To all non-traditional leaders, Maya Angelou said it best “all great achievements require time.” Thank you for your perseverance, it serves as a role model for the next generation. May this manuscript provide motivation and guidance for the pursuit of dreams.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>Football Bowl Subdivision: A postseason bowl system used for the 120 members to determine a national champion. Programs must offer 16 teams and meet minimum attendance standards (NCAA, 2011a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA</td>
<td>National Collegiate Athletic Association: An unincorporated Association with more than 1,200 four-year member institutions organizing athletic programs (NCAA, 2011a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Division I</td>
<td>Member institutions must offer 14 sports including a minimum of seven sports for women. Two team sports such as football, basketball or volleyball must be offered for each gender. A required number of sport contests against other Division I programs must be played. Institutions must offer a minimum amount of financial aid to student-athletes while not exceeding established maximums (NCAA, 2011a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Predominantly White Institutions: Excludes Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCT</td>
<td>Social Cognitive Career Theory is an extension of social cognitive theory, espoused by Bandura (1986) to account for social influences such as gender, race, and ethnicity. The key concepts include self-efficacy, outcome expectation, vocational interests, environmental factors and choice goals (Lent, Brown, &amp; Hackett, 1994).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DEFINITION OF TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW)</td>
<td>Created in 1971 to govern women’s intercollegiate athletics. Eleven years later the association was discontinued and the NCAA governed women’s athletics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>Highest-ranking administrator managing all functions within a given institution’s intercollegiate athletics program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)</td>
<td>A postseason bowl system used for the 120 members to determine a national champion. Programs must offer 16 teams and meet minimum attendance standards (NCAA, 2011a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Champion Subdivision (FCS)</td>
<td>Determine a champion through a twenty team single elimination playoff system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Ceiling</td>
<td>An unofficial barrier that prevents non-traditional leaders from advancing within an organization (Barreto, et al., 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Old Boys’ Network</td>
<td>An unofficial gender-based network consisting of mostly White men characterized by exclusive support systems, gender restricted communication, and hiring practices (Acosta &amp; Carpenter, 2002; Lovett &amp; Lowry, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hegemony</td>
<td>The dominance of one group over another by use of power or ideological principles to maintain their place in society (Schell &amp; Rodriguez, 2000; Whisenant et al., 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homologous Reproduction</td>
<td>Kanter’s (1977) framework stating dominant workforce groups hire individuals with similar social and/or physical characteristics as themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Athletic Administrators</td>
<td>NCAA Division I FBS and FCS administrators in the following positions: executive associate athletic director, senior associate athletic director, associate athletic director, and assistant athletic director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Career Theory</td>
<td>The theory suggests personal, environmental, and behavior factors interact and lead to career interest development, career-related choices, and achievement of performance outcomes (Lent et al., 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Dominance Theory</strong></td>
<td>The theory suggests structural and individual factors contribute to group-based oppression (Sidanius, Levin, Frederico, &amp; Pratto, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Saturation</strong></td>
<td>A point reached when no further insight is being generated and emerging concepts have been exhausted (Bryman, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IX</strong></td>
<td>A federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in federally funded educational institutions stating “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Coakley, 2009, p. 233).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title VII</strong></td>
<td>Federal law that prohibits employers from discriminating on the basis of a person’s race, color, religion, sex or national origin with respect to their employment or compensation (EEOC, 2011; Whisenant, Miller, &amp; Peterson, 2005).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framed as a mixed-method study, the purpose of this dissertation was to evaluate the intentions of a select group, non-traditional leaders, to become Division I Athletic Directors. Sport literature suggests non-traditional leaders have been vastly under-represented in high-powered positions (Abney & Richey, 1992; Acosta & Carpenter, 2012, Lapchick, 2011). As such, this study focused on the highest-ranking athletic administrator of all National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions, Division I Athletic Director. In an effort to explain the lack of non-traditional Division I Athletic Directors, social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) was used to examine the influence of race, ethnicity, and gender on senior athletic administrators intentions. Shaped by societal acceptance the frameworks of homologous reproduction, hegemony, and social dominance theory were used to reveal non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ perceptions of this phenomenon.

