



5-2011

# Professional Preparation of the NCAA Division I Athletic Director: An Occupational Framework

Jeffrey Charles Spenard  
jspenard@utk.edu

---

## Recommended Citation

Spenard, Jeffrey Charles, "Professional Preparation of the NCAA Division I Athletic Director: An Occupational Framework." Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2011.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_gradthes/911](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/911)

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

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jeffrey Charles Spenard entitled "Professional Preparation of the NCAA Division I Athletic Director: An Occupational Framework." 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 Sport Studies.

Robin L. Hardin, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Lars Dzikus, Steven N. Waller

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

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

---

Professional Preparation of the NCAA  
Division I Athletic Director: An Occupational Framework

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

Jeffrey Charles Spenard II  
May, 2011

Copyright © 2011 by Jeffrey Charles Spenard II  
All rights reserved.

The study collected occupational data from the 99 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I membership institutions head athletic directors. The purpose of this study was to identify common professional preparation and occupational characteristics among NCAA Division I athletic directors. Through issuing an electronic survey, the current study identified common characteristics and themes among Division I athletic directors specifically within the socio-demographical background, educational background, professional experience and career progression, and career and job satisfaction. The study also provided demographic information about the participant's institutional athletic department. The necessity of this study is not due directly to the current lack of current literature and research within the collegiate administration, rather in reference to literature examining the athletic administration occupational field. The study provides an occupational framework in regards to the career progression, training, and characteristics of NCAA Division I athletic director career field. The study's purpose was to examine the career growth of NCAA Division I athletic directors, as well as evaluate the demographic and socio-demographics characteristics of the NCAA Division I athletic director. The research and data collected from the study's participants provided the author the opportunity to create a profile of the athletic administration career field and more specifically, the detailed qualities sought in a NCAA Division I athletic director. The results from the study are beneficial to aspiring persons that wish to work in the field of collegiate athletics administration by correlating common occupational framework for educational requirements, professional experience and years necessary to gather the appropriate experience and also to identify an overview of the job and career satisfaction common among current NCAA Division I athletic directors. In doing so, the study utilized homosocial reproduction as

its theoretical framework. The study's results concluded that the field of athletic administration, and specifically NCAA Division I athletic directors are disproportionately white males (89% white, 90% male), and further examined the educational and professional background characteristics and experiences which lead to this occupational characteristic.

**Keywords:** *NCAA athletic director, athletic administration, career mobility, occupational study, homosocial reproduction*

# Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction and General Information .....	1
Purpose of study.....	2
Significance of study.....	3
CHAPTER II.....	5
Literature Review.....	5
Gender Representation.....	6
College Coaching Positions .....	6
The Impact of Career Development:Mentoring-Protégé Relationship.....	8
Senior Management Positions in Sport.....	10
Gender Representation among Division I Athletic Directors .....	11
Minority Representation in Sport and Recreation .....	14
Theoretical and Conceptual Framework.....	16
Research Questions.....	17
CHAPTER III .....	20
Methodology.....	20
Sampling .....	20
Instrument .....	20
Instrument Development.....	24
Career Development and Progression.....	24
Career Path, Growth, and Mobility.....	25
Career Mobility, Job and Career Satisfaction.....	27
Networking and Career Mobility.....	30
Prioritization and Operations Involvement.....	31
Implementation of Previous Studies and Study Objectives.....	33
Procedure .....	34
Data Analysis.....	35
CHAPTER IV .....	36
Results and Discussion .....	36
Research Question #1 .....	36
Athletic Department Demographics .....	36
Socio-demographics of Current NCAA Division I Athletic Directors.....	37
Salary .....	37
Bonuses.....	38
Research Question #2 .....	38
Educational Background.....	38
Highest Degree Level .....	38
Bachelor’s Degree Field .....	39
Master’s Degree Field.....	40

Doctorate Degree Field .....	40
Research Question #3 .....	41
Job Experience .....	41
Occupational History and Experience .....	41
Years Held at Prior Position .....	43
Job Held Directly Before Assuming Current Position.....	45
Research Question #4 .....	46
Operations involvement .....	46
Research Question #5 .....	47
Job and career satisfaction .....	47
Motivation to Pursue Career .....	48
Rewarding .....	48
Discouraging and Troublesome .....	49
Significant Findings .....	50
RQ 1: Race and Gender Representation .....	50
RQ 2: Educational History and Degree Field .....	52
RQ 3: Occupational History and Career Growth.....	53
RQ 4: Operations Involvement .....	55
RQ 5: Job and Career Satisfaction .....	56
CHAPTER V .....	58
Conclusions and Recommendations .....	58
Study Limitations.....	58
Future Research .....	59
Future Research within Leadership Styles.....	59
Conclusion and Recommendations .....	60
Impact of Bonuses.....	62
Homosocial Reproduction and "Old boys' network" .....	63
Job and Career Growth: Top-down impacts from bottom-up.....	63
List of References .....	67
Appendix.....	71
Tables .....	72
Table 1. NCAA Athletic Department Profile. ....	72
Table 2. NCAA Division I Athletic Director Profile.....	73
Table 3. Salary Range .....	74
Table 4. Bachelor's Degree Field .....	75
Table 5. Master's Degree Field.....	75
Table 6. Prior Positions Held.....	76
Table 7. Job Experience: Position and Years Held.....	77
Table 8. Job Held Directly Before Assuming Current Position.....	78
Table 9. Operations Involvement.....	78
Table 10. Most Discouraging/Troublesome Part of Job .....	79
Electronic Survey.....	80
Institutional Review Board Form A.....	89
Vita.....	91



## Chapter 1

### Introduction and General Information

Collegiate athletics have experienced tremendous growth (Ross, Hyejin, & Seungum, 2007). Collegiate sports have seen their population nearly double with the advocate of women's sports through the adoption of Title IX; which mandated equal representation of the underrepresented sex within collegiate sports (Podgers, 1980). Different sports have evolved and have been recognized by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA, hereafter) as varsity sports with a NCAA national champion. The growth in media coverage in collegiate sports due to the increase numbers in sport fans has helped many collegiate institutions negotiate the sale of broadcasting rights, licensing fees for apparel, increase ticket price and stadium capacity, thus adding additional revenue streams to their athletic departments (Ross, Hyejin, & Seungum, 2007).

Further positions within the athletic department were added to accommodate the additional sports. Popularity in the media has grown for not only the student-athletes but as well as for their administrators within the public eye (Ross, Hyejin, & Seungum, 2007). In doing so, the institution's athletic director has become a highly publicized figure within the media, fans, and general public, such as through televised broadcasted interviews (Hoch, 2003).

With the continued interest and growth in working within collegiate athletic departments, many institutions have expanded their graduate level degrees and accommodated Master of Science degrees within Sport Management and Sport Administration for the purpose of obtaining positions working within the collegiate athletics (Lewis, & Quarterman, 2006). The issue that arises at this point is the current lack of occupational data referencing the specific types of

professional experience necessary to excel within collegiate athletics, grow within the field, and become collegiate athletic directors (Sagas, Paetzold, & Ashley, 2005). Although collegiate sports have endured tremendous growth and expansion, there has been limited occupational data and research conducted analyzing the career growth and progression, mobility, or job characteristics on National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I athletic directors (Watkins, & Rikard, 1991). Information analyzing the process of career development and progression of upper-level management within collegiate athletics is insufficient. Therefore, research and data among the collegiate administrative occupational field is severely limited in respect to other occupational fields and further study and research is necessary. This study is significant because very little is known of the impact that comparative demographic characteristics have on group members in the context of coaching and career growth (Sagas, Paetzold, & Ashley, 2005).

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to examine the characteristics among NCAA Division I athletic directors and the athletic administration occupational career field. Institution demographic information was collected assessing the athletic department's size measured by full-time and part-time employees, total men's and women's varsity sports offered, total student-athletes, and the number of student-athletes supported by athletic scholarships. Socio-demographic information was also collected from the study's participants in an effort to examine the occupation career field.

The study examined the educational background in both the highest degree level and the corresponding degree concentration per level. The study sought to identify and reference which

career paths (positions, departments, and years held) were most common among current NCAA Division I athletic directors, along with identifying the most common positions held directly before assuming their current position of director of athletics at a NCAA Division I institution.

Next, the study evaluated the daily and weekly operations and activities involvement most common among athletic directors in an effort to identify the most common needs for the position. Lastly, job and career satisfaction were evaluated, assessing both the motivation to enter the career field, and identify what was most rewarding, and the most discouraging or troublesome part of the position.

### **Significance of the Study**

The information from the study will be beneficial for administrators working within collegiate athletics who aspire to ascend and obtain higher positions within collegiate athletic departments, specifically as head or associate athletic directors, while also useful for student's when determining what educational degree field is necessary or most admired for the position. Lastly, the research and data collected from the study is useful for gender and minority representation in the athletic administration career field. The study's results yielded suggestions that the position of coaching at the high school and college level play a significant role in one's development in becoming a NCAA Division I athletic director. Thus, research examining the barriers to female and minority coaches are assessed in the study to provide a potential framework which leads to the lack of gender and minority representation among Division I athletic directors.

The practical significance of this study will reference occupational information about NCAA Division I athletic directors career growth, mobility, and development along with

providing previous experiences that may have helped ascend them to their current positions as collegiate athletic directors. This information is directly useful for young college graduates seeking to gain the necessary experience to one day excel to the position of athletic director of an NCAA Division I institution. This study will also seek to provide a module of job and career satisfaction for Division I athletic directors. The information gathered via an electronic survey in this study may potentially serve as a profile amongst athletic directors within the Division I collegiate athletic administration occupation through the collection of socio-demographical data, while also specifically referencing the educational and training background, professional experience and career progression, personal and institutional demographics, and career and job satisfaction of current NCAA Division I athletic directors.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

In part of investigating a common connection among the career development and career growth of NCAA Division I athletic directors to determine an occupational profile, previous literature examining gender representation in athletic administrators (Sander, 2011) (Carpenter, & Acosta, 2010), gender barriers for women in athletic administration (Whisenant, Miller, & Pedersen, 2005), minority representation in athletic administration (Elfman, 2010) (Matthews, 2006) and leadership qualities sought in athletic directors (Hoch, 2007) was assessed to evaluate existing and potential barriers to career growth within the athletic administration career field. In doing so, related literature in parallel disciplines was also assessed in the field of sport and recreation focusing on upward mobility for minorities (Outley, & Dean 2007), college coaching (Sagas, Cunningham, Teed, 2006), and the role of gender in professional sport management (Knoppers, & Anthonissen, 2007).

Additionally, while other literature in regards to athletic directors have focused on leadership styles (Ryska, T. A., 2002), behavioral methods and perceptions (Watkins, & Rikard, 1991), occupational stress and burnout (Hoch, 2002; 2003), and within ticket sales and marketing for college athletics (Ming, & Burden, 2002), research in the area of NCAA Division I athletic director career development, such as outlining career growth is limited (Hoch, D., 1996). Literature examining the occupational field of athletic administration, specifically gender representation, minority representation, and coaching is assessed throughout this chapter in order to further understand the current socio-demographic profile of NCAA Division I athletic

directors and the ability to grow within athletic administration occupational field as an administrator.

## **Gender Representation**

### **College Coaching Positions**

Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006) argued the role of homologous (homosocial) reproduction in the representation of female assistant coaches in collegiate sports. Drawing from Kanter's (1977) findings and the theories of homologous reproduction and homogeneity, Sagas, Cunningham and Teed's (2006) study revealed that the proportion of women coaches in collegiate athletics was at an all-time low, with only 42.5% of women serving as the head coach at NCAA membership institutions in 2006, and in 2010, the women coaches increased by only 0.1% to 42.6% females coaching women's college teams (Acosta, & Carpenter, 2010). What is even more discouraging is that Acosta and Carpenter (2010) revealed that in 1972 over 90% of coaches for NCAA women's sport teams were indeed women. Kanter's (1977) theory of homologous reproduction conceptualized that members of a dominant group within an organization tend to recruit, nurture (mentor), and promote persons that resemble qualities and characteristics most like themselves (e.g. physical or psychological characteristics), or as Kanter stated, the dominant group "systematically reproduces themselves in their own image" (p.48). Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006) further argued the presence and impact of homologous reproduction has on the employment of coaches at the intercollegiate level, and that homologous reproduction is "at least one major underlying variable that contributes to the continued under-representation of female coaches" (p.503).

Additionally Sagas (et. al., 2006) also argued that homologous reproduction leads to the continuation of the “old boy network,” which perpetuates gender discrimination at the highest level of managerial positions for collegiate athletics; the athletic director. While Sagas (et. al., 2006) acknowledge their findings of an “old girls network” existing in collegiate athletics, men occupy the majority of positions amongst collegiate athletics, especially power positions such as head athletic director, therefore the “old girls network” is rather ineffective in replicating itself for the female gender. As in comparison, since there are a distinct majority (91.7%) of male NCAA Division I athletic directors, the “old boy’s network” continues to grow and continue (Lapchick, Hoff, & Kaiser, 2011). Furthermore, Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser (2011), “2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport” study in combination with the NCAA discovered that “women coaching women’s team still do not represent the majority of coaches in the women’s game” (p.5).

Kanter’s (1977) theory also argues that the presence of homologous reproduction is in effort to create a predictable environment in which they (person in the power position) rely on socially similar others and reproduce themselves to create trust, shared values, and loyalty within the organization. This in turn creates a structural barrier for women advancement in the workplace and reproduces male hegemony (Sagas, Cunningham & Teed, 2006). Lastly, Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006) concluded that the gender of the head coach directly impacts the gender composition of the assistant coach, irrespective of sport (p.508). Most notably, this was more common with female head coaches hiring female assistant coaches, possibly due to males being in the dominant power positions, athletic directors.

