, the impacts of such an economic state are impacting the career mobility of women. If women are to equally contend for job security, women must continue to be given support and funding to continue education in the field. In turn by organization's encouraging women to continue their career development, women will bring back their new found knowledge and implement it within their departmental practices. Especially in a time where much

research and focus is being placed on producing the same amount if not more work with fewer resources, organizations need to recognize the importance of continuing education as a means to keep their department constantly evolving and growing in an ever changing society.

Upward Career Mobility of Women Campus Recreation Administrators

The current study asked respondents to indicate if they were seeking a position they perceived to be an career advancement. Additionally, respondents were asked to indicate if they had accepted a position within the last year that they felt was an career advancement. Reasons for upward mobility included wanting more challenge, sense of achievement, and more money. Reasons for not accepting upward mobility included a high degree of job satisfaction in current position, not wanting an increase in stress and time commitment, and waiting for the right opportunity. These findings were supported by Shinew, Anderson, and Arnold, 1999; Arnold & Shinew, 1996; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; and Yager, 1983. These findings raise the question of the type of woman pursuing upward mobility. Willer, 2002 found that the average woman campus recreation director is between the ages of forty and forty-five, white, single, with no children. Additionally, White, 2004 found the average woman campus recreation director was between the ages of forty-one and fifty, white/Caucasian, unmarried with no children, and holding a master's degree in a related field. One could deduce that the types of women pursing upward mobility are career driven, well educated, unattached to family obligations, primarily white/Caucasian, and reach their career goal between the age of forty and fifty. The traditional work model supports this notion as career mobility

is seen as a series of uninterrupted upward moves. This could have implications on the career development of women as some women want to start a family and often endure a career interruption to do so (Shinew, Anderson, Arnold, 1999; Henderson & Bialeschki, 1995; Frisby & Brown, 1991). Women in the current study noted that when they left the field they had a harder time getting back into the profession and often perceived that family obligations were frowned upon within the profession. This perception could cause women to become stressed and feel guilty, thus feel the need to work harder within the profession. Administration needs to understand that women and men experience different barriers and strive to provide women with a supportive and family friendly environment. Organizations can provide assistance with child care, reassure women professionals during staff training and professional development that they support and understand responsibilities of family and work balance, and promote job sharing when needed. By taking proactive steps organizations can reduce the negative perceptions that women have regarding their career mobility, thus enabling a less stressful and more productive workplace.

Theoretical Framework

Career Mobility Theory

The literature (Sicherman & Galor, 1990) and the current study acknowledge that career mobility is a function of one's education and experience. Sicherman & Galor, 1990 found that the more educated the individual the more likely they will advance within their career. Additionally, individuals with higher levels of experience are more likely to experience career mobility (Sicherman & Galor, 1990). This was reflected in

the current study as women with a higher level of education experienced upward career mobility more than women with a lower level of education. Further women with a higher level of experience had more upward mobility within the profession than women with less experience. Additionally, the current study found age and income to have a significant relationship between career mobility. Although women in the study felt network, mentor(s), NIRSA membership, affiliation with other professional organizations, and gender discrimination played a role in their career mobility, the study found no significant relationships among these factors and one's career mobility. The perceptions of career mobility in the current study contradict the statistical analysis of the factors influencing career mobility. Although the current study supports the findings of Sicherman and Galor, 1990, further research should be conducted in this area to examine other factors influencing career mobility.

Sicherman and Galor, 1990 also examined the relationship between promotion and career mobility. Sicherman & Galor, 1990 suggest that among individuals who have a high probability of promotion, but are not promoted are more likely to quit the firm. This was observed in the current study as well as in previous studies (Anderson, 2001; Shinew, Anderson, & Arnold, 1999). Women in the current study indicated there was a lack of opportunity for advancement within the profession, thus they often left the profession in order to seek career advancement elsewhere. It is not uncommon for women to move within the profession in an effort to gain upward mobility, however when women feel they are qualified for promotion but do not receive a promotion within the profession they must pursue opportunity outside the profession in an effort to gain

upward career mobility. Anderson, 2001 noted that if women continued to feel rebuffed when it comes to promotions, they may simply leave the profession. Therefore, if women are not encouraged to continue to develop their careers within the profession many women will continue to feel that there is a lack of opportunity for advancement within sport and recreation industry, and ultimately leave the profession. If women leave the profession this could have grave effects on the industry as a whole as women will continue to be underrepresented, ill prepared for promotion, and continue the ongoing cycle of gender inequity.