Using a mixed-method study senior athletic administrators were surveyed. First, participants responded to a survey assessing the constructs of SCCT. Subsequently, semi-structured interviews followed the questionnaire to reveal the experiences and barriers of non-traditional senior athletic administrators. Multivariate analysis of variance
and path analysis were used to assess the quantitative findings and content analysis was used to expose themes from the interviews.

Results suggest comparable support and self-efficacy for all participants, only non-traditional leaders perceived more barriers and lower outcome expectations associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director. Therefore, non-traditional senior athletic administrators had significantly lower vocational interest and intentions to become a Division I Athletic Director than their traditional senior athletic administrator counterparts. The path analysis found outcome expectations mediated the relationship between self-efficacy and vocational interest for non-traditional senior athletic administrators.

Six themes emerged from the semi-structured interviews:

1) obstructed access and opportunity
2) salient gender
3) positional segregation
4) networking
5) the phenomenon of non-traditional administrators
6) evolution of sport leaders

Overall, the findings suggest traditional and non-traditional alike are capable of being a Division I Athletic Director, however, social dominance, environmental factors, limited access and opportunities are influential in hindering non-traditional leaders career advancement to a Division I Athletic Director position.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Non-Traditional Leaders in Sport

Over a century ago the late father of vocational guidance and social reformer, Frank Parsons, foresaw the influence of race and gender on vocational interests when he stated:

In the wise choice of a vocation there are three broad factors: (1) a clear understanding of yourself, your aptitudes, abilities, interests, ambitions, resources, limitations, and knowledge of their causes; (2) a knowledge of the requirements, conditions of success, advantages and disadvantages, compensation, opportunities, and prospects in different lines of work; (3) true reasoning on the relations of these two groups of facts (1909, p. 5)

For centuries women and racial minorities (herein referred to collectively as non-traditional) have faced injustice in the United States workplace, thus, to neutralize these challenges Congress enacted Title VII (EEOC, 2011). Under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII was ratified to prohibit employment discrimination on the “basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex” (EEOC, 2011, p. 1). Additionally, affirmative action programs were established in 1965 to ensure federal contractors did not make hiring and promotional decisions based on an applicants’ color, creed, national origin, or race (Barreto, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2009). In 1967, the affirmative action requirements expanded to include requirements benefitting women (Barreto et al., 2009). Congress intervened again in 1972 when Title IX was enacted to provide gender equity in educational institutions receiving federal financial assistance (Coakley, 2009; Swaton, 2010). Following this Civil Rights era, gender and racial inequalities have declined; conversely, several occupations continue to be segregated (Tomaskovic-Devey, Zimmer, Stainback, Robinson, Taylor, & McTague, 2006). Particularly in sport organizations, a call for leadership diversification persists (Brooks & Althouse, 2007; Cunningham, 2008)
because non-traditional leaders continue to be underrepresented in leadership positions (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; DeHass, 2007; Lapchick, 2011; Irick, 2010).

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2009), women and racial minority workers have made strides in the professional sector, but they are typically found in lower status and salaried jobs (see Table 1-1) than White men. For example, non-traditional leaders represented 36% of upper-level management positions (EEOC, 2009) and earned 25% less than White men (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Sport, especially athletic administration, is no exception to this unequal representation of non-traditional leaders. Division I athletic administration mirrors society with a lack of non-traditional athletic directors (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011). Hence, their succession into leadership positions such as senior athletic administrators (e.g., executive associate athletic director, senior associate athletic director, associate athletic director, and assistant athletic director) challenges the perceptions of their place in athletic organizational structures. In accordance with the 2009-2010 NCAA Race and Gender Demographic Report, non-traditional leaders account for 18% of Division I Athletic Directors (see Table 1-2). Although this is a 5.9% increase since 1995 (Irick, 2010), the percentage under represents that of the U.S. population and viable hiring pool, administrators and student-athletes (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). As such, this is not to say the front office should replicate percentages on the field, but the gap should not be as widespread (see Figure 1-1; Shropshire, 1996).