Furthermore, previous literature examining both gender and minority representation in the collegiate coaching realm is directly applicable to the athletic administration field, not solely because of the hierarchy of the profession, but also because of the impact it has on the hiring process starting from the top down; the athletic director. Factors discussed by Sagas, Cunningham, and Teed (2006) including the “old boys’ network” and Kanter’s (1977) theory of homosocial reproduction are all clearly present within the field of college coaching and are prevalent in the collegiate athletic departments. For instance, in NCAA Division I women’s sports there are 65.6% women coaching women’s basketball, and only 19.7% women head coaches for women’s indoor track, women’s outdoor track, and women’s cross country, and in all other women’s sports men were the head coach of 55.5% of the NCAA Division I women’s teams, leaving women coaching 45.5% of Division I women sports (Lapchick, Hoff, & Kaiser, 2011). Additionally, homosocial reproduction and the “old boys’ network” not only effects gender representation but it also directly impacts minority representation among college coaching and within the collegiate administration career field because in 2010 only 8.3% of NCAA Division I athletic directors were female (Lapchick, et. al, 2011).

### **The Impact of Career Development: Mentor-Protégé Relationship in College Sports**

In addition to Sagas, Cunningham, and Teed’s study (2006), Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) examined the impact of mentors and their protégés on gender representation in NCAA Division I women’s basketball. Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) examined the “effects sex and attitudinal similarity in head coach- assistant coach mentoring dyads on the quality of psychological and career related mentoring received” (p.73). The authors (2007) also



examined if the gender of the mentor affects the girth of the career development functions due to the organizational power position of the male.

Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) study results concluded that protégé in same-sex dyads reported receiving more psychological mentoring from their mentor than those in cross-sex dyads, determining that the gender of the coach (mentor) and assistant coach (protégé) directly impacts psychological career mentoring (p.75). Next, Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) examined the impact sex-dissimilar and cross-ethnicity has on the mentor-protégé career development relationship. Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) determined that when ethnicity of the mentor (coach) was not a white male, protégé's of the different sex reported substantially lower levels of career development mentoring than those of the same sex, while also determining that when the mentor was a white male, the female protégés showed significantly similar results to the male protégés. Also, a significant finding from Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips' (2007) study revealed that the "negative impact of sex-dissimilar mentorship on psychological and career development mentoring was attenuated in longer-lasting relationship" (p.76). Further concluding that the longer the relationship lasts between mentor and protégés of different genders, the less negative impact it has on the career and psychological development.

Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) study of the mentor (coach) and protégé (assistant coach) is applicable to the athletic administration career field. The parallels between coaching and collegiate athletic departments are significant due to the hiring process and on career development. Just as coaches have protégés so too do athletic directors and the field of sport

management as Sander (2011) and Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) will discuss later in this chapter. Avery, Tonidandel, and Phillips (2007) concluded their study by stating that:

“By extending organizational research on similarity (sex and attitudinal) and mentoring to a sport setting, we were able to uncover another factor that may aid in explaining the relative decline in female representation on sidelines in women’s college sport” (p.79).

### **Senior Management Positions in Sport**

Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) examined the role and representation of females within senior managerial positions within sport organizations. Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) discussed the barriers of women advancing to senior management level positions within sport organizations. While acknowledging the continued growth of women working within sport, Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) discussed that this was primarily at middle-management level positions and that the senior level managerial positions were male dominated. In fact, Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser (2011) discovered that women make up 31.1% of NCAA Division I associate athletic directors. Furthermore, Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) argued the presence of homologous reproduction within senior management positions of sport organizations, and identified the presence of four dominant discursive themes; instrumentality, relationality, emotionality/passion, and homogeneity which all play a strong role and strengthen the trend of male gendered senior level managers within large sport organizations.

The impact of toughness and perseverance along with availability, and impression management all make the instrumentality discursive theme. Relationality, such as the social interactions with groups and employees, along with the discourse of emotionality and the passion for sport were also synonymous in Knoppers and Anthonissen’s study (2007). Knoppers and

Athonissen (2007) identified the perceived differences among the male and female counterparts within the discursive themes and the perceptions that follow. Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) refer to Shaw and Frisby (2006) as they described that gender shapes more than identities, rather it is an axis of power that plays a consistent and influential role interactions, structures, and processes of sport organizations.

Lastly, Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) conclude with their final discourse of homogeneity. Alike Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006), Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) discuss the presence of the “old boys network” within sport organizations, specifically upper-level and senior managerial level positions. Kanter’s theory of homologous reproduction (1977) was prevalent within this discourse, and as Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007) concluded that this “further perpetuated the exclusion of women, minorities, and marginalized men from positions of leadership in sport” (p.8).

### **Gender Representation among NCAA Division I Athletic Directors**

The 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card revealed that only 8.3% of NCAA Division I athletic directors were female (Lapchick, Hoff, & Kaiser, 2011). Sander (2011) conducted a study evaluating the representation of women athletic directors at NCAA Division I-A Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) membership institutions. Sander (2011) concluded that women only occupy five of the 120 athletic director positions at NCAA Division I-A FBS institutions.

Sander (2011) next evaluated the barriers and potential reasons which may lead to such a strong discrepancy among gender representation among Division I-A institution athletic directors. While females make up nearly half all Division I athletes, only four percent of the largest collegiate athletic departments were led by a female in 2010 (Sander, 2011). Sander

examined the reasons which impact the glass-ceiling for female athletic directors Division I-A institutions. Sander (2011) addressed the presence of the “old boys’ network,” discouragement from not being selected for head athletic director positions, and the stigma surrounding an institution who elects hire a female as the athletic director of all playing a role in the barrier surrounding female gender growth within the lead positions for athletic departments. One area which Sander (2011) determined was not a barrier was the “pipeline” for female athletic administrators. Rather, Sander (2011) found that women were currently serving and being hired for associate and assistant athletic director positions within large athletic departments at the NCAA Division I-A FBS level. However, Sander (2011) further concluded that “in the past 14 years, 174 athletic-director positions have been filled in Division I-A, with only four going to women” (p.3).

Next, Sander (2011) interviewed FBS male athletic directors to assess the severe lack of gender representation among the top positions. DeLoss Dodds, athletic director of the University of Texas- Austin, discussed this with Sander, stating; “We sat around here five years ago and looked at ourselves, and we said, ‘You know, we’re a bunch of old white men,’ and he and his colleagues agreed to do something about it” (Sander, 2011 p.3). The decision made by Dodds and his colleagues, as Sander (2011) discussed, was that to increase the number of females and minorities as athletic directors at FBS institutions. Dodds elaborated that first they must provide them (women) with the opportunity to first succeed and lead their respective specialized departments within the athletic department (Sander, 2011). Next, Dodds and his colleagues discussed the impact of mentoring, networking, and nurturing females and minorities so they were prepared and could excel at the position when offered the opportunity (Sander, 2011).

However, while there is an awareness among NCAA Division I athletic directors to increase female representation, there is another major hindrance identified by search firms and athletic directors; which is seeking out female candidates for athletic director searches (Sander, 2011). Todd Turner, head of a national search firm and former Division I-A athletic director stated, "I had a hard time getting them (women) to move. My perception is that they have far more balance in their lives than some of the guys," and Turner continued to state that, "The guys are all about money and the position. The women are oftentimes about a lot more" (Sander, 2011 p.4). Turner also continued to discuss how it was just as hard to find talented female coaches to hire when he served as the athletic director (Sander, 2011).

Lastly, Sander (2011) concluded in her findings that some women like being "No. 2," meaning that they are comfortable at their current positions with their current responsibilities, or as Julie Hermann stated, second in command of the University of Louisville's athletic department, "the silent partner" (Sander, 2011 p.4). Also, on-going suggestions are currently being implemented to initiate the growth of women athletic directors at Division I athletic departments. Officials at the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators say that they are considering similar tactics which the Division 1A Athletic Directors' Association implemented which aimed at increasing the number of Division I-A African-American head football coaches, by seeking out minorities to interview for the position. A tactic which has seen an increase of African-American head football coaches from seven in 2008 to 16 in 2010, in combination with another two head coaches hired who are from other minority backgrounds (Lapchick, et al. 2011) (Sander, 2011).

## **Minority Representation in Sport and Recreation**

Another factor influencing career growth within the athletic administration field is the socio-demographic outlay of NCAA Division I athletic directors in regards to minority representation. The 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport, completed by Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser (2011) in conjunction with the NCAA revealed that 88.8% of athletic directors at the NCAA Division I level identified as white or Caucasian, while 7.4% identified as African-American, 2.2% as Latino, .9% as Native American, and 0 percent identified as Asian. Previous research in the parallel discipline of sport and recreation was evaluated due to the likeness of the occupational field to athletic administration. Outley and Dean (2007) examined minority representations at upper management positions at the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA). The study examined the representation of African-Americans at senior-level management positions and the balance of power within the YMCA organization between blacks and whites.

Through interviewing 37 senior level managers within the organizations, Outley and Dean (2007) concluded that homosocial reproduction contributed to the under-representation of African-Americans within the organization's senior level management positions. Outley and Dean (2007) further argued that their study's findings were applicable not only to other non-profit organizations but also to organizations in both the public and private sectors (p.75).

Kanter's theory of homosocial reproduction (1977) was assessed to explain the factors contributing to the continued limited promotions and career growth for African-American employees within the YMCA organization. The study concluded that when managers within the organization were faced with uncertainties, managers commonly sought homogeneity in order to

pursue social conformity to achieve an allegiance, credibility, and trust (Outley, & Dean, 2007 p.78). As Kanter (1977) discovered, social conformity within an organization can manifest in a number of ways; in appearance, talk, and dress. Also, the literature revealed that women and minorities are more likely not to have networks or support systems in findings or acquiring jobs as opposed to white males (Outley, & Dean, 2007). Outley and Dean's study revealed the departmentalization of job placement for African-American based upon "racialized jobs" (treatment discrimination). Meaning, African-Americans were more likely to assume a management position in areas more closely resembling their race, which were typically in lower-income inner-city areas with limited resources and opportunities for career advancement which eventually led to a decrease in African-American senior-level manager promotions within the organization. This concept was referred to by Outley and Dean (2007) as "pigeonholed," and created a barrier to upward mobility to African-Americans. Furthermore, pigeonholing has an adverse effect on career development. Outley and Dean (2007) argued that pigeonholing African-Americans to managerial positions within predominately African-American inner-city, low economic level areas directly affects the managers ability to oversee a larger budget, employment department, and resource base, characteristics all of which are necessary for senior management positions within organizations. Pigeonholing also diminished the chances for organizations to create a diverse and inclusive environment for the organization (Outley, & Dean, 2007).

In addition, Outley and Dean (2007) argued that the presence of the "old boy network" also influenced homosocial reproduction among the promotion structure and upward mobility for African-American managers to senior-level managerial positions. The authors further described

how the “old boy network” hinders the growth of minorities directly due to the individuals who possess the sought out homosocial reproduction characteristics were white males in the senior-level management power structure within the YMCA. In addition, the “old boy network” provides the persons in the power positions to hire, promote, and nurture (mentor) people that closely resemble themselves. Another key finding that Outley and Dean (2007) discovered in their study was the need to assimilate within the organization to achieve upward mobility.

Consistent with the previous literature discussed in the parallel disciplines, Outley and Dean (2007) argued that “organizational leaders tend to hire and promote people like themselves because it is an expedient way to ensure that those selected are compatible with existing norms and expectations” (p.88). Lastly, it was concluded by Outley and Dean (2007) that the primary hindrance and barrier to upward mobility for African-Americans within the YMCA was homosocial reproduction.

### **Theoretical and Conceptual Framework**

The theoretical framework for the study was derived directly from homosocial reproduction theory. Homosocial reproduction is the promotion of management according to social identification with those above them, more specifically, Outley and Dean (2007) stated that the theory homosocial reproduction “posits that members of a dominant group tend to recruit, nurture, and promote persons like themselves, especially when they are selecting individuals for prestigious, confidential, and trusted positions” (p.78). Based upon the current study’s results, the theory of homosocial reproduction aligns strongly with previous research conducted in corresponding fields, such as in gender representation in college and professional coaching (Avery, Tonidandel, & Phillips, 2007) (Sags, Cunningham, & Teed, 2006), gender



representation in sport organizations (Knoppers and Anthonissen, 2007), and the representation of minorities, specifically, African Americans in managerial positions in sport and recreation organizations (Outley, and Dean, 2007).

The theory of homosocial reproduction aligns with the aforementioned literature and previous studies conducted and further perpetuates a homologous field surrounding sport and the occupational field of athletic administrators. The theory of homosocial reproduction was adopted from previous studies within similar career fields and study objectives including job mobility (Outley, and Dean, 2007), career growth (Knoppers, and Anthonissen, 2007), occupational studies measuring managerial positions and career theory (Pfeffer, 1988), and the representation of race and gender in sport (Carpenter, and Acosta, 2010). The theoretical framework of homosocial reproduction clearly aligns and corresponds with the study's results and thus the conceptual framework from the aforementioned literature in related studies will be used to guide the current study and examination of NCAA Division I athletic directors occupational career field.

### **Research Questions**

In utilizing the theory of homosocial reproduction as the theoretical framework of the study, the author developed five objective based research questions to guide the study. The five research questions were developed to provide a holistic approach to evaluate the athletic administration career field, and specifically NCAA Division I athletic directors.

Research question one, "What are the institutional and personal socio-demographics of NCAA Division I athletic directors?" The research question served necessary in order to evaluate the study's survey pool socio-demographic make-up, and also to correlate and identify means

among Division I athletic department demographic characteristics. Furthermore, the data gathered from the personal socio-demographic characteristics along with the institutions' athletic departments demographics were then measured against two primary sources; the "NCAA Member Institutions Personnel Report: Race and Gender Demographics" (Zgonc, 2010), and "The 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport" (Lapchick, Hoff, & Kaiser, 2011) in order to evaluate the reliability and accuracy of the study against the entire NCAA Division I membership institutions.