Additional Theories to be Considered

Future research could examine the role of equity theory which focuses on the individual's perceptions of how fairly he or she is being treated in comparison to others. Previous research has illustrated equity theory in practice and more importantly raised awareness that gender inequity still exists (NCAA, 2008; Anderson & Shinew, 2001; Shinew, Anderson, & Arnold, 1999). By utilizing this theory one could delve deeper into the issues of gender discrimination and perceptions of gender inequity among women working in the sport industry. Additionally, this theory could be used to explore the issues of race/ethnicity on career mobility. This research could call action for organizations to recognize that society is not as equal as previously believed and motivate organizations to develop strategies to overcome inequity in the profession.

The theory of homophily could also be investigated among sport industry's workplace and hiring practices. Homophily is experienced when individuals surround themselves with others that are most similar to them. Allison (1999) found that

respondents felt that non-minority male administrators continued to surround themselves with those they felt most comfortable with (Anderson & Shinew, 2001), specifically white males (Anderson, 2001). Many organizations may not be aware that homophily exists within their organization, thus further examination of this theory could shed light on a conscious and unconscious form of discrimination. Race/ethnicity, age, and gender are a few of the issues that could be further investigated among the profession utilizing this theory.

Limitations

Although every effort was made to be thorough, there were certain limitations to the proposed study. First, the results from this study were applicable to higher education campus recreation programs. Therefore the results may not generalize accurately to other sectors such as the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), Municipal Parks and Recreation Services, and the National Park System. Second, the survey was sent out electronically, which may have resulted in technical difficulties and ultimately affect the response rate. Third, the sample obtained from NIRSA Member Database may not have been accurate and/or represent the entirety of women holding administrative level positions in campus recreation. Fourth, some of the respondents included in the sample may have progressed at a faster rate due to external factors such as a smaller school and limited number of positions within the department. Fifth, since there is no known nomenclature for the field of campus recreation, career mobility was determined objectively by the researcher which could present errors in accuracy of career mobility within the profession. Finally, the

participant’s responses were analyzed objectively for common themes by the research which could have been misinterpreted.

Chapter 6

Recommendations for Future Research and Conclusion

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings of this study, future research may focus on several areas. Future research could be conducted to examine the career mobility of men working in campus recreation administration. The results from the study could be used to develop a comparative analysis between the career mobility of men and women. Further the study could shed light on the differences in perceptions of gender discrimination among men and women working in campus recreation administration.

Based on the findings in the current study that there is no known nomenclature within the campus recreation profession, a study should be conducted to identify and establish a nomenclature within the field. This would be beneficial to future career mobility research, as well as provide a way to compare occupational mobility across sport industry professions.

Future research should investigate the perceptions of campus recreation administrators with work experience from the early 1950s to the present. In depth interviews could provide insight into the challenges women have faced over the years in campus recreation as well as advice to current and future women on how to overcome the challenges women face working in campus recreation administration.

Future research could focus on the career mobility and perceptions among women administrators working in different facets of campus recreation. Are intramurals and sport clubs women administrators experiencing gender discrimination more than women

administrators in other program areas? Are women administrators experiencing varying career mobility depending upon their respective program areas?

Future research could also be conducted to ascertain what campus recreation departments and higher education administrators are currently practicing in an effort to close the gender gap and provide a more diverse and open workplace.