While non-traditional individuals make up 60% of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011), the hiring pool only consists of 37% non-traditional Division I senior
athletic administrators and 36% non-traditional Division I student-athletes (Irick, 2010; Zgonc, 2010).

**Statement of Problem and Purpose**

Traditionally, athletics has been a segregated field dominated by males (Anderson, 2009), especially White males, in athletic administration positions (Lapchick, 2011). Non-traditional leaders are grossly under-represented at the highest leadership position, athletic director, within NCAA Division I institution athletic departments (Lapchick, 2011). At the start of the 2010 athletic season, there were five women (excluding the separate women’s athletic department at University of Tennessee, Knoxville and University of Texas at Austin) and 14 racial minority (nine African-American, four Latino and one Native American) athletic directors at Division I Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS; Lapchick, 2011). Across all Division I athletic departments, only 10.6% of athletic directors were women (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012).

The unique experiences of non-traditional leaders working in higher education, particularly in intercollegiate athletics, are scarce in literature. While numerous studies have examined the underrepresentation and decline of non-traditional athletic administrators from a number of perspectives, one’s intention to become an athletic director has yet to be addressed in the literature. Considering this gap in literature, the need to research non-traditional leaders’ experiences and intentions is necessary to understand how they attempt to overcome an apparent glass ceiling and explain the disparity in intercollegiate athletic administration representation (Lapchick, 2011). The goals of this study were:
1) to reveal and illustrate how the intersection of gender and race may influence the intentions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators becoming NCAA Division I Athletic Directors

2) to explore how career choices have influenced their collegiate athletic workplace experience.

Furthermore, the research questions framing the study were:

1) What are the differences between traditional and non-traditional senior athletic administrators and their career intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director?

2) Have formative experiences influenced the intended career path of non-traditional senior athletic administrators pursuit of a Division I Athletic Director position?

3) What are the common factors of non-traditional senior athletic administrators decision to pursue or not pursue a Division I Athletic Director position?

**Employment Trends of Women Administrators**

Relative to men, women occupy structurally disadvantaged positions in organizations (Molyneux & Razavi, 2002). McKay (1997) noted “sex segregation of labor forces” with women more likely to be in lower pay and status positions, whereas men were more likely to be found in well-paying, powerful positions (p.13). According to the Sander (2011), out of all university leadership positions (e.g. president, athletic director, chief academic officers), women have the lowest representation at the athletic director position. At the start of the 2010-11 NCAA Division I athletic season, only 10.6% of athletic directors were women (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). When focusing on FBS institutions this percentage diminished to 4.9% (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011).

Forty years since the passage of Title IX, individuals may think that the inequity women had faced in athletics prior to 1972 had been eliminated, however, while females have had one of the most successful participation rates (9,274 teams) these
figures have been eclipsed by the losses women have suffered in leadership positions (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lopiano, 2005; Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). Today, it is not unusual to find only one woman in a senior leadership position. Among all NCAA institutions Acosta and Carpenter (2012) reported an average of 1.41 women for every 3.94 administrators in an institution. The disparity expands when the focus is on Division I athletic administrators. On average only 1.78 women consist of the 5.98 Division I athletic administrators (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Not only is this trend occurring in the field of sport, but Stroh, Langlands, and Simpson (2004) discovered the same to be true in managerial organizations. Only two Fortune 500 CEOs and 12.5% of corporate officers were women (Stroh et al., 2004). Thus, considerable attention has been given to the socio-cultural problem of the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions (Cunningham, 2008; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007).