Research question two next evaluated the educational background of the study's participants; "What are the most common degree levels and degree fields that NCAA Division I athletic directors possess?" In doing so, this research question sought to correlate the mean results of the highest level of education possessed by the participants combined with identifying the most common degree fields per degree level. Through descriptive statistics the study successfully identified the most common degree fields among the degree levels.

Research question three next addressed the job growth and experiences NCAA Division I athletic directors acquired; "What professional experience do NCAA Division I athletic directors possess?" This specifically addressed the prior positions current athletic directors have held throughout their careers along with the time (in years) they spent at the position. The data collected from this research question was used in multiple ways; to identify the most common positions held, and also to determine what positions help develop and ascend athletic directors to the top position throughout their career development. In addition, questions within this section of the survey also discovered what the most common positions were directly before the participant assumed their current position of head athletic director.

Research question four evaluated the participant's weekly operations involvement within 16 core activities within their athletic department, asking; "What are the frequent trends in the daily and weekly operations and activities involvement among NCAA Division I athletic directors?" This research question evaluated the primary responsibilities Division I athletic departments desire from their athletic directors. Data collected within this section of the survey was further used to identify what necessary job development and skills are most necessary for serving as a Division I athletic director, while also correlating with the needs of the athletic department.

Research question five evaluated the perceived job and career satisfaction among Division I athletic directors; "Evaluate job and career satisfaction among athletic director; what was their motivation for entering the field?" This section also evaluated what was the most rewarding aspect of the position along with what athletic directors felt was the most discouraging or troublesome part of their job, all while also ranking their job and career satisfaction through the Life Satisfaction Inventory (Lounsbury, 2010).

## **Chapter 3**

### **Methodology**

#### **Sampling**

In order to effectively and efficiently collect socio-demographic, institutional demographic, educational, professional experience, career growth information, and job and career satisfaction, an electronic survey was issued to a potential survey pool of 327 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I athletic directors. The survey pool was comprised only of colleges and universities who participate at the NCAA Division I membership level. Out of a potential 327 sampling pool, 99 participants fully and successfully completed the electronic survey and participated in the current study, summing a successful response rate of 30.28% for current NCAA Division I athletic directors in the current study. An additional 45 participants attempted the electronic survey; however, they either timed out of the browser, or did not fully complete the survey, and were therefore discarded from the study and the study's results. Full anonymity was provided to all of the participants, and therefore all survey responses remained anonymous.

#### **Instrument**

The electronic survey questionnaire issued to NCAA Division I athletic directors was comprised of five sections corresponding with the study's research questions. The electronic survey questionnaire was comprised of closed ended and open ended questions, including multiple choice, single response, Likert-type scale, and short response questions. A copy of the electronic survey questionnaire can be found in the appendix.

Although, the study's electronic survey was developed through the desired research questions, there was not a specific outlay for sections within the electronic survey. The purpose for this is to increase the attentiveness of the respondents based upon the importance of aptitude required for the survey question. Thus, the more time consuming and thought provoking questions were put towards the beginning of the electronic survey to help ensure well-thought-out responses, and basic questions such as regarding sex, age, race, and ethnicity were put towards the end of the electronic survey because of the lack of attentiveness required.

Therefore, questions were not be divided or grouped together in specific areas of the survey in regards to the topic of the question but rather the importance and attentiveness required in answering the questions. The survey collected personal and institutional demographic information such as age, gender, race, salary, employment size of current athletic department, varsity sports supported, varsity student-athletes, and varsity sports supported by the athletic department. The purpose of these questions is to attempt to identify the basic information among current athletic directors to develop an occupational profile of current NCAA Division I athletic directors. The current study also correlated similarities among the sizes of the institutions and athletic departments.

Furthermore, questions within the electronic survey collected educational information. The educational information collected will include highest degree type earned and degree field along with identifying undergraduate and graduate level degrees common among current athletic directors. These questions of the electronic survey were derived from Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch (2010) previous study concerning the effect on higher educational degrees, specifically doctorate degrees, on the person's job placement. The current study's electronic

survey questionnaire will seek to collect the major(s) and concentration(s) of each degree earned. This is in part to attempt to identify if there are any similarities in degree fields and to determine what undergraduate and more importantly, graduate degrees were obtained by current NCAA Division I athletic directors.

Also questions within the electronic survey questionnaire collected information in relation to professional experience. These questions were generated to identify the career progression and growth of current NCAA Division I athletic directors. Questions from the current electronic survey questionnaire were referenced from Yamaguchi's (2010) previous study within career placement and mobility of college graduates in comparison to people with a high school diploma as their highest reached degree and determined substantial returns to career-specific experience. The current study provided open ended questions related to career development and identified the career progression by the participants identifying their prior positions held and years at the position in order to identify the most common positions, athletic administrative department of position, and years held at the position. Also, the study evaluated the job and position title held directly prior to assuming their participant's current position of head athletic director. The professional experience within the electronic survey identified the similarities in the professional experience of current Division I athletic directors by correlating common departments of employment and positions obtained within collegiate athletic administration before obtaining the position as a head athletic director. Questions within the current electronic survey questionnaire were referenced from Feldt and Woelfel (2009), who surveyed individuals' self-efficacy ratings in response to educational requirements, getting a job, job success, and advancement. The information collected served to determine which positions

and departments within collegiate athletic administration provide the best opportunity for promotion, along with attempting to identify career progression.

The next objective criteria that the electronic survey collected was evaluating job and career satisfaction of current Division I athletic directors. These questions of the current electronic survey drew upon previous studies including the Life Satisfaction Survey (2010) by Lounsbury. Lounsbury's study (2010) evaluated respondents perceived job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction. Lounsbury's study (2010) was formatted with a set of two phrases separated with a closed-ended responses with a rating of one to five, and the respondent is asked to read the following sets of phrases and think about how they act most of the time or how they most characteristically feel or think when you are at work (on their job). For most of the questions, the respondent's perspective should be how they typically act or feel (or how you think you would act or feel when you are in your work role) (Life Satisfaction Survey; Lounsbury, 2010).

The Managerial Behavior Survey (MBS) developed by Yukl (1982) which consisted of 23 leader behavior scales, Styles of Leadership Survey (SLS; Hall & Williams, 1986) which was further used by Ryska (2009) in a study that attempted to assess programs goals and leadership style were referenced in the study to evaluate departmental involvement of current NCAA Division I athletic directors. Also, questions within the current study were drawn from Chelladurai, Inglis, and Danylchuk's (1983) Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP). The SAP was referenced to generate career specific questions and to identify decision making characteristics and allocation of involvement among current athletic directors.

Lastly, the survey provided an open ended response section with a word cap of 250 words. This section of the current study allowed current Division I athletic directors the opportunity to describe what they find to be most rewarding along with the most discouraging and troublesome part they encounter while assuming the position as a Division I athletic director, along with a section for any additional comments.

## **Instrument Development**

### **Career Development and Progression**

Career development is defined as “managing your career either within or between organizations” (Masterson, 2006, p.91). Moreover, career development includes “learning new skills, setting goals and objectives for your own personal career growth, and making improvements to help you advance in your career” (Masterson, 2006, p.91). As Masterson (2006) further alludes, “it is an ongoing, lifelong process to help you learn and achieve more in your career” (p.93). Examinations of career development can be done on an individual analysis level. Feldt and Woelfel (2009) conducted research examining social cognitive career theory including the determinants of career decision making, importance of career-related outcomes, and whether careers of choice or preference would provide such outcomes (e.g. higher income). Feldt and Woelfel (2009) surveyed individuals’ self-efficacy ratings in response to educational requirements, getting a job, job success, and advancement. The survey sample was made up of 179 undergraduate college students and the methods used to evaluate survey pool’s responses were the Career Decision Scale (CDS), and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). Feldt and Woelfel (2009) determined that in predicting career planning, importance significance was put upon self-efficacy and outcome expectations.



The current study examined career development amongst professionals within the collegiate athletic administration field, more specifically, current NCAA Division I athletic directors. The study referenced Feldt and Woelfel's (2009) survey questionnaire which included such methods as Career Decision Scale (CDS), and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) in order to generate appropriate questions which identified career field decisions and career growth amongst Division I athletic directors.

### **Career Path, Growth, and Mobility**

Another objective of this study was to examine the career paths of current Division I athletic directors. While examining professional career paths, the study provided a common correlation and outline of the most common prior positions held by current athletic directors. This effort was necessary to identify common experiences and career paths that may have contributed to the study's participants' ascension within collegiate athletic administration. A career path can be defined as; a planned, logical progression of jobs within one or more professions throughout working life (BNet, 2010). The purpose of identifying the career paths of collegiate athletic directors was done to correlate common trends among athletic director's professional career succession in both identifying the positions and years held. The study identified similarities amongst education background, department of employment (e.g. marketing, development, media relations, and compliance), position of employment, number of years held at the position, and identified the position held directly before assuming their current position of head athletic director.

An exploratory study using Schein's Career Anchor Inventory (1978) to the careers of Research and Development (R&D) personnel was conducted by Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio

(2009). Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio (2009) interviewed six managers to help draft the survey which sought to gauge the extent of what R&D employees agreed with statements concerning their career route and management. Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio (2009) formulated the items in short statements on a seven-point Likert-type scale. The study (2009) examined the modes of career development for research and development staff through issuing a postal questionnaire with an acceptable response rate of 51 firms (out of 98, chosen out of 201) and a total of 309 employees surveyed. The study aimed to indicate that the R&D personnel's career orientations as a predictor of their career route preferences, confirming a total amount of three possible career routes in R&D labs (Bigliardi, & Ivo Dormio, 2009). The questionnaire was divided in three parts.

The first part of Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio's (2009) questionnaire focused on background variables in a series of self-reported questions about general information about the firm, and background variables, such as age, gender, education and professional tenure. Emphasis on "professional tenure was coded on the basis of three career stages: establishment (two years or less) = 1, advancement (over two and up to ten years) = 2 and maintenance (over ten years) = 3" (Bigliardi, & Ivo Dormio, 2009, p.12).

The second part of the survey (2009) focused on "career orientations." Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio (2009) focused on the 40 items drawn from the original questionnaire which was developed by Schein (1978). Responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale to measure the eight career anchors of R&D professionals (Bigliardi, & Ivo Dormio, 2009).

The third part of the survey focused on "career preferences." This section of Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio (2009) questionnaire included five questions about career mobility that are taken

into account as a possible career track. The questions about career path preferences were rated on a five-point Likert scale (where 1=not at all and 5=to a very large extent) (Bigliardi, B, and Ivo Dormio, A., 2009).

A significant result concluded from Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio (2009) study was that there was “a significant correlation existing between what an individual expects from his/her job and the career route he/she will follow” (p.16). The study was also successful in identifying possible career routes within research and development profession along with the desired in career route.

The survey instrument of Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio’s (2009) study, Schein’s Career Anchor Inventory (1978), can be transferred to surveying professionals within the collegiate administration career field and moreover the objective of the study (2009) serves in part to the development to the current survey. The methods and results of the study (2009) within the research and development occupation field reflect the ability to apply the study’s survey objective instruments to the collegiate athletic administration occupational field in order to determine common career development and career paths taken by current NCAA Division I athletic directors. Bigliardi and Ivo Dormio’s (2009) study can be transferred from professionals within the research and development profession to administrators within the collegiate administration profession by utilizing the same ideological concepts and referencing similar question types from the questionnaire.

### **Career Mobility, Job and Career Satisfaction**

Kingma (2006) defined the factors affecting career mobility, such as the search of better pay and working conditions, availability to relocate, professional development, a better quality of life, personal safety, or sometimes just novelty and adventure. Several studies have attempted to

research career mobility within the management discipline. Studies researching career mobility in relation to job placement, job tenure, and career changes have been conducted. Yamaguchi (2010) studied career placement and mobility of college graduates in comparison to people with a high school diploma as their highest reached degree and determined substantial returns to career-specific experience with the results indicating in a lower incidence of career changes the more advanced the degree. The findings suggests that college graduates learn about their suitable careers before they enter a labor market and positively correlate with career placement and negatively correlate with career field changes (Yamaguchi, 2010). In the current study, career mobility within collegiate athletic administration was one of the objectives evaluated. The study assessed the career mobility and progression of current NCAA Division I athletic directors in relation to their education background which includes degree field, degree level, and within job experience and reference survey questions similar to Yamaguchi's (2010) study.

It was also imperative to evaluate and assess current athletic director's motivation for entering the field, job satisfaction, and career satisfaction in order to accurately assess their perceived motivation and career interest in becoming a NCAA Division I athletic director. For this, the study utilized a previous study conducted by John W. Lounsbury entitled, Life Satisfaction Inventory (2010). Lounsbury's Life Satisfaction Inventory (2010) survey evaluated applicant's responses in three primary areas, job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction. For the purpose of the current study, questions referencing job satisfaction and career satisfaction were directly derived from Lounsbury's Life Satisfaction Inventory (2010). Lounsbury's study (2010) used a 26 question survey to evaluate the three primary areas. Lounsbury (2010) utilized a numerical five-scale response key to the Life Satisfaction Inventory

(2010). The scale identified which of the survey questions directing referred to the three areas of evaluation, making it very easy to pinpoint which questions refer to job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction, and thus evaluating the respondents overall satisfaction per area.