How respondents may have interpreted the proposed questions: are you currently seeking an upward position, which you consider to be a career advancement?, Within the last year did you accept a position which you consider to be a career advancement?, In the last five years have you accepted a position which you consider to be lower than the one you currently hold?, In the last five years have you accepted a position which you consider to be equal to the one you currently hold? These questions may have been interpreted differently by each of the respondents. For future research, the questions should be restructured to better identify the typed of career mobility among women campus recreation administrators.

Additionally, the please explain text boxes may have been interpreted differently among respondents. Future research should provide more context to the please explain text boxes that follow the proposed questions.

Further respondents may have interpreted the proposed questions differently: What is your current position title in campus recreation? and What was your first position title in campus recreation? Future research should restructure these questions to provide a drop down menu of occupational titles to select from for each of the proposed

questions. These occupational titles could be derived from the occupational titles used in the 2009 NIRSA Salary Census.

Conclusion

Women campus recreation administrators have come a long way since being banned from NIRSA membership in 1959. It is evident that the field has evolved to include more women amongst the upper administrative ranks in addition to providing equal compensation and support to both female and male professionals. However, the perceptions women hold regarding organizational barriers, family and gender socialization experiences, gender discrimination, and economic barriers remain un-phased. Women continue to feel underrepresented within the profession, feel excluded from the network, feel there is a lack of female mentors, feel gender discrimination still exists, and feel the pressure to balance work and home expectations. If women continue to believe that barriers to their career development exist, they may become discouraged with advancement and leave the profession. Therefore, campus administration and legislation need to take heed that differences in career mobility exist between female and male professionals. Awareness and openness to the issues is the first step in eliminating the perceptions that women hold towards their career development. Male and female professionals need to ban together to create change and facilitate discussion to promote change within the profession. Topics should include offering women more opportunities for advancement, providing a support network for women, encouraging females to mentor one another, and better preparing women for promotion. These are just a few

steps campus recreation professionals can take to mitigate the perceptions women hold regarding their career mobility within the profession.

List of References

Acosta, R. & Carpenter, L. (2010). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study. thirty three year update, 1977-2010*. Retrieved from www.acostacarpenter.org.

Acosta, R. & Carpenter, L. (2009). *Are we there yet? Thirty seven years later, Title IX hasn't fixed it all.* Retrieved from www. acostacarpenter.org.

Allison, M. (1999). Organizational barriers to diversity in the workplace. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *31*(1), 78.

Anderson, D. (2001). Is what's good for the goose good for the gander?: The current status of women in the parks and recreation profession. *Parks & Recreation, 36*(5), 22,24-28.

Anderson, D., & Shinew, K. (2001). A national examination of gender equity in public parks and recreation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *33*(4), 470.

Arnold, M. & Shinew. K. (1997). Preventing the career advancement of professional women. *Parks & Recreation (32)*9, 26-34.

Bower, Glenda. (2008). Career paths and advice for women working to obtain a management position within the health and fitness industry. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal, 17*(1), 29-37.

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

Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., and Keedy, J. L. (2006). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor females in leadership positions within campus recreation: A historical perspective. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 20.

Buchanan, H. E. (1978). An analysis of administration responsibilities for men and women within institutional membership units of the National Recreational Sports Association. *NIRSA Journal*, *2*(2), 26-28.

Carney, A. and Gold, E. (1978). Common challenges of women NIRSA members. *NIRSA Journal*, *2*(3), 10-13.

Dudenhoeffer, F. T. (1997). Life before NIRSA: A brief history of women's intramurals in the 20th century. *NIRSA Journal*, *21*(2), 3-7.

Frisby, W. & Brown, B. (1991). The balancing act: Women leisure service managers. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, *16*(4), 297-321.

Frisby, W. (1992). Women in leisure service management: Alternative definitions of career success. *Society and Leisure*, *15*(1), 155-174.

Gabriel, P. E. (2003). An examination of occupational mobility among full-time workers. *Monthly Labor Review*, *126*(9), 32-36.

Glass ceiling. (2009). In *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/glass ceiling

Henderson, K. and Bialeschki, M. (1995). Career development and women in the leisure services profession. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, *13*(1), 26-42.