One of the focuses of the sport workplace literature has been on women increasing their market share in leadership positions (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008). For the few women who have advanced into high-level athletic administrative positions, they typically have had exceptional qualifications and support (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Teel, 2005; Whisenant, 2003; Yee, 2007). While there is no clear career path to becoming an athletic director, crucial steps have been taken to the position (Fitzgerald, 1990; Grappendorf, Lough, & Griffin, 2004). Grappendorf et al. (2004) found 89% of women athletic directors had been coaches and 85% had been collegiate athletes (Teel, 2005).

Extensive literature has also contributed to the underrepresentation and decline of women in athletic leadership positions. Homologous reproduction, (Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991), combining of athletic managements
(Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004), gender role attitudes and stereotypes of leaders (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruening, 2009; Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008; Kellerman & Rhode, 2007), family work balance (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000), sexism and homophobic exclusion (Cahn, 1994), gender biases in mentoring networks and evaluations (Kellerman & Rhode, 2007), gender schemas (Valian, 1998), backlash and resistance to women (Freeman, Bourque, & Shelton, 2001), male hegemony (Norman, 2010; Whisenant et al., 2002), resistance to job changes (Carpenter & Acosta, 1992), promotion and career satisfaction (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004), rate of advancement (Whisenant et al., 2002), and socially construed stereotypes (Embry Padgett, Caldwell, 2008) have all shed light on the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions.

**Employment Trends of Ethnic and Racial Minority Administrators**

In terms of race, the 2010 NCAA Division I athletic season found 88.3% of the 120 FBS Athletic Directors were White (Lapchick, 2011). From the prior year, racial minorities suffered a 1.7% representation loss (Lapchick, 2011). When focusing on Division I senior athletic administrators, racial minorities had a slight increase to 12.8% (Irick, 2010). Four decades post the Civil Rights Movement, racial equity in collegiate participation has risen (Zgonc, 2010). However, this growth has been eclipsed by the seemingly stagnant representation of racial minorities in athletic administration positions (Lapchick, 2011; Irick, 2010).

Several factors attribute to the struggle racial minorities face entering and advancing in athletic leadership positions. Organizational structures have limited racial minorities’ career opportunities because of discriminatory hiring practices, stereotypes, political constraints, and societal attitudes (Abney & Richey, 1991; Teel, 2005). Moore
(2002) and Myles (2005) agree that racial discrimination along with cultural deprivation, tokenism, positional segregation and a lack of mentors have limited the advancement of racial minorities. Since the traditional workplace has created an employment setting with no or few minority representatives, employed racial minorities have felt obligated to be the spokesperson for their group (St. Jean & Feagin, 1998). Likewise, the social isolation felt by racial minorities has resulted in assimilation to the institutional settings (St. Jean & Feagin, 1998). For example, McDowell (2008) discovered Black Women Athletic Directors negotiated their identity according to the environment. St. Jean and Feagin (1998) also noted racial minorities in leadership positions may face “conforming too much or too little, to the dictates of white-framed organizational norms and understanding” (St. Jean & Feagin, 1998, p. 110).

Time after time, racial minorities have had to prove themselves in their field compared to their White counterparts (Farrell, 1999; Naughton, 1998; McDowell, 2008). Even after proving themselves, Athletic Director Eugene Marshall Jr. believes minorities have been known to “work the ranch, but they cannot run it” (Burdman, 2002, p. 24). In accordance with Naughton (1998), it appears racial minorities are unlikely to be hired as an athletic director unless the candidate has been exceptional in another field, such as business or professional athletics. Additionally, Naughton (1998) found athletic directors to typically affiliate with affluent social networks, which racial minorities are less likely to be exposed to (Bettie, 2003; Wilson, 1980; Zack, 1998).