Also, a key area of investigation the study was to analyze is education. Before one begins their career as an athletic director a strong educational background is required for working at a collegiate institution. For that purpose, the study evaluated respondent's educational degree level, degree type, and degree major. In doing so, previous research was evaluated which was conducted by Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch (2010) concerning the effect on higher educational degrees, specifically doctoral degrees, on the person's job placement. Factors in Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch's (2010) study included job placement, perceived quality of work, obtainment of greater job placement benefits, perceived quality of their publications, and future career opportunities were directly affected by the prestige of the graduate's place of doctoral origin. Lastly, Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch (2010) concluded that the "results suggest that recruitment patterns in the management discipline reflect an inherent academic stratification system and that doctoral origin prestige is an important determinant of early and later career opportunities" (p.23). Based upon Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch (2010) study, the current study evaluated the most common degree level, degree types, and area of major concentration per degree level in order to identify similarities and trends among current NCAA Division I athletic directors. While referencing Bedeian, Cavazos, Hunt, and Jauch's (2010) study, the current study sought to draw common correlations and conclusions based on higher

education in order to determine which degree type and concentration are most suited and common for becoming a Division I athletic director.

### **Networking and Career Mobility**

Several previous studies have determined a connection between career mobility and networking as means of enhancing one's career (Wolff, & Moser, 2009). Wolff and Moser (2009) examined whether specific networking sub-dimensions predict specific career outcomes specifically differentiating types of career mobility based upon the internal and external networking. Networking is defined as "behaviors aimed at building and maintaining informal relationships, that possess the (potential) benefit to ease work related actions by voluntarily granting access to resources and by jointly maximizing advantages of the individuals involved" (Wolff, & Moser, 2009, p.3). Wolff and Moser (2009) further go on to state that "networking behaviors allow individuals to build and maintain personal relations that facilitate the exchange of resources, such as task advice, strategic information, career enhancement, and power" (p.4). Such findings in Wolff and Moser's are similar to findings researching the effects of the "old boys' network." The basis of Wolff and Moser (2010) study focused on career mobility outcomes based on promotions and organizational change through networking.

Results from Wolff and Moser's (2010) study concluded that a positive relationship with networking and promotions, along with concluding that through internal networking (within the current organization) by means of their contacts, "individuals obtain relevant information and advocacy, and also successfully influence those who decide upon who gets promoted" (Wolff, & Moser, 2009 p.5). External networking (external contacts outside of the organization) showed a positive relation with distal organization change (Wolff, & Moser, 2009, p.5). However, a

significant finding from the study revealed that networking and contact building must take place before the open position is available (Wolff, & Moser, 2009).

Wolff and Moser's (2010) successfully correlated the significance of internal and external networking as a means of enhancing career mobility and job attainment. The study referred to Wolff and Moser's (2010) survey method in order to identify if networking influenced career mobility and progression (e.g. advancement and promotions).

### **Prioritization & Operations Involvement**

In evaluating prioritization and operations involvement among NCAA collegiate athletic directors, one source of survey questions were referenced from the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP; Chelladurai, Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1983). The SAP was referenced to generate career specific questions within athletic administration pertaining specifically to athletic directors. Ryska (2009) most recently employed Chelladurai, Inglis, and Danylchuk's Scales of Athletic Priorities (SAP, 1983) in his study (2009) surveying the program goals, leadership styles, and occupational burnout among collegiate sport coaches.

Ryska (2009) preliminarily conducted research in the form of questionnaires, collected from 345 randomly selected NCAA Division I sport coaches (52.3% response rate of 660 surveys generated from a published list of NCAA member programs, totaling 267 males and 78 females) across the collegiate sports of soccer, tennis, golf, volleyball, and baseball aimed at examining how leadership styles and administrative goals effect the development of burnout among collegiate sport coaches. The questionnaire also recorded the age, gender, ethnicity, coaching experience, and win-loss record of the respondents.

Upon analyzing the data, the survey employed the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP; Chelladurai, Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1983) to “measure the degree to which coaches emphasize various administrative goals within their respective sport programs” (Ryska, 2009 p.480). Six subscales including entertainment, career opportunities, public relations, athlete personal growth, prestige, and achieved excellence were ranked on a seven point system based on importance to each coach (from 1, not at all important to 7, very important) (Ryska, 2009). As noted by Chelladurai et al. (1983) and Chelladurai and Danylchuk (1984), the internal consistency and stability estimates of the SAP subscales typically range from .66 to .89 ( $M=.78$ ) and .62 to .83 ( $M=.73$ ).

Next, the leadership style and analytical characteristics of each coach were analyzed using the Style of Leadership Survey (SLS; Hall & Williams, 1986) using a ten-point scale to determine five independent leadership styles (directive, supportive, bureaucratic, strategic, and collaborative). Lastly, to determine organizational burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1986) was used to “determine the extent of perceived burnout reported by coaches according to the dimensions of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment” (Ryska, 2009 p.481).

The study referred to the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP; Chelladurai, Inglis, & Danylchuk, 1983) in order to generate a series of questions referencing the prioritization and involvement of the weekly tasks, duties, and responsibilities of current Division I athletic directors allocate throughout a given week of work. The questions within this section of the study identified a series of 16 core priorities and involvement Division I athletic directors allocate to the activities within their athletic department. In doing so, the study formulated



questions regarding the weekly involvement in which the closed-ended responses were rated with the following criteria: slightly involved = once/week, involved = 2-3 times/week, heavily involved = 3 or more times/week to daily. This objective criteria was then paired with the following activities and departments: teaching, coaching, recruiting, employment/human resources, financials/budgetary oversight, policy making (Internal), policy making (External), community relations, campus relations, business management, compliance/risk management, development/fundraising, marketing, communications, sport operations, facilities/equipment in which the respondents then evaluated their level of involvement within collegiate athletics at their institution.

### **Implementation of Previous Studies and Study Objectives**

Upon referencing the methods from the aforementioned studies, the study identified common characteristics among Division I athletic directors. Through analyzing the qualitative and quantitative data from the current study's electronic survey, this study identified common characteristics among Division I athletic directors, including personal socio-demographic and institutional demographic information, educational and training information (degree type, area of concentration), career progression, experience, and career growth, occupational involvement, and job and career satisfaction. The study determined a correlation among current NCAA Division I athletic directors career progression in which educational degree level and concentration were the most common per degree level. The study also determined the most common prior positions held, years held at the past positions, along with similarities in the departmental involvement athletic directors primarily focus on. The study produced identifiable educational degree fields

and career paths of athletic directors based upon the common experiences and characteristics of the study's participants.

### **Procedure**

After receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (see Appendix X), the electronic survey was electronically sent via the internet to the head athletic director recipients at NCAA Division I membership institutions. The initial survey pool consisted of only 327 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I institutional membership status athletic directors. An initial response period of two weeks, fourteen consecutive days was allotted for completing the survey. However, as a precaution, if the survey response rate was at a minimum, below eighty respondents, a follow-up email was going to be sent to the remaining non-respondents within the survey pool, and the electronic survey response period would have been extended for an additional ten consecutive days in order to allow for ample quantity of responses from the survey pool. However, that was unnecessary based upon the survey pool responses within the 14 consecutive day period.

Before issuing the study's electronic survey, initial pilot testing was conducted on collegiate educational administrators and professors. The purpose of this precaution was to identify strengths within the survey questionnaire and eliminate any possible questions that may cause any misconceptions or irregularities in interpretation. The purpose of pilot testing collegiate level educational administrators is because of the close relationship to the collegiate athletic administrator career field along with the current study's questionnaire referencing educational history, professional experience, job progression, and job and career satisfaction.

## **Data Analysis**

After collecting the electronic survey data from ninety-nine NCAA Division I athletic directors who participated in the study, descriptive statistical analyses was used to analyze the demographical, educational history, professional experience and progression, and job and career satisfaction into frequency categories using SPSS version 19.0. Descriptive statistical analysis tests along with frequency testing was necessary to measure mean averages, median, mode, and percentage characteristics of the data in order to correlate an occupational background for NCAA Division I athletic directors. Also, coding was conducted in order to group open-ended responses into categories to further interpret the data and develop themes among the participant's responses. Much of the data presented in the current study will be discussed and displayed in a percentage format based upon the survey's ninety-nine participants whom successfully completed the electronic survey.

The survey pool consisted of 99 survey participants amongst NCAA Division I head athletic directors; (99 respondents successfully completed the electronic survey). The electronic survey data was collected through SPSS MRInterview Reporter and then was analyzed in SPSS Statistics and SPSS Statistics data analysis editor version 19.0 in order to formulate codes, group the data, and apply descriptive statistics and frequencies among the data collected.

## Chapter 4

### Results and Discussion

#### Research Question #1

##### Athletic department demographics

Upon analyzing the study's results in SPSS data analysis and running descriptive statistics, the mean number of student-athletes that a NCAA Division I athletic department supports is 407, while the mean number of athletic scholarships funded by an athletic department is 175.82. The survey showed that the highest number of student-athletes within an athletic department at a NCAA Division I university was 1,100, while the lowest amount was 190 student-athletes. The survey also discovered that on average based upon the participating athletic departments within the survey, 47.05% of student-athletes within an athletic department receive athletic scholarships (see Appendix, Table 1. NCAA DI Athletic Department Profile). Of the participating NCAA Division I collegiate athletic departments, 69.7% offered football as a varsity sport while 30.3% did not. Moreover, the study's participants supported on average nine men's varsity sport programs and ten women's varsity sport programs.

Next, the athletic department employee support was evaluated within the electronic survey. Results revealed that the average number of current full-time employees within a NCAA Division I athletic department is 84 persons, with the largest amount of full-time employees ranging from 325 to the smallest amount of full-time employees being 14 persons. Also, the number of part-time employees was evaluated within the study. Results showed that the average number of part-time persons employed within a NCAA Division athletic department is currently 38 persons. Furthermore, it can be applied that a current NCAA Division I athletic department

employs 122 persons (on average) in their efforts to support student-athletes, compete athletically at the highest collegiate level, and comply with NCAA rules, policies, and regulations.

### **Socio-demographics of NCAA Division I athletic directors**

Out of the 99 successfully completed surveys, the mean average age among NCAA Division I athletic directors were 54 years old, ranging from the oldest response of 71 to the youngest at 35 years old. Results showed that 89.9% (89 persons) of the possible 99 successfully completed survey respondents were male, leaving just 10.1% female (10 respondents). 89.9% of respondents (89 persons) reported that they were married or living with a partner, while 10.1% respondents (10) stated that they are unmarried and do not live with a partner.

Racial and ethnic alignment showed that 88.9% (88 respondents) identified as white/Caucasian, 5.1% (5 respondents) identified as Black or African American, while 2% (two respondents) identified as Latino or Hispanic, 1% (one respondent) aligned with a racial or ethnic identity listed as “other,” and lastly, 3% (three respondents) chose not to answer the question. Also, it is necessary to point out that 0% of respondents reported their ethnicity as Asian/Pacific Islander, Arabic/Middle Eastern, or Native American/Alaskan/Hawaiian. Results from the survey referencing respondents’ racial and ethnicity identification, gender, age, and other demographic characteristics are shown below in Table 2 the Appendix, “NCAA Division I Athletic Director Profile”.

### **Salary**

Next, the survey examined current NCAA Division I athletic director salaries. Table 3 (see Appendix) displays current salaries of NCAA Division I athletic directors as a percentage of

the study's participants. Six (6.1%) of the study's 99 participants elected not to disclose their salary and did not answer the question. Table 3 displays the percentage of salary among only the 93 participants who answered the question. The highest range of annual salary reported within the study ranged between \$120,000 and \$139,999 and was 18.3% of the 93 participants who chose to answer the question. The next highest salary range corresponded between \$140,000 - \$159,999 and included 16.2% of the current study's participants. After reaching a peak in the majority of participants with 18.3% of an annual salary between \$120,000 - \$139,999, a continual diminishing trend in salary was reported until an extreme peak with 15.1% participants reporting making \$260,000 or more annually in their salary. By far, the most common range in salary among NCAA Division I athletic directors ranged between \$120,000 and \$179,999 which 60.3% of the study's participants reported making.

### **Bonuses**

Additionally, the study evaluated bonuses that current NCAA Division I athletic directors receive. 33.3% (33 persons) participants reported receiving bonuses based upon team's athletic performance (e.g. record, championship, tournament accomplishment). Also, 27.3% of participants (27 persons) reported receiving bonuses based upon a team or team's academic accomplishments or achievement.

## **Research Question #2**

### **Educational Background**

#### *Highest Degree Level*

Next, the study sought to collect data referencing degree level and degree type. Of the 99 participants, all possessed at least a bachelor's degree. 13.1% (13 persons) had only a bachelor's

degree, 68.7% (68 persons) possessed a master's degree as their highest level of education, and 18.2% (18 persons) possessed a doctorate. It should also be noted that four percent (four persons) of the participants obtained an associate's degree before continuing their education.

### ***Bachelor's Degree Field***

The study next sought to identify common degree fields and majors amongst current athletic directors. As previously mentioned, it was identified through the survey that all 99 participants possess a bachelor's degree, however, the survey next attempted to identify the degree field or major that the participants achieved the degree in. However, although 99 of the participants possess a bachelor's degree only 68 of the 99 participants successfully identified their bachelor degree field or major, while the other 31 participants chose not to disclose their degree field. Table 4 (seen in Appendix) displays the most common bachelor degree fields from the 68 participant's responses.

A majority of 20.6% of participants possess a bachelor's degree in physical education, while the next most common degree field was business representing 17.6% of the participants. Following that, a degree field of political science with 10.3% amongst the participants was the third most common. The next most common degree field was history with 7.4% of the participants along with 7.4% with a major degree field in finance or accounting. After such, degree fields of sport management or athletic administration, education, science, and journalism each achieved 5.9% of the survey's field. Next at 4.4% of the participants were both the fields of economics and psychology. Lastly, 2.9% of the participants received bachelor's degrees in the field of mathematics and 1.4% received a bachelor's degree in the field of public policy.