Hewatt, Carolyn. (1977). Especially for women. *NIRSA Journal*, *1*(1), 54-55.

Hirt, Sam. (2009, January). *Historical membership numbers (1960-2008).* Paper presented at the 2009 Tennessee Intramural Recreational Sports Association State Workshop held at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, TN.

Hums, M. A. and Sutton, W. A. (1999). Women working in the management of professional baseball: Getting to first base? *Journal of Career Development, 26*(2), 147-158.

Mull, R. F., Bayless, K. G., and Ross, C. M. (1987). *Recreational sports programming* (2nd ed.). North Palm Beach, FL: The Athletic Institute.

NCAA. (2008). *Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: A practical guide for colleges and universities—2008.* Retrieved from http://www.ncaapublications.com/p-4023-gender-equity-in-intercollegiate-athletics-2008.aspx

NIRSA. (1999). Reflections from past presidents. *NIRSA Journal, 23*(1), 34-38.

NIRSA. (2001). Hazel Varner: NIRSA's 2001 honor award recipient. *NIRSA Online.* Retrieved from http://www.nirsa.org/Content/NavigationMenu/AboutUs/Awards/HonorAward/Honor_Award_2001.htm

NIRSA. (2007). *2007 NIRSA salary census.* Retrieved from http://www.nirsa.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Research_Central&Template=/MembersOnly.cfm&ContentFileID=489

NIRSA. (2007). *National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association comprehensive member survey results.* Retrieved from http://www.nirsa.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Research_Central&Template=/MembersOnly.cfm&ContentFileID=492

NIRSA & Douglas, F.S. (2008) Campus recreation careers and professional standards. In NIRSA, *Campus Recreation: Essentials for the Professional* (295-312). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

NIRSA (2009). *2009 NIRSA salary census.* Retrieved from https://www.nirsa.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Research_Central&Template=/MembersOnly.cfm&ContentFileID=6166

NIRSA. (2009). *2009 NIRSA recreational sports directory*. Corvallis, OR: NIRSA.

NIRSA. (2010). *2010 NIRSA recreational sports directory.* Corvallis, OR: NIRSA.

Oelling, C. (2004). *Leadership among female National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association Directors.* Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts Online. University of Nebraska – Lincoln.

Quarterman, J., DuPree, A., and Wills, K. (2006). Challenges confronting female intercollegiate athletic directors of NCAA member institutions by division. *College Student Journal 40*(3), 528-545.

Riddick, C. C. and Russell, R. V. (2008). *Research in recreation, parks, sport, and tourism* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Sagamore.

Rooker, A.A. (1992). Historical review of women in the national intramural association, 1950-1972. *NIRSA Journal, 17*(1), 17.

Shinew, K.J. & Arnold, M. (1998). Gender equity in the leisure services field. *Journal of Leisure Research, 30*(2), 177-194.

Shinew, K. J., Anderson, D., and Arnold, M. (1999). Is there a glass ceiling in parks & recreation? *Illinois Parks & Recreation, 30*(3), 23-26.

Sicherman, N. and Galor, O. (1990). A theory of career mobility. *The Journal of Political Economy 98*(1), 169-192.

U.S. Department of Labor. (2007). *Employment and earnings,* 2007 annual averages, and the m*onthly labor review.* Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/main.htm.

U.S. Department of Labor (2007b). *Quick facts on nontraditional occupations for women.* Retrieved from http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/nontra2007.htm.

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

White, N. (2004). *Profiles, career paths and perceived job competencies of female higher education recreation directors.* Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts Online. The University of New Mexico.

Willer, A. (2002). *Profile, barriers, and leadership behaviors of women campus recreation directors.* Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts Online. University of La Verne.

Wolverton, B. (2007). The athletics department of the future. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 33*(46), A28.

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

Appendix

Appendix A

Occupation Definitions

Director: Responsible for the overall administration of the program, including intramural sports, sport clubs, information recreation, outdoor recreation, etc.