To increase the number of racial and ethnic minority administrators, in 2001 the NCAA formed the Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males. Originally, the intent of the institute was to increase diversity, yet it excluded racial and ethnic minority women.
Five years later, the NCAA held the first Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males and Females. This institute was created to address the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities in senior athletic administration positions at all levels (e.g., conference, institutional, and national) through extensive leadership training (NCAA, 2011b). The Minority Opportunities and Interest Committee (MOIC) of the NCAA selects applications to participate in workshops led by diverse leaders from business, higher education, and intercollegiate athletic (NCAA, 2011b). In 2007, the NCAA also initiated the Pathway Program, formerly known as the Fellows Leadership Development Program, to enhance “the professional skills of women and people of color” with the intention to become an athletic director (NCAA, 2011c, p. 1). These institutes demonstrate the NCAA’s commitment to diversity and serve as an example for changing organizational behavior (Schneider & Allison, 2000). Since the institute’s inception, racial and ethnic athletic director representation has risen 2% (Irick, 2010).

**Conceptual Framework**

An assortment of theoretical frameworks, including homologous reproduction, symbolic interaction, hegemony, hegemonic masculinity, social capital theory, and human capital theory, (Norman, 2010; Sagas & Cunningham, 2005; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007; Whisenant & Mullane, 2007; Whisenant et al., 2002) have been used individually to explore the underrepresentation of non-traditional leaders in athletic positions. However, scant research has explored the intersection of gender and race. Therefore, three theoretical frameworks (i.e., homologous reproduction, hegemony, and social dominance) have collectively been used to imply that the lack of non-traditional leaders at the Division I Athletic Director position has become an acceptable norm (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Additionally, although classical career development
theories (Holland, 1959; Parsons, 1909; Super, 1953) exposed career choices, they did not reveal the unique career decisions facing non-traditional leaders in sport. Thus the versatile framework of social cognitive career theory (SCCT) (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994, 2002) was used to understand individuals’ academic and vocational choices. Together these frameworks will be utilized to explore the career intentions and experiences of non-traditional leaders becoming Division I Athletic Directors.

**Significance of Study**

Since most of the sport leadership research separates gender and race, the significance of this study is in the exploration of the gender and race intersection. Not only have women felt the resistance of obtaining sport leadership positions (Fink, 2008; Whisenant, 2008; Whisenant et al., 2002), but so have racial minorities (Abney & Richey, 1991; Lapchick, 2011; Moore 2002; Myles, 2005). This study serves as a stimulant for inquiry of non-traditional leaders entering the traditional workplace of collegiate athletics. This study serves as voice for non-traditional leaders by revealing the barriers they may face in obtaining Division I Athletic Director positions.

Several practical implications stemmed from this study. The results provided an educational lesson for institutions and the NCAA on the retention of diverse staffs and non-traditional leaders. Literature has illustrated gender and racial inequities in leadership positions (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011). Insight into the retention of personnel is a vital issue in sport. Furthermore, since women and racial minority student-athletes and senior athletic administrators could be considered a primary source for applicants in collegiate athletic, there is a need for more research on non-traditional role models in leadership positions.
Although this proposed study only gives insights into the intentions of current Division I senior athletic administrators, it opens the door for further research. For example, conducting longitudinal studies tracking non-traditional leaders’ career progression would provide greater details of projected career paths. In addition, this research opens scholars’ exploration into the impact of NCAA organizational structures on non-traditional leaders.

**Dissertation Structure**

Following a traditional five chapter manuscript format, this mixed method study will be structured to examine intentions of senior athletic administrators becoming Division I Athletic Directors. Chapter 1 introduces the problem, purpose, framework, and significance of the study. In Chapter 2 relevant literature on the employment processes and challenges of non-traditional leaders will be discussed. Chapter 3 outlines the research design and method used to conduct the study. First quantitative data was collected from senior athletic administrators. To confirm quantitative results, interviews of non-traditional leaders were conducted. Chapter 4 then details the results and Chapter 5 concluded the dissertation presenting implication and future research endeavors. Overall, this study aims to address the experiences and perceptions of non-traditional leaders pursuit of a Division I Athletic Director position and to expand previous literature to create more inclusive workplaces.
Table 1-1. Earnings and Percentages of White Male Compensation for Full-Time Workers Older than 16 Years (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Weekly Earnings ($)</th>
<th>Percent of White Male Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>$569</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latina</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$782</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$667</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>$618</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$989</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>$833</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-2. 2009-2010 Division I Percentages of Athletics Administrative Staffs – Excluding Historically Black Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Athletics</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Athletics</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Athletics</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Woman Administrator</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2009-2010 NCAA race and gender demographic report
Figure 1-1. Trend of Athletic Directors and Senior Athletic Administrators.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Advancement Barriers in the Social System of Sport