### ***Master's Degree Field***

The study further identified common master's degree fields in which current athletic directors possess. Although 86 participants possess at least a master's degree, four of the participants that possess a Ph.D. did not disclose their master's degree field, and six other participants did not disclose their degree field, which left 76 of the participants who possess a master's degree disclosing their degree field. As shown in Table 5 (see Appendix), a majority of 35.5% (27 participants) possessed a master's degree in either sport management or athletic administration, while 31.6% (24 participants) possess a master's degree in education or higher education. Following that, 18.4% of the participants (14 persons) possess a master of business administration degree or in the field of management. The next most common master's degree field was in physical education with 7.9% of the participants (6 persons). After such, there was only one participant for each of the following degree fields: leadership and communications, chemistry, physiology, political science, and public administration, each receiving 1.3% of the 76 participants who disclosed their master's degree field.

### ***Doctorate Degree Field***

Of the 18 participants who possess a doctorate degree, 44.4% (eight persons) respondents have obtained it in either education or higher education administration/leadership. 38.8% (seven persons) of respondents possess a doctorate degree in the fields of sport administration, sport management, or physical education. Of the three remaining respondents who possess a doctorate, one received it in public policy, another in chemistry, and the last a M.D. Below, Table 4 aligns the degree types.



### **Research Question #3**

#### **Job Experience**

Next, the study sought to evaluate similarities among the job experiences current NCAA Division I athletic directors possess. Based on the study's participants, on average, they have worked for their current institution for 10.68 years at any position, and have served as the head athletic director for an average length of 7.22 years at their current institution. The study also determined that the participants have served 10.44 years (on average) as head athletic directors at any institution (See Table 2, Appendix). Also, 79.8% (79 persons) of the study's participants reported that they have received employment for a job within an athletic department in part because of the networking connections they have formed with associates within collegiate athletics. Also, the study's participants reported that they identified being a NCAA Division I head athletic director as their career goal at an average age of 32 years old. However, participant's responses ranged from age 7 to 60 years old (see Table 2, Appendix).

#### ***Occupational History and Experience***

The study next sought to understand the career progression NCAA Division I athletic directors took to achieve their role as head athletic director. The electronic survey administered identified the participant's occupational history including the title of the position and years at the position, along with identifying the job title of the position held directly before assuming their current position of head athletic director. Table 6 (see Appendix) illustrates the prior positions and job experiences gathered by the ninety-nine current NCAA Division I athletic directors that participated in the study. The most common position possessed by current NCAA Division I athletic directors was assistant and, or associate athletic director which 65.6% (sixty-five

participants) identified working. This finding correlates exactly with the position the participants identified possessing directly before assuming their current position of head athletic director, which will be further discussed later in the chapter.

The next most common position held throughout the career of current NCAA Division I athletic directors was a college coaching position with 36.4% (36 participants). Accordingly, the third most common position held was a coach of a high school team which 29.3% (29 participants) reportedly served as. 25.3% (twenty-five participants) reported serving as a graduate assistant, followed by 24.2 percent% (24 participants) identified working with development and fundraising for college athletics. Next, 21.2% (twenty-one participants) worked within marketing for a collegiate department, which was followed by 20.2% (twenty participant) reportedly working as a high school teacher.

The eighth most common position held by NCAA Division I athletic director was working business management within a collegiate athletic department with 19.2% (19 participants). 16.2% (sixteen participants) reported working compliance within a collegiate athletic department, followed by 13.1% (13 participants) reported working event management for collegiate athletics along with thirteen participants working within intercollegiate operations with collegiate athletics. 10.1% (ten participants) reported working as a college professor, while 7.1% (seven participants) reported serving as a high school athletic director at some point throughout their career. 6.1% (six participants) reported working facilities or equipment management for a collegiate athletic department, while 5.1% (five participants) reported working within a collegiate athletic conference at some point throughout their career. 4.0% (four participants) worked as a high school principal or assistant principal as well as serving with

academic support or advising for student-athletes, and general university administration higher education positions (non-athletic position). Another 3% all reported working within the following positions: administration for professional sport, communications with a collegiate athletic department, collegiate athletic ticket office, and clerical duties within a collegiate athletic department. Lastly, 2% of the participants all reported working the following jobs: collegiate athletic director for a community or junior college, athletic trainer, sports information, administration for college campus recreation, and administration for community or public administration.

#### ***Years Held at Prior Positions***

Next, the study evaluated the time, measured in years, that current NCAA Division I athletic directors spent at their previous positions held throughout their career. The purpose of this was to evaluate the career progression and identify similarities in the positions and departments current athletic directors acquired throughout their job experiences. Among this, participants identified all prior positions held throughout their career along with the time spent at the positions.

All of the aforementioned positions reported by the study's participants were next assessed in effort to identifying the minimum as well as maximum time spent at the positions along with the overall mean time spent at the position. Table 7 (see Appendix) breaks down the prior positions held by job position while correlating with the percentage of participants reported working the position, along with the years the participants reported serving at the position. This was next evaluated by assessing the minimum reported time spent at the position before receiving a promotion or receiving a higher position, along with the maximum or most amount of

time reported at the position before accepting a higher position or promotion reported by the participants. Lastly, the average (or mean) amount of time spent at the position was then calculated to evaluate the average amount of time the participants reported serving the specific position before receiving a promotion or higher position. Table 7 (see Appendix) numerically displays the participant's survey results in regards to the years spent at the identified positions.

On average, participants served as assistant or associate athletic director for 8.9 years before ascending to a head athletic director position. As for the next most reported position held by the study's participants, a college coach, participants served 11.8 years on average. Participants who worked as a high school coach, on average worked 5.4 years at the position before leaving the position. Participants who worked within development and fundraising within a collegiate athletic department reported working 6.5 years on average. Also, the 21.2% of participants who worked within the marketing department for collegiate athletics reported working only 3.7 years at the position. Participants who worked as a high school teacher served 5.7 years on average. Participants within the department of business management within a collegiate athletic department worked 7.8 years on average, while participants working within the compliance department within collegiate athletics worked 7.5 years. With 13% of the participants reported working within event management for collegiate athletics, the average time worked within the department was 5.5 years. The 13% who reported working with sport operations within a collegiate athletic department served at the position for 4.7 years on average. Table 7 (see Appendix) further displays the rest of the departments and position reported, along with the positions that were not discussed due to the lack of participants reporting working the position.

### ***Job Held Directly Before Assuming Current Position***

Upon identifying themes in the career path and occupational history among current NCAA Division I athletic director, the study sought to determine the position most common among current athletic directly before assuming their position at their current institution. Table 8 (see Appendix) displays the results. As previously discussed, a total number of 65 participants served as an assistant or associate athletic director throughout their career. However, the current study took it one step further and assessed the specific position held directly before assuming the participant's current position of head athletic director. As shown in Table 8 (see Appendix), a majority response of 28.3% of current athletic directors succeeded directly to their current position from formally being an assistant or associate athletic director. The next most common position held by current athletic directors directly before assuming their current position was an equal percentage of 26.3% between senior associate or executive associate athletic directors (head of a specific department within an athletic department at a university) and a head athletic director at another institution. Next, it was determined that 10.1% of the participants were head coaches of a team at a university before assuming their current position of head athletic directors, while 6.0% were formally chief executive officers of a business or commissioners of an athletic conference. Lastly, 3.0% of the study's participants identified that they were either a dean or a higher education official directly before assuming their current position of head athletic director of a NCAA Division I institution.

## Research Question #4

### Operations Involvement

Next, the study evaluated athletic directors' weekly involvement in regards to specific departments and operations within a NCAA Division I athletic department. Participants responded to a series of 16 core responsibilities of which current athletic directors would either oversee or be directly involved in. Participants had the options of selecting "uninvolved," "slightly involved," "involved," or "heavily involved." The aforementioned responses had the following meanings: uninvolved = zero times a week/never, slightly involved = once a week, involved = 2-3 times a week, heavily involved = 3 or more times a week to daily. A numeric value was given for coding purposes to interpret the participant's responses based upon the aforementioned scale: 1= uninvolved, 2= slightly involved, 3= involved, and 4= heavily involved. Table 9 (see Appendix) displays the responses from 99 NCAA Division I athletic directors. Also, Table 9 (see Appendix) further displays the mean and ranges for the participants results for their operations involvement.

The top five results revealed that the most time throughout a given week is allocated to financials and budgetary oversight with it receiving a 3.77 on average, followed by internal policy making (3.76), then fundrasing and development (3.70), community relations (3.68), and then by external policy making at 3.58. The completed results are shown in Table 9 (see Appendix).

## **Research Question #5**

### **Job and Career Satisfaction**

The study implemented the Life Satisfaction Survey by Lounsbury (2010) to evaluate job and career satisfaction among current NCAA Division I athletic directors. Lounsbury's study (2010) evaluated respondents within their perceived job satisfaction, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction on a five-point Likert scale. For the purpose of the current study, job satisfaction and career satisfaction were evaluated among the survey's participants. Lounsbury's study (2010) is formatted with a set of two phrases separated with a closed-ended responses with a rating of one to five, and the respondent is asked to read the following sets of phrases and think about how they act most of the time or how they most characteristically feel or think when you are at work (on their job). Lounsbury's scale reflected a positive relationship with the participant's response. For example, the more satisfied the participant was with his or his job or career, the closer (and numerically higher) their response would be to the statement. For instance, to more clearly elaborate, if one of the questions asked: "I am typically unhappy at my job: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: I am typically happy at my job."

All of the study's 99 participants participated in this section of the survey. Overwhelmingly, respondents scored a 4.23 on average (ranging from one, the lowest very unsatisfied, to five, the highest, very satisfied) for their job satisfaction for being a current NCAA Division I athletic director. Furthermore, the average score for participant's career satisfaction was a 4.43 on a scale of one to five (one= very unsatisfied, five= very satisfied). In correlation with Lounsbury's Life Satisfaction Survey (2010), the current study's participants showed very high job satisfaction along with extremely high career satisfaction. Additionally,

62.6% of the study's participants (62 persons) reported that they plan on retiring from or remaining at their current institution, while 37.4% reported that they did not plan on retiring from or remaining at the their current institution.

### ***Motivation to Pursue Career***

Following the participant's job and career satisfaction as a NCAA Division I athletic director, the study then sought to evaluate the participants' motivation to pursue a career as a collegiate athletic director. 47.5% of the participants disclosed that their motivation to pursue a career in collegiate athletics as an NCAA Division I athletic director was to give back, help others, and make a difference in the student-athletes lives. Following that, 26.3% of the participants disclosed that their motivation for working in collegiate athletics as an athletic director was because they had a passion and love for sports and athletics and wanted to follow their passion and interests. Next, 16.2% of the participants disclosed that it was a natural progression in their career, an opportunity that presented itself, and for career advancement. Lastly, 10% revealed that it was because they enjoyed the competitive atmosphere and the daily and weekly challenges that they pursue a career as a NCAA Division I athletic director.

### ***Rewarding***

In an attempt to further understand the role of working as a head athletic director for a NCAA Division I institution, the study identified what was most rewarding and also what was most discouraging or troublesome part of being a head athletic director. Upon analyzing and coding the open-ended responses from the current study's participants, an overwhelming majority of 62.2% revealed that the most rewarding part of being an athletic director was assisting, helping, and working with the student-athletes. This includes the student-athletes



efforts both on and off of the field or court of play and primarily towards the ultimate step of graduation.

Next, 22.4% revealed that the most rewarding aspect of serving as an athletic director was the relationships formed. This included relationships formed with employees and coaches within the athletic department, and within the institution, conferences, and community. Next, 9.2% disclosed that it was the competition and opportunity to both win and compete for championships that they found the most rewarding. Lastly, 3.1% disclosed that they simply enjoyed being in charge as the director of the athletic department, along with another 3.1% who fell into the category of other due to the nature of their responses.

#### ***Discouraging and Troublesome***

Lastly, the study sought to understand what was most discouraging and the most troublesome part of being a current NCAA Division I athletic director. Again, the responses were within an open-ended format in which the athletic directors' responses were then coded based upon the primary criteria of their statement. A majority of 53% disclosed that the most troublesome and discouraging part of being a NCAA Division I athletic director was the financial restraints, budgetary requirements, and constant need for funding. Next, 8% were both the categories of dealing with personnel and personnel issues, along with 8% in regards to compliance related issues and student-athlete academic eligibility. Following that, unreasonable expectations and the lack of understanding of what collegiate athletics is actually about (e.g. too much emphasis on just winning) received 6.0% of the participant's responses. Next, 5% revealed that media, news, internet misconceptions were the most troublesome and discouraging part of being a head athletic director. 4% identified parental involvement as the most troublesome or

discouraging part of being a head athletic director, and the following areas all received 3% of the participant's response of being the most troublesome or discouraging part of being an athletic director: politics, pressure and blame, and time restraints. 2% of the participants felt that the NCAA was the most discouraging part of their job and lastly, 1% felt that planning was the most troublesome and discouraging part of being a NCAA Division I athletic director. Table 10 (see Appendix) displays the results from this section of the survey.

## **Significant Findings**

### **RQ 1: Race and Gender Representation**

There were many useful findings determined throughout the study. A discovery the study obtained was the alarming discrepancy among diversity within current NCAA Division I athletic directors in both gender and minority representation. The study identified that an overwhelming majority, 88.9% of current NCAA Division I athletic directors reported their racial identification as white or Caucasian, while 5.1% reported their racial identification as black or African American following with 2% aligning as Latino or Hispanic. Three percent of the participants elected not to disclose their race and one percent selected "other" as their racial identification, and no one within the study aligned their racial identification as Asian/Pacific Islander, Arabic or Middle Eastern, or Native American, Alaskan, or Hawaiian. Furthermore, 89.9% of the study's participants were male, while only 10.1% out of the 99 current NCAA Division I athletic directors in the study were female. The study's results correlate similarly with Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser's (2011) findings from 2010 in that females make up only 8.3% of the NCAA Division I athletic directors. Similarly, the NCAA's study in conjunction with Zgonc (2010), found that from 2008-2009, female NCAA Division I athletic director represented on 9.4%,

while males represented 90.6% of the occupation. Also, the study's 99 participants reflect a more than accurate representation of the entire NCAA Division I athletic director occupation.