Senior Associate: Share in the overall administration of the entire program with the recreational sport director, and rank above director(s) and other associate director(s).

Associate Director: Shares in the overall administration of the entire program with the recreational sports director, and ranks above any assistant director.

Senior Program Director: Shares in the administration of programs, and ranks above other program director(s), e.g., aquatics, intramurals, marketing, etc…

Business Services: Responsible for management of business aspects of the department including financial and fiscal matters, office management, personnel and payroll, and other business related functions.

Aquatics: Responsible for the administration of recreational programs and activities associated with swimming pools and/or marinas.

Facilities: Responsible for any of a number of facilities administered by the department, including indoor and outdoor, etc.

Fitness: Responsible for programming that encourages development of physical fitness.

Informal Recreation: Responsible for the administration of leisure programs for the campus community (free-time, family recreation, and cultural activities).

Instructional Programs: Responsible for the administration of noncredit instructional programs.

Intramural Sports: Responsible for the administration of structured contests, tournaments, and leagues within the institutional setting.

Marketing: Responsible for the administration of promotional activities and departmental marketing.

Membership: Responsible for the administration of membership programs.

Outdoor Recreation: Responsible for the administration of nonacademic outdoor recreational programming.

Sport Clubs: Responsible for the administration of recognized student organizations that may provide instruction, recreation, and/or competition in specific sport activities.

Student Development: Responsible for student employee recruitment, training, and learning and development programs.

Technology: Responsible for the administration of technology support, systems, and related activities (computers, etc.).

Wellness: Responsible for the administration of nonacademic health and wellness programs coordinated and/or sponsored by the department.

Other: Responsible for other programs and activities within the department, but not matching any other title or description.

Appendix B

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

		Frequency	Percent
Age	<25 years	9	2.6%
	25-30	102	29.3%
	31-34	45	12.9%
	35-44	78	22.4%
	45-54	74	21.3%
	55 or above	40	11.5%
Race/Ethnicity	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.3%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	4	1.1%
	Black	9	2.6%
	Hispanic/Latino	9	2.6%
	White	320	92.0%
	Other (please specify)	5	1.4%
Highest Level of Education	Some College	2	0.6%
	Bachelor's Degree	51	14.7%
	Master's Degree	273	78.4%
	Specialist Degree	3	0.9%
	Doctorate Degree	13	3.7%
	Other	6	1.7%
Income	Less than $19,999-29,999	6	1.7%
	$30,000-39,999	90	26.0%
	$40,000-49,999	91	26.3%
	$50,000-59,999	53	15.3%
	$60,000-69,999	40	11.6%
	$70,000 or higher	66	19.1%
Work History	0-5	302	86.8%
	6-10	42	12.1%
	11-15	2	0.6%
	16-20	0	0%
	20+	2	0.6%

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics Continued

Type of Position	Full Time	340	97.7%
	Part Time	2	0.6%
	Other (please specify)	6	1.7%
Type of Institution	Public	259	74.4%
	Private	80	23.0%
	Other (please specify)	9	2.6%
Enrollment of Institution	0-999	5	1.4%
	1000-2999	21	6.0%
	3000-4999	21	6.0%
	5000-9999	46	13.2%
	10000-19999	99	28.4%
	20000-29999	75	21.6%
	30000-39999	43	12.4%
	40000+	38	10.9%

Vita

Jessica M. Hobart was born in Asheville, North Carolina, to the parent of Denise Robbins. She attended A.C. Reynolds High School in Asheville, North Carolina. After graduation, she continued her education at Western Carolina University where she received a Bachelor of Science degree in Parks and Recreation Management in May 2008. Jessi completed her capstone internship with the Campus Recreation Department at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell, which encouraged her to continue her career in campus recreation. She accepted a graduate assistantship at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in the RecSports Department. Jessi completed her graduate internship with The National Intramural Recreational-Sports Association (NIRSA). Jessi graduated with a Master of Science degree in Recreation Administration in May 2010.