The purpose of this study was to investigate the intentions of senior athletic administrators pursuit of a Division I Athletic Director position and explore non-traditional leaders’ career choices have influenced their athletic workplace experience. As noted non-traditional individuals are well represented as collegiate student-athletes, especially in revenue generating sports (Zgnoc, 2010), but they are underrepresented in athletic administration. As aforementioned a multitude of frameworks (see Burton et al., 2009; Pastore Inglis, & Danyi, 1996; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007; Whisenant & Mullane, 2007; Whisenant et al., 2002; Whisenant, 2008) and statistics (see Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011) have explored the underrepresentation of non-traditional leaders in athletic positions, the barriers preventing their entrance to the field, and the reasons for leaving sport. Nevertheless, key literature relevant to the impacts on non-traditional leaders’ career choices will be reviewed in this chapter.

First, the social system of sport will be discussed. Then collectively three theoretical frameworks (i.e., homologous reproduction, hegemony, and social dominance) will be referenced to understand the lack of non-traditional Division I Athletic Directors becoming an acceptable norm (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Next, employment trends and potential barriers facing non-traditional leaders will be reviewed. Finally, literature on career development will be explored, and SCCT will be applied to understand non-traditional leaders’ vocational choices. Together these frameworks will provide insight into the experiences and intentions of non-traditional leaders.
Our society consists of numerous social systems that determine the allocation and value of power, prestige, and psyche (Sage, 1998). Determinants such as class, education, gender, race or occupation have been used to define and give meaning to a social system. Thus, sport is a prime example of a social system in our society (Coakley, 2009; Sage, 1998). As Sage (1974) noted open social systems allow positions to be filled by the most qualified individual, whereas closed social systems are fixed by historical traits. Although on the field sport looks like an open system, in the front office it remains closed (Myles, 2005). The first Division I African-American Woman Athletic Director, Vivian Fuller, agreed athletic administration is a closed market that has a tendency to recycle people (Burdman, 2002).

**Homologous Reproduction**

Homologous reproduction is the process of selecting or promoting an individual who has similar social and/or physical characteristics as the majority (Stangl & Kane, 1991). The interaction of three constructs: opportunity, power, and proportion, indicate the prevalence of homologous reproduction (Kanter, 1977, 1993). Since there are significantly more traditional athletic directors in athletic administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011), if the cycle of homologous reproduction persists, non-traditional leaders will remain underrepresented.

When evaluating gender, extensive attention has been given to the effects of homologous reproduction in athletics. In the early interscholastic studies, homologous reproduction was present in athletic director (Stahura, Greenwood, & Dobbs, 2004; Stangl & Kane, 1991) and principal (Lovett & Lowry, 1994) employment practices. Most recently in interscholastic athletics, neither Whisenant and Mullane (2007) nor Whisenant (2008) found evidence of homologous reproduction between the principal,
school type, athletic director, and women’s head coach. In the collegiate sector, women head coaches have been found to employ greater women dominated coaching staffs (Sagas, Cunningham, & Teed, 2006), while men head coaches employed more balanced gender staffs (Aicher & Sagas, 2009). Additionally, Whisenant and Mullane (2007) discovered men athletic directors employed more men sport information directors.

In terms of race, scant literature exists on the direct impact of homologous reproduction. Cunningham and Sagas (2005) assessed the impact of homologous reproduction and access discrimination of NCAA Division I basketball coaches. Results supported the notion of homologous reproduction when both White and African-American head coaches were found to employ staffs similar to their race. Indirectly, the affects of social networks have been the focus of most of the literature. Day and McDonald (2010) found African-American assistant football coaches received fewer promotions than their White counterpart. Moreover, the networks of African-American assistant football coaches' have stifled their career progression (Day & McDonald, 2010).