The study's results in regards to minority representation among Division I athletic director again yielded nearly identical results to Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser's (2011) study in conjunction with the NCAA which revealed that 88.8% of athletic directors at the NCAA Division I level identified as white or Caucasian, 7.4% identified as African-American, 2.2% as Latino, .9% as Native American, and 0 percent identified as Asian. The author believes that the NCAA is aware of this discrepancy and would infer that these facts are in correlation with the NCAA's diversity initiatives in order to achieve inclusive excellence. The socio-demographic information collected from the study further justifies the need for diversity initiatives within the collegiate administration career field. As discussed within the literature review (Chapter 2) by Outley and Dean (2007), Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006), Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007), and Sander (2011) and displayed within the study's results, networking, mentoring, opportunity, and job position all directly impact one's career growth within the athletic administration career field, and yet literature shows that these factors in career growth are often assisted by one's socio-demographic background. Factors such as the "old boys' network" and homosocial reproduction both directly impact these factors and further hinder the career growth of women and minorities within collegiate athletics and as NCAA Division I athletic directors. However, although these barriers (old boys' network and homosocial reproduction) are constructed from the top down, they directly impact the career development at lower level within the athletic department, and especially within coaching.

## **RQ 2: Educational History and Degree Field**

Another significant finding the study discovered was the background information referencing current NCAA Division I athletic director educational history, including how 20.6% of participants possess a bachelor's degree in physical education, while the next most common degree fields were business representing 17.6% and political science representing 10.3% of the study's participants. However, a significant shift in the degree field was discovered between the participant's bachelors and master level degrees, specifically within the degree field of sport management and athletic administration. The sport management and athletic administration degree fields represented only 5.9% of the bachelor level degrees, however, a significant increase to 35.5% represented sport management and athletic administration at the master's level degree field and was the most common degree field among the participant's for the master's level. It also should be noted that the degree field of business remained relatively constant from 17.6% at the bachelor's level to 18.6% at the master's degree level.

An inverse relationship existed between the physical education and sport management/athletic administration degree field between the bachelors and master's degree levels. As mentioned, the most common bachelor's degree field (20.6%) was physical education. However, the degree field took a significant drop at the master's degree level to 7.9%. A similar pattern was discovered within the degree field of sport management and athletic administration. At the bachelor's degree level sport management and athletic administration represented only 5.9% of the participants. However, the degree field saw a tremendous increase at the master's degree level with 35.5% of the participants obtaining their master's degree within the sport management or athletic administration degree field.

Other findings of the current study in regards to the participant's educational history include 31.6% (24 persons) possess a master's degree in education or higher education, while only 5.9% pursued a bachelor's degree in the field of education. These relationships may exist between the education degree levels and degree fields due to the participant's career goal identification age and thus advancing to a specialized degree field.

As mentioned, the consistency of the business degree field between the bachelor's and master's degree level may be attributed to the growing demand of athletics and collegiate athletic departments emphasis on budgetary oversight, financials, and development and marketing procedures (see Appendix, Table 6, 7, & 9). The occupational field of collegiate athletic administration may see a continued shift in the master's level degree field to business related degrees, such as Master of Business Administration (MBA) and management type degrees. Based upon the study's results, master level degree fields may see continued growth within the field of sport management and athletic administration, and business related fields, which may in turn see other degree fields such as higher education and leadership see a continued decrease among NCAA Division I athletic director degrees

### **RQ 3: Occupational History and Career Growth**

In evaluating the survey's results, a majority of participants, 65.6% reported serving as an assistant or associate athletic director throughout their career, as well as, 28.7% reported that they served as an assistant or associate athletic director directly before assuming their current position of head athletic director. Along with this, the study concluded that 26.9% reported serving as senior associate or executive associate athletic directors directly before becoming a head athletic director for a NCAA Division I institution.

It was also evident that while the study attempted to identify a common career path and progression of current athletic directors, only certain conclusions could be made. As discussed, there was a wide range of positions and departments from which current NCAA Division I athletic directors ascended to their position of director of athletics. However, what was determined is that there was a progression among the participants of working within a collegiate athletic department throughout their career and ascending to their positions as well as acquiring the necessary experience, which was measured in position title and years at the position. Apart from serving as an assistant or associate athletic director, what was next displayed most by 36.4% participants was holding the position of a college coach at some point throughout their career, and on average this position was held for 11.8 years. Following that, the third most common position to be held throughout the career of a NCAA Division I athletic director was a high school coach with 29.3% of the participants reported holding this position for 5.4 years on average. This finding in part leads to identifying that coaching at both the high school (interscholastic) and collegiate (intercollegiate) level both play a significant role in the development and career growth of NCAA Division I athletic directors.

If this proves to hold true, the barriers keeping women and minorities out of coaching, as discussed in the literature review by Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006) and Outley and Dean (2007) could as well as directly impact their chances to pursue their athletic administration career at an administrative level within an athletic department. While a significant amount of participants reported coaching at the intercollegiate and interscholastic level, only 10.1% reported serving as the head athletic director directly after their coaching position. Furthermore, the study showed that 28.3% reported working as an assistant or associate athletic and 26.3%

worked as a senior associate or executive associate athletic director directly before getting the position of the head athletic director for a NCAA Division I athletic department. This illustrates that career development and career mobility are both necessary to achieve the position of athletic director at a Division I institution. The ability to go from coaching to head athletic director is very unlikely, rather, career growth is necessary within the athletic department to develop the knowledge and experience required for the position. And thus, the barriers at the lower level positions (Outley and Dean, 2007) continue to further hinder the opportunity to pursue the management (assistant/ associate athletic director) and senior management (executive/ senior athletic director) positions which are typically necessary and, or required for the head athletic director position.

#### **RQ 4: Operations Involvement**

The study also revealed that current Division I athletic directors serve a wide variety of roles at their respected institutions. In doing so, the study assessed the participant's activity and departmental involvement on a daily and weekly basis, the most involved areas which participants reported being involved in three or more times a week to daily are represented in corresponding order: financials and budgetary oversight (3.77, heavily involved), followed by internal policy making (3.76, heavily involved), then development and fundraising (3.70, heavily involved), then community relations (3.68, heavily involved), external policy making (3.57, heavily involved), campus relations (3.52, heavily involved), and business management (3.40, heavily involved). Responses for involvement for human resources, employment, and sport operations ranged from one to four on the scale and had a mean average between 3.26 and 3.19 (involved). Communications, marketing, and compliance and risk management involvement had

responses scaled between two and four but had an overall lower average between 3.18 and 3.05 (involved). Lastly, the areas Division I athletic directors reported the least involvement in were facilities and equipment, recruiting, teaching, and coaching. All received involvement responses ranging from one to four on the weighted scale but receiving the lower average per the participant's 2.87 to 1.35 (slightly involved).

The activity and operations involvement positively aligned with the participant's job satisfaction for the corresponding activity, and thus the more discouraging and troublesome parts of the position, identified by the participants, were actually what they spent the most time involved in. Also, results from research question four could impact a trend in the potential degree field shift due to the time spent on the business-like activities and operations required for the athletic director position.

#### **RQ 5: Job and Career Satisfaction**

As previously noted, current NCAA Division I athletic directors that participated reported extremely high job and career satisfaction in correlation to Lounsbury's Life Satisfaction Survey (2010). The average job satisfaction score for participants was 4.23, while their average career satisfaction was 4.43 which represented highly satisfied to extremely satisfied. This could be due to the participant's motivation for entering this career field. Responses for current athletic director's motivation to become a Division I athletic director display a care and motivation to help student-athletes excel in both sport and academics (47.5%), while 26.3% responded that they possess a passion and love for sports and athletics and decided to pursue their passion with a career.



In correlation with the participants job and career satisfaction is their responses for what they found to be the most rewarding part of being a Division I athletic director; an overwhelming majority of 62.2% revealed that the most rewarding part of being an athletic director was assisting, helping, and working with the student-athletes, which corresponds exactly with their motivation for pursuing this career path. 22.4% revealed that was most rewarding as serving as an athletic director was the relationships formed. Next, 9.2% disclosed that it was the competition and opportunity to both win and compete for championships that they found the most rewarding, which also can be interpreted as their motivation for entering the career field based upon their passion and love for sports and athletics.

However, what was found to be the most discouraging and troublesome part of being a NCAA Division I athletic director was the financial restraints, budgetary requirements, and constant need for funding, which 53% of the participants aligned with this position. This corresponds exactly with what the participants identified what they are most involved in on a daily and weekly basis; financials and budgetary oversight (3.77) and development and fundraising (3.70). The next most common response only represented 8% of the participants and were dealing with personnel issues, along with 8% in regards to compliance related issues and student-athlete academic eligibility. Following that, unreasonable expectations and the understanding of what collegiate athletics is actually about received 6.0% of the participant's responses.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions and Recommendations

#### Study Limitations

The purpose of this study was to provide an occupational profile of NCAA Division I athletic directors in order to identify a common career path and occupational profile. Through analyzing the study's results and identifying common trends and themes within current NCAA Division I athletic directors' socio-demographics, educational background, professional experience, career mobility, motivation, and evaluating perceived job and career satisfaction, certain conclusions and findings were discovered. However, certain limitations do apply to the study. While NCAA Division I membership institutions are relatively small in number and thus a limited survey response rate, a non-response bias, could alter the outcome of the study had there been a higher participation rate. While the participant socio-demographic and institution demographic findings in the study identified similarly to the "NCAA Member Institutions Personnel Report: Race and Gender Demographics" (Zgonc, 2010) and "The 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport" (Lapchick, Hoff, Kaiser, 2011) potential limitations can exist.

Also, the institutional size of NCAA Division I membership institutions range dramatically, and each institution may put a different emphasis on the qualities and attributes sought in a athletic director and thus could influence the reasons to why the hire a particular applicant for the head athletic director position, and would also influence what prior positions the head athletic director originated from in determining the career growth. Also, while the role of Division I athletic directors may vary from institution to institution, educational background,

such as degree level and degree type may vary and could possibly inaccurately display a range of educational backgrounds, making it rather difficult to determine common educational background theme and trend. In addition, the operations involvement among athletic director could be dependent upon the institution and athletic department needs and mission and thus could fluctuate from year to year and institution to institution.

### **Future Research**

Future research may best serve at the NCAA Division I conference affiliation level, such as studying and analyzing institutions similar in athletic department operating revenue, size, and the importance put upon collegiate athletic operations in order to best determine common characteristics amongst the head athletic directors within the conference. This may be used to best evaluate common institutional athletic department goals, objectives, and also common leadership, educational, and personality traits among the hired athletic directors. Also, future research may be useful at the NCAA Division II and Division III level in order to serve as an occupational background based upon the NCAA membership affiliation athletic purposes.

Lastly, a core area to be examined is collegiate athletic director personality and leadership styles. Further research examining the type of personality traits common amongst NCAA Division I athletic director would be beneficial in examining the occupational burnout within the field and also what traits are most common within current athletic directors.

### **Further Research within Leadership Styles**

The Styles of Leadership Survey (SLS; Hall & Williams, 1986) which was further used by Ryska (2009) in a study that attempted to assess programs goals, leadership, and occupational burnout among intercollegiate sport coaches. Further research in future studies can draw from the

Styles of Leadership Survey (SLS) in order to assess how athletic directors approach decision-making, problem-solving, and situational adaptation dilemmas within the context of their job-related duties (Ryska, 2009).

### **Conclusion & Recommendations**

The occupational field of collegiate athletics administration is a growing field and additional research is necessary to further understand the administrators and professionals within the field. While the study included several objective criteria which were evaluated from the electronic survey results, the five main objectives and research questions of the study were assessed based upon current NCAA Division I athletic director support and participation within the study. The participant's personal socio-demographics identified the need for diversity and gender representation within collegiate athletic departments. Furthermore, while assessing the participant's socio-demographics and career growth, similarities were identified between the existing barriers for women and minorities at entry level positions, specifically, within coaching. As previously discussed in the literature review (Chapter 2), methods for evaluating the barriers into the athletic administration career field and coaching by Sagas, Cunningham and Teed (2006), Knoppers and Anthonissen (2007), and Carpenter and Acosta (2010) are necessary due to the on-going discrepancy in the representation of women and minorities within collegiate athletics administration.

Also, demographic information pertaining the participant's institutional athletic department was useful in displaying the size of an athletic department, measuring both employment, as well as, varsity sports and the average number of student-athletes that are supported among NCAA Division I collegiate athletic departments.

Next, the data collected which evaluated current athletic director's educational level and major degree field is essential for young professionals and current students who aspire to pursue a career within collegiate athletic administration. The study provided a series of degree fields which can suit working within the occupation and further evaluated both bachelor degree fields as well as master's degree fields. The findings suggest that advanced degrees and education are essential; only 13.1% had a bachelor's degree as their highest level of education, while 68.7% possessed a master's degree as their highest educational level, and 18.2 % possessed a doctorate. As discussed in the significant findings (Chapter 4), the author hypothesizes that there may be a continual increase and shift within the educational background of future NCAA Division I athletic director. Based upon the study's operations and activity results being heavily focused around business-like responsibilities, there may soon be a strong shift in the educational background of Division I athletic directors possessing advanced degrees within the business and management fields and specifically, Master of Business Administration degrees.

Also, current athletic directors' involvements in the daily and weekly operations were evaluated to further understand not only the position but also the current needs of collegiate athletic departments. Overwhelmingly, based upon the NCAA Division I athletic directors who participated in the study, tremendous attention and time are allocated to financials and budgetary oversight along with development and fundraising as well as internal policy making of the athletic department and community relations. These operations involvement are done on a daily basis based upon the participant's responses. Those involvement responsibilities were closely followed by external policy making, campus relations, business management, and human resources and employment.