In terms of the gender and race intersection, Kanter’s (1977) theory has been applied to coaching staffs (Aicher & Wells, in press) and management positions (Maume, 1999). Aicher and Wells (in press) discovered a gender and race intersection on women collegiate basketball staffs. In the occupational literature, Maume (1999) investigated the relationship between occupational segregation and managerial progression by gender and race. Results revealed race was not a factor on women;
however, Maume (1999) discovered the intersection of race and gender to be detrimental to the promotion of African-American men.

**Hegemony**

Four decades ago Gramsci (1971) originally espoused the cultural concept of hegemony. Hegemony theory has evolved into a social theory where individuals of a certain group accept their unfair treatment as commonsense (Whisenant et al., 2002). Hartley (1982) suggests the power of one group over the other group occurs by acceptance, not by force. Consciously, the dominant group (e.g., traditional leaders) use their power to maintain their place in society, while the deprived group (e.g., non-traditional leaders) accept their role in society (Whisenant et al., 2002). In short, hegemony perpetuates the status quo.

According to Sage (1998) sport has become one of the most hegemonic social institutions in society. Evidence has been prevalent on and off the playing field (Whisenant et al., 2002). Habitually in athletics, male hegemony (Fink, 2008; Whisenant, 2008; Whisenant et al., 2002) has limited the advancement of women because of the masculine emphasis, which reinforced the power and control of men (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Theberg, 1987) and privilege over women (Sabo & Jansen, 1992).

Research has shown when hegemonic masculinity exists, men try to take power and distance themselves from women (Connell, 1987; Kane & Disch, 1993). Hegemonic masculinity has been identified in intercollegiate athletics. For example, prior to the creation of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) in 1971, participation and leadership opportunities for women were stunted and even despite the
passage of Title IX significant declines in women in leadership positions continued (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011).

Furthermore, Grappendorf and Lough (2006) discovered hegemony existed with White men having the power at the athletic director position. Since the majority of literature has focused on men’s privileges and power over women (Sabo & Jansen, 1992; Whisenant et al., 2002), the intersection of race and gender in the administrative sport arenas remains as a gap in the literature

Social Dominance Theory

The focus of social dominance theory (SDT) (Sidanius et al., 2001) is on both the structural and individual factors contributing to group-based oppression (Sidanius et al., 2001). Ibarra (1997) found structural constraints in four Fortune 500 companies limited networks and job mobility of non-traditional leaders. Also personal discrimination and systematic institution drive oppression (Sidanius et al., 2001) and perpetuate ideologies (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007) of the disenfranchised group (i.e., non-traditional leaders). These social ideologies reinforce institutional power structures and societal status (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Specific to this study, non-traditional leaders in the sport context may self-limit themselves unconsciously by responding to daily racial and gender ideologies.

In the social institution of athletic administration, SDT may consider institutional discrimination as one of the main forces “creating, maintaining, and recreating systems of group-based hierarchy” (Sidanius, Pratto, van Laar, & Levin, 2004, p. 847). Historically, private networks have controlled the hierarchical organization of athletic administration; thus, creating the idea of the “good old boys’ network” (Myles, 2005). In accordance with Myles (2005), the “good old boys’ network” is made up of “mostly
White men who are interconnected across the athletic administration profession, and are extremely resistant to hiring Blacks for positions in athletic administrations they deem exclusively for Whites” (p. 126). Not only has this informal power structure limited the progression of racial minority men, but it may have excluded women (Mainiero, 1986). Thus, the need to explore the structural factors that influence non-traditional senior athletic administrators' achievement of the most prestigious position in athletic administration still remains.