While a common career path and progression was not determined by the data collected from the current study's participants; the data collected does illustrate the opportunity to work within numerous different departments within a collegiate athletic department and provide an equal opportunity for advancement to serve as a head collegiate athletic director. While common departments and positions did exist, the results were inconclusive to identify a specific career path within a specific department.

Lastly, the study's participant's identified extremely high career satisfaction along with very high job satisfaction based upon Lounsbury's study (2010). Furthermore, upon analyzing the open-ended responses from current athletic directors, many serve their position with a strong passion to helping student-athletes succeed athletically but more importantly academically. Participant's motivation for entering the career field and with identifying the most rewarding part of their job proved that the combination of the passion and love for collegiate athletics and the desire to help and assist student-athletes provided a rewarding atmosphere for their job. Furthermore, in evaluating the most troublesome and discouraging part of the role of head athletic director of a Division I athletic department coincided with what they are directly involved with most and spend the most time doing; financial budgetary oversight, and fundraising and development.

### **Impact of Bonuses**

Although, seemingly minor, the study also assessed the number of NCAA Division I athletic directors receiving bonuses both based on a team's athletic performance (e.g. record, championship, tournament accomplishment) and academic accomplishment (e.g. team grade point average). The results determined that 33.3% of athletic directors participating in the study

receive a bonus based upon a team's athletic performance, while 27.3% reported receiving a bonus based upon a team's academic accomplishment. While the difference is not immensely significant, it does represent a disconnect between collegiate athletics and the institutions of higher education that they represent. As a former NCAA Division I student-athlete who was supported by both athletic and academic scholarships, the emphasis put on *student-athlete* should not be overlooked nor epitomized for purely athletic results. However, this process of the overemphasizing a university's athletic accomplishment seem to evolve within the athletic department themselves rather than on outside influences, and this is clearly seen based upon the participant's athletic accomplishments bonus incentives. While the author recognizes the job title of *athletic* director, and understands the positions responsibilities, the position and department is still directly associated with the institution of higher education and thus believes the emphasis on academic achievement should outweigh the importance of athletics.

### **Homosocial Reproduction and "Old Boys' Network"**

#### ***Job and Career Growth: Top-down impacts from the bottom-up, for experience***

As the study referred to several previous studies in examining the socio-demographic background of its participants, direct parallels were determined and previous theories such as Kanter's theory of homosocial reproduction (1977) and the ensuing byproduct of the "old boys network" were seen within the study's results. Factors which further perpetuate these occurrences in the lack of gender and minority representation in collegiate athletics and within the athletic director position were evaluated based upon the study's participants results. As discussed, the study determined that there is a clear conjointment between the career growth in becoming an athletic director and coaching. 65.7% of NCAA Division I athletic director that

participated in the study reported working as a coach for either a college or high school sports team. Just as there is a severe lack in gender representation among Division I athletic directors (10.1% of female athletic directors in the study; and 8.3% NCAA Division I female athletic directors in 2010) (Lapchick et al., 2011), there is also a large discrepancy within the representation of female coaches in college athletics, with only 42.6% of women's sport teams being coached by a female in 2010 (Acosta, & Carpenter, 2010). While men coach 57.4% of female college sport teams, women coach of less than 3% of men's college sport teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). If a significant predictor and outlier in becoming an athletic director is indeed coaching, the lack of gender representation at the highest level of a collegiate athletic department (e.g. athletic director), may in part start with the lack of gender representation at the lower level positions (e.g. coaches and assistant coaches) and thus diminishes the career development and growth of women in the field of collegiate administration. Furthermore, 78.9% of the study's participants directly stated that they received employment for a job within an athletic department in part because of the networking connections formed with associates within collegiate athletics. While networking exists within all career fields, one main concern is that the relationships formed through a mentor-protégé opportunity (Avery, Tonidandel, & Phillips, 2007) and networking within the collegiate athletic administration may be based upon homosocial reproduction and the "old boys' network" and thus further diminish the chances for women and minority advancement within the profession.

As mentioned, this discrepancy in regards to inclusive excellence within the collegiate athletic administration career field is not solely against the inclusion of women but also for minorities. Data examined from the study's survey results concurs with the existing data for



minority representation in collegiate athletic administration. In regards to race, whites make up 89.3% of the head coaching position among NCAA Division I men's sports, while African-Americans held 6.6% of the coaching positions in 2010 (Lapchick, et al., 2011). Within NCAA Division I women's sports there is little change with whites holding 87.7% of the coaching positions, while African-Americans held 7.2% (Lapchick, et al., 2011). In the sport of NCAA Division I men's basketball, the representation of African-American coaches have actually experienced a continual decrease since 2005-2006 when African-American represented 25.2% of the Division I men's basketball coaches, which is now down to 21.0% in 2010 (Lapchick, et al., 2011).

The importance of career development for ensuing the position of a NCAA Division I athletic director cannot be understated. While barriers for minority representation start at the lower level, it persists throughout collegiate athletic administration career field and diminishes the chances for career growth within the athletic department, as it was clearly determined that of the 65.7% reported working as a coach, only 10.1% of the Division I athletic director assumed the position directly from serving as a coach. The career development of becoming an assistant athletic director in order to one day ascend to the head athletic director position is essential. The study's results showed that 28.3% participants (largest amount reported for position held directly before current) served as an assistant or associate athletic director directly before becoming a NCAA Division I head athletic director, further displaying the need for career development after the participants' coaching career. The impact of homosocial reproduction is apparent at the athletic director level, however, it perpetuates among the lower levels within the collegiate athletic administration career field.

Diversity through gender and minority representation is necessary within the career field of athletic administration and specifically within NCAA Division I athletic directors. Future research is necessary in order to monitor the progress. Ideas and initiatives by the NCAA are currently being developed to increase diversity within the career field, however, more initiatives must be instilled within the lower-level and entry-level positions within the career field to help career development and achieve career growth.

**List of References**

## References

- Acosta, V. R., & Carpenter, L. J. (2010). *Women in Intercollegiate Sport. Acosta/Carpenter Inc. West Brookfield, MA*, 11p.
- Avery, D. R., Tonidandel, S., & Phillips, M. S. (2007). Similarity on Sports Sidelines: How Mentor-Protégé Sex Similarity Affects Mentoring. *Spring Science and Business Media, LLC*, 58: 72-80.
- Bedeian, A. G., Cavazos, D. E., Hunt, J. G., & Jauch, L. R. (2010). Doctoral Degree Prestige and the Academic Marketplace: A Study of Career Mobility Within the Management Discipline. [Article]. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(1), 11-25.
- Bigliardi, B, and Ivo Dormio, A., 2009. "R&D Personnel Career Routes: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*. 4,1; 8-21.
- BNet, 2010. BNet Business Dictionary, CBS Interactive Inc. Retrieved March 21, 2010 from <http://dictionary.bnet.com/definition/career+path.html>.**
- Chelladurai, P., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1984). Operative goals of intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of athletic administrators. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science*, 9, 3341.
- Chelladurai, P., Inglis, S., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1983). Priorities in intercollegiate athletics: Development of a scale. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 14, 32-45.
- Feldt, R. C., & Woelfel, C. (2009). FIVE-FACTOR PERSONALITY DOMAINS, SELF-EFFICACY, CAREER-OUTCOME EXPECTATIONS, AND CAREER INDECISION. *College Student Journal*, 43(2), 429-437.
- Hall, J., & Williams, M.S. (1986). *Styles of Leadership Survey*. The Woodlands, TX: Teleometrics International.
- Hoch, D. (1996). Overall organization for the athletic director. *Coach & Athletic Director*, 66(5), 6.
- Hoch, D. (2003). Are you an entrenched AD. *Coach & Athletic Director*, 73(1), p. 8-9.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kennedy, M. (1998). A Cultural Analysis of Homosocial Reproduction and Contesting Claims to Competence in Transitional Firms. *Working Papers (William Davidson Institute) -- University of Michigan Business School*; 1998, 44p.

**Kingma, M. (2006). Nurses on the move: Migration and the global health care economy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.**

Knoppers, A., & Anthonissen, A. (2007). Gendered Managerial Discourses on Sport Organizations: Multiplicity and Complexity. *Springer Science and Business Media, LLC*, 10 p.

Lapchick, R., Hoff, B., Kaiser, C. (2011). The 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport. *The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) at the University of Central Florida*.

Lewis, B. A., & Quarterman, J. (2006). WHY STUDENTS RETURN FOR A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SPORT MANAGEMENT. *College Student Journal*, 40(4), 717-728.

Lounsbury, J. W. (2010). Life Satisfaction Inventory. Copyright *Resource Associates*, 2010.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1986). Maslach Burnout Inventory. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

**Masterson, M., (2006). Seven Years to Seven Figures: The Fast-Track Plan to Becoming a Millionaire. John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey.**

Outley, C. W., & Dean, W. (2007). Factors Affecting the Upward Mobility of African Americans in the Young Men's Christian Association Movement. *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 25: 75-95.

Pfeffer, J. (1988). A Political Perspective on Careers, Interests, Networks, and Environments. *Stanford University*, 39 p.

Podgers, J. (1980). New Title IX Game Plan: Lawyers to Get the Ball. [Article]. *American Bar Association Journal*, 66(1), 28.

Ross, S. D., Hyejin, B., & Seungum, L. (2007). Assessing Brand Associations for Intercollegiate Ice Hockey. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 16(2), 106-114.

Ryska, T. A. (2002). Leadership Styles and Occupational Stress Among College Athletic Directors: The Moderating Effect of Program Goals. *Journal of Psychology*, 136(2), 195.

Ryska, T. A. (2009). Multivariate Analysis of Program Goals, Leadership Style, and Occupational Burnout Among Intercollegiate Sport Coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 32(4), 476-488.

- Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G. B., & Teed, K. (2006), An Examination of Homologous Reproduction in the Representation of Assistant Coaches of Women's Teams. *Springer Science and Business Media, Inc*, 55:503-510.
- Sagas, M., Paetzold, R., & Ashley, F. (2005). Relational demography on coaching dyads. *Physical Educator*, 62(2), 103-112.
- Sander, L. (2011). In the Game, But Rarely No.1. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 57(26), p.1-16.
- Shaw, S., & Frisby, W. (2006). Can gender equity be more equitable? Promoting an alternative frame for sport management research, education, and practice. *Journal of Sport Management*, 20, 483-509.
- Watkins, D. L., & Rikard, G. L. (1991). Perceptions of leader behaviors of athletic directors: Implications for change. *Physical Educator*, 48(1), 2.
- Whisenant, W., Miller, J. and Pedersen, P.M. ( 2005). Systemic Barriers in Athletic Administration: An Analysis of Job Descriptions for Interscholastic Athletic Directors. *Sex Roles Journal*. Springer Netherlands, 53; 911-918.
- Wolff, H.-G., & Moser, K. (2009). DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS OF NETWORKING ON CAREER MOBILITY. [Article]. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1-6.
- Yamaguchi, S. (2010). The effect of match quality and specific experience on career decisions and wage growth. [Article]. *Labour Economics*, 17(2), 407-423.
- Yukl, G.A. (1982). *Managerial Behavior Survey*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Zgonc, E., (2010). NCAA Member Institutions Personnel Report: Race and Gender Demographics. *National Collegiate Athletic Association*, Indianapolis, IN.

**Appendix**

**Table 1. NCAA DI Athletic Department Profile**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Student-athletes	190	1100	407.21
Student-athlete athletic scholarships	0	255	175.82
Student-athletes supported by athletic scholarship (Percent)	.00	90.00	47.05%
Men's varsity sports	5	36	9.20
Women's varsity sports	7	18	10.02
Football offered as varsity sport at institution (Percent)	69.7	69.7	69.7%
Full-time employees currently working in athletic department	14	325	84.44
Part-time employees currently working in athletic department	0	500	37.53



**Table 2. NCAA Division I Athletic Director Profile**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
<b>Gender</b>	Male	89	89.9	89.9
	Female	10	10.1	10.1
	Total	99	100.0	100.0
<b>Ethnicity/ Racial ID</b>	White/Caucasian	88	88.9%	88.9
	Black/African-American	5	5.1%	5.1
	Latino/Hispanic	2	2.0%	2.0
	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	.0%	.0
	Arabic/Middle Eastern	0	.0%	.0
	Native American/ Alaskan/Hawaiian	0	.0%	.0
	Other	1	1.0%	1.0
	No Answer	3	3.0%	3.0
	Total	99	100.0%	100.0
<b>Married/ Living Partner</b>	Yes	89	89.9%	89.9
	No	10	10.1%	10.1
<b>Highest Degree Level</b>	Bachelors	13	13.1%	13.1
	Masters	68	68.7%	68.7
	Doctorate	18	18.2%	18.2
	Total	99	100.0	100.0
<b>Goal Age Identified (Years)</b>	Minimum	7.0	60.0	31.9
	Maximum			
<b>Age</b>		35.0	71.0	54.0
<b>Occupational Background</b>	Years at current institution	1	35	10.68
	Years held position of A.D. at current institution	0	27	7.2
	Total years held position A.D. at any institution	0	30	10.44

**Table 3. Salary Range**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	\$70,000 - \$99,999	1	7.1	7.6%
	\$100,000 - \$119,999	9	12.1	12.9%
	\$120,000 - \$139,999	9	17.2	18.3%
	\$140,000 - \$159,999	6	15.2	16.2%
	\$160,000 - \$179,999	8	12.1	12.9%
	\$180,000 - \$199,999	7	10.1	10.7%
	\$200,000 - \$219,999	2	3.0	3.2%
	\$220,000 - \$239,999	1	2.0	2.1%
	\$240,000 - \$259,999	1	1.0	1.1%
	> \$260,000	1	14.1	15.0%
	Total	93	93.9	100.0%
Missing	No Answer	6	6.1	
Total		99	100.0	

**Table 4. Bachelor's Degree Field**

Degree Field	Frequency	Valid Percent
Public Policy	1.0	1.4%
Psychology	3.0	4.4%
Math	2.0	2.9%
Political Science	7.0	10.3%
Journalism	4.0	5.9%
Science	4.0	5.9%
History	5.0	7.4%
Finance/Accounting	5.0	7.4%
Education	4.0	5.9%
Sport Management/Athletic Admin.	4.0	5.9%
Physical Education	14.0	20.6%
Economics	3.0	4.4%
Business	12.0	17.6%
Total	68.0	100.0
Did not Disclose	31.0	-

**Table 5. Master's Degree Field**

Degree Field	Frequency	Valid Percent
Public Administration	1.0	1.3%
Physiology	1.0	1.3%
Political Science	1.0	1.3%
Chemistry	1.0	1.3%
Leadership & Communications	1.0	1.3%
Physical Education	6.0	7.9%
Education/ Higher Education	24.0	31.6%
Sport Management/Athletic Admin.	27.0	35.5%
MBA/ Management	14.0	18.4%
Total	76.0	100.0
Did not disclose	10.0	-

**Table 6. Prior Positions Held**

	No		Yes	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
High school teacher	79	79.8%	20	20.2%
High school coach	69	69.7%	30	30.3%
High school principal/asst principal	95	96.0%	4	4.0%
High School athletic director	92	92.9%	7	7.1%
Administration – Community sport/recreation	97	98.0%	2	2.0%
Administration – College campus recreation	97	98.0%	2	2.0%
Graduate Assistantship	74	74.7%	25	25.3%
College professor	89	89.9%	10	10.1%
Intercollegiate athletics – Clerical	96	97.0%	3	3.0%
Athletic training	97	98.0%	2	2.0%
Intercollegiate sport operations	86	86.9%	13	13.1%
College Coach	57	57.6%	42	42.4%
Community/junior college athletics director	97	98.0%	2	2.0%
Collegiate athletic conference administration	93	93.9%	6	6.1%
College athletics – Business management	80	80.8%	19	19.2%
College athletics – Communications	95	96.0%	4	4.0%
College athletics – Compliance	83	83.8%	16	16.2%
College athletics – Development/Fundraising	74	74.7%	25	25.3%
College athletics – Event management	86	86.9%	13	13.1%
College athletics – Facilities/equipment	92	92.9%	7	7.1%
College athletics – Marketing	77	77.8%	22	22.2%
Administration – Professional athletics	96	97.0%	3	3.0%
College athletics – Asst/Assoc athletic director	33	33.3%	66	66.7%
College athletics- Ticket Office	96	97.0%	3	3.0%
College athletics Academic Support/Advisor	95	96.0%	4	4.0%
College athletics- Sports information	97	98.0%	2	2.0%
University administration (Other)	80	80.8%	19	19.2%

**Table 7. Job Experience: Position and Years Held**

Position	Percentage of Participants	Minimum Amount of Time at Position (Years)	Maximum Amount of Time at Position (Years)	Mean Years at Position
College athletics – Assistant/Associate athletic director	65	.3	30.0	8.912
University Administration (Other)	4	5.0	12.0	7.750
Administration – Professional athletics	3	5.0	30.0	13.67
Academic Support/Advisor	4	2.0	7.0	4.25
College athletics- Ticket office	3	3.0	8.0	5.00
College athletics – Marketing	21	1.0	7.0	3.71
College athletics – Facilities/equipment	6	2.0	18.0	7.17
College athletics – Event management	13	1.0	15.0	5.54
College athletics – Development/Fundraising	24	1.0	25.0	6.54
College athletics – Compliance	16	2.0	18.0	7.50
College athletics – Communications	3	2.0	10.0	5.00
College athletics – Business management	19	2.0	19.0	7.84
Collegiate athletic conference administration	5	2.0	7.0	4.40
Community/junior college athletics director	2	3.0	5.0	4.00
College Coach	36	1.0	30.0	11.47
Intercollegiate sport operations	13	2.0	15.0	4.69
Athletic training	2	11.0	20.0	15.50
Intercollegiate athletics – Clerical	3	1.0	3.0	2.33
College professor	10	5.0	25.0	10.40
Graduate Assistantship	25	1.0	6.0	1.94
Administration – College campus recreation	2	1.0	3.0	2.00
Sports Information	2	3.0	5.0	4.00
Administration – Community sport/recreation	2	2.0	18.0	10.00
High School athletic director	7	1.0	16.0	5.86
High school principal/assistant principal	4	3.0	14.0	8.00
High school coach	29	.5	20.0	5.40
High school teacher	20	.5	16.0	5.73

**Table 8. Job Held Directly Before Assuming Current Position**

Position	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Assistant/Associate A.D.	28	28.3%	28.3
Senior Associate A.D./ Executive Associate A.D.	26	26.3%	26.3
Head Athletic Director at another institution	26	26.3%	26.3
Dean/ Higher Education Position at a University	3	3.0%	3.0
Coach	10	10.1%	10.1
CEO of a Business/ Conference Commissioner	6	6.0%	6.0

**Table 9. Operations Involvement**

Involvement Type	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Financials/Budgetary Oversight	2	4	3.77
Policy Making (Internal)	2	4	3.76
Development/Fundraising	2	4	3.7
Community Relations	2	4	3.68
Policy Making (External)	2	4	3.57
Campus Relations	2	4	3.52
Business Management	2	4	3.4
Employment/HR	1	4	3.26
Sport Operations	1	4	3.19
Communications	2	4	3.18
Marketing	2	4	3.16
Compliance/Risk Management	2	4	3.05
Facilities/Equipment	1	4	2.87
Recruiting	1	4	2.24
Teaching	1	3	1.42
Coaching	1	4	1.35

**Table 10. Most Discouraging/Troublesome Part of Job**

Job Function	Frequency	Percent
Financials/Budget/funding	53.0	53.5%
Parental Involvement	4.0	4.0%
Compliance Related Issues to Academics & student-athletes	8.0	8.1%
Personnel	8.0	8.1%
Media, Internet, Blogging Misconceptions	5.0	5.1%
Politics	3.0	3.0%
Pressure/Blame	3.0	3.0%
Unreasonable Expectations	6.0	6.1%
Student-athlete attitude/lack of Development	4.0	4.0%
Planning	1.0	1.0%
Time Restraints	3.0	3.0%
NCAA	2.0	2.0%

## Electronic Survey

### Collegiate Athletic Directors: An Occupational Study

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

#### *Classification*

Under which NCAA division is your institution classified?

- Division I
- Division II
- Division III

#### *Degree*

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

- Associates : \_\_\_\_\_
- Bachelors : \_\_\_\_\_
- Masters : \_\_\_\_\_
- Doctorate : \_\_\_\_\_

#### *Goal year*

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

\_\_\_\_\_

#### *Occupational background*

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

- High school teacher : \_\_\_\_\_
- High school coach : \_\_\_\_\_
- High school principal/asst principal : \_\_\_\_\_
- High School athletic director : \_\_\_\_\_
- Administration – Community sport/recreation : \_\_\_\_\_
- Administration – College campus recreation : \_\_\_\_\_
- Graduate Assistantship : \_\_\_\_\_



- College professor : \_\_\_\_\_
- Intercollegiate athletics - Clerical : \_\_\_\_\_
- Athletic training : \_\_\_\_\_
- Intercollegiate sport operations : \_\_\_\_\_
- College Coach : \_\_\_\_\_
- Community/junior college athletics director : \_\_\_\_\_
- Collegiate athletic conference administration : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Business management : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Communications : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Compliance : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Development/Fundraising : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Event management : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Facilities/equipment : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Marketing : \_\_\_\_\_
- Administration – Professional athletics : \_\_\_\_\_
- College athletics – Asst/Assoc athletic director : \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (please list additional occupations related to athletics administration) : \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

*Years at Current Institution*

How many years have you worked at your current institution?

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

*Job Held Directly Before*

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

- Yes
- No

*Involvement*

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

	Uninvolved	Slightly involved	Involved	Heavily involved
Teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Coaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Recruiting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Employment/HR	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Financials/Budgetary Oversight	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy Making (Internal)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy Making (External)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community Relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus Relations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business Management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compliance/Risk Management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Development/Fundraising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Marketing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sport Operations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Facilities/Equipment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

---



---



---

*Networking*

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

- Yes  
 No

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

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

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

- 1 - I don't enjoy the nature of the work I do on my job.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I really enjoy the nature of the work I do on my job.

- 1 - I don't really like the people I work with.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I really like the people I work with.

- 1 - There are few, if any, good opportunities for advancement on my job.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - There are good opportunities for advancement on my job.

- 1 - I am very dissatisfied with the supervision I receive on my job.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I am very satisfied with the supervision I receive on my job.

- 1 - All things considered, I am dissatisfied with my job as a whole.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - All things considered, I am very satisfied with my job as a whole.

- 1 - I feel that I am on a definite career path which leads somewhere.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I do not feel that I am on a definite career path which leads somewhere.

- 1 - I am not happy with my choice of career and would like to find a new career direction.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I am very happy with my choice of career.

- 1 - I feel burned out doing the kind of work I have been doing recently.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I do not feel burned out doing the kind of work I have been doing recently.

- 1 - My career future looks dim.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - My career future looks bright.

- 1 - I am very dissatisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 - I am very satisfied with the way my career has progressed so far.

*Motivation*

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

---

---

---

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

---

---

---

*Varsity men's sports*

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

---

*Varsity women's sports*

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

---

*Support football as varsity sport*

Does your institution offer football as a varsity sport?

- Yes  
 No

*Total student-athletes*

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

---

*Scholarships*

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

---

*Fulltime employees*

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

---

*Part-time employees*

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

---

*Age*

What is your age?

---

*Gender*

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

*Racial identification*

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

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

*Marital status*

Are you married or living with a partner?

- Yes
- No

*Salary*

What is your base salary range?

- < \$30,0000
- \$30,000 - \$39,999
- \$40,000 - \$49,999
- \$50,000 - \$59,999
- \$60,000 - \$69,999
- \$70,000 - \$79,999
- \$80,000 - \$89,999

- \$90,000 - \$99,999
- \$100,000 - \$109,999
- \$110,000 - \$119,999
- \$120,000 - \$129,999
- \$130,000 - \$139,999
- \$140,000 - \$149,999
- \$150,000 - \$159,999
- \$160,000 - \$169,999
- \$170,000 - \$179,999
- \$180,000 - \$189,999
- \$190,000 - \$199,999
- \$200,000 - \$209,999
- \$210,000 - \$219,999
- \$220,000 - \$229,999
- \$230,000 - \$239,999
- \$240,000 - \$249,999
- \$250,000 - \$259,999
- \$260,000 - \$269,999
- > \$270,000
- No Answer

*Bonus for athletic performance*

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

- Yes
- No

*Bonus for academic performance*

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

- Yes
- No

*Rewarding*

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

---

---

---

*Discouraging*

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

---

---

Additional comments

(optional):

---

---

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



**Institutional Review Board****FORM A**

IRB # \_\_\_\_\_

**Certification for Exemption from IRB Review for Research Involving Human Subjects**

---

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

Jeff Spenard

Dr. Robin Hardin

**B. DEPARTMENT:**

Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport Studies

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

University of Tennessee

1914 Andy Holt Ave., Room 335

Knoxville, TN 37996

865-974-1281

robh@utk.edu

jspenard@utk.edu

**D. TITLE OF PROJECT:**

Collegiate Athletic Directors: An Occupational Examination

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

N/A

**F. GRANT SUBMISSION DEADLINE** (if applicable):**G. STARTING DATE: (NO RESEARCH MAY BE INITIATED UNTIL CERTIFICATION IS GRANTED.)**

Upon IRB Approval

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

May 31, 2011

**I. RESEARCH PROJECT:****Objective(s) of Project** (Use additional page, if needed.):

The objective of this is to determine collegiate athletic directors' professional background and career satisfaction.

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

Athletic directors at NCAA member institutions

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

An e-mail will be sent to collegiate athletic directors describing the purpose of the study and containing a link that will direct them to a Web site where the questionnaire (see attached) is hosted. The e-mails were obtained through the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) Directory. The participants will be assured that all information they provide will be held confidential and presented only in group form. To assure confidentiality, participants' names will not appear on the questionnaires, the completion of which will constitute the respondents' consent to participate.

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

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

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

Principal Investigator

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

Principal Investigator

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

Dept. Review  
Comm. Chair

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

**APPROVED:**

Dept.  
Head

Name	Signature	Date
------	-----------	------

Rev. 01/97

## Vita

Jeffrey C. Spenard II is currently pursuing a Master of Science degree with a major concentration of sport management from the University of Tennessee and currently maintains a 3.88 cumulative grade point average. He currently serves as an academic coach, graduate assistant at the University of Tennessee's Student Success Center. While earning Bachelor of Arts degree from Hartwick College, Jeffrey majored in business administration and graduated Magna Cum Laude with department distinction. In 2009, he was inducted to the International Honor Society in Business, Sigma Beta Delta, Hartwick College chapter. He served as a NCAA Division I student-athlete for Hartwick College men's soccer team and competed in the Mid-American Conference (MAC). While playing soccer for Hartwick, Jeffrey was also the men's soccer team representative for Hartwick College's Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC) and was later elected as a board member and treasurer. Before attending Hartwick College, Jeffrey attended Bryant & Stratton College, where he obtained his Associate's degree in business and competed for their men's soccer program at the NJCAA level. There, he achieved NJCAA Academic All-American status as a student-athlete athlete, and also was named as an Adidas Distinguished Academic All-American. Jeffrey achieved Dean's List every semester while at Hartwick College and graduated with a 4.0 grade point average from Bryant & Stratton College. He was also named by the professors, advisors, and administration at Bryant & Stratton College as the student commencement speaker at the graduation ceremony.