**Discrimination**

Allison (2000) refers to discrimination as the unjust treatment of specific individuals or groups. Discrimination in managerial positions occurs when dominant groups' (i.e., White men) believe inferior groups (i.e., non-traditional leaders) are less suited for the position (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Even though discrimination is illegal, non-traditional candidates are being excluded from the recruitment and selection process because of biases and systematic discrimination (Shrosphire, 1996) through hidden social qualifications (Myles, 2005; Naughton, 1998), targeted applicants and criteria (Harrison, Lapchick, & Janson, 2009; Holl, 1996). Not only has discrimination hindered the hiring of non-traditional leaders, but once they have been hired they face sexism, racism, tokenism, segregation and occupational ceilings (Abney & Richey, 1991; Moore, 2002; Myles, 2005; Sharf, 2006; St. Jean & Feagin, 1998; Teel, 2005) within the organization.

While the institutionalization of racism in collegiate athletics may be subtle and systematic (Rosellini, 1987), Brooks and Althouse (2000) believe the hiring practice of racial minorities is tied to racism. For example, significant financial donors such as alumni and boosters influence the athletic administration hiring decisions (Myles, 2005;
Rosellini, 1987). Myles (2005) found the need of athletic directors to please donors caused resistance to minority hires because of fear of losing support. Likewise, Shropshire (1996) revealed the existence of sexism and racism in hiring practices due to the concern of losing support because of perceptions and stereotypes. Racial stereotypes have also resulted in racial minorities being overlooked for top positions (Edwards, 1970; Lapchick, 1996; Reyes & Halcon, 1991). These stereotypes appear to be validated by the anecdotal evidence (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011) suggesting a lack of non-traditional leaders in athletic administration (Naughton, 1998; Rosellini, 1987).

**Classic Career Development Theories**

**Frameworks Studied for and by Traditional Leaders**

Even though literature on careers can be traced to the fifteenth century, Frank Parsons (1909) originated the first career decision making conceptual framework in the eighteen century (Brown, 2002). Classic career development theories (see Ginzberg, Ginsburg, Axelrad, & Herma, 1951; Holland, 1973, 1985; Parson, 1909; Roe, 1956; Super, 1953) have evolved over the last century from psychologically based theories to incorporating sociological traits. Prior to the Civil Rights era the dominant professional workforce consisted of White, middle-class men, thus, women and racial minorities were omitted from career development studies (Stitt-Gohdes, 1997). While classical career development theories focused on White, middle-class men (Leong, 1995), the foundations are important to understand the progression.

Chronologically the career development theories derived from a perspective model that matched individuals with jobs (Parson, 1909) through career choice and development stages (Ginzberg et al., 1951; Super, 1953) to specific explanations for
career choices (Holland, 1973, 1985; Roe, 1956). Parsons (1909) three factor vocational guidance laid the foundation for most of the current research (Minor, 1992) and until the early 1950s, occupational choice was viewed as a once in a lifetime event (Minor, 1992).

In 1951, Ginzberg and his colleagues viewed career development as an irreversible early twenties decision, until his revised model (1972) identified occupational choice as a flexible optimizing decision. In accordance with Ginzberg et al. (1951) three stage development process, senior athletic administrators would have reached the realistic stage of their career through the influences of reality, education, emotions, and values. Although senior athletic administrators have accomplished a great feat to reach the position, the application of this career developmental theory is limited by the lack of consideration of one’s gender, race or social class (Stitt-Gohdes, 1997).

Originally, Super (1953) derived his ideas on self-concept and sociological theory after combining Parsons (1909) and Ginzberg et al.’s (1951) work to identify propositions of career development. Super’s theory (1953) believed an individual’s experiences caused continuous change to their personal and social self-concepts. Super’s theory recognizes career choices and development through five stages – growth (ages 0-14), exploration (ages 15-24), establishment (ages 25-44), maintenance (ages 45-64), and decline (ages 65+) (Niles & Herr, 2001; Zunker, 1994). Later in Super’s career he developed the Life Span Life Space Theory to address the fluidness in one’s career path (Niles, Herr, & Hartung, 2001). In this theory, Super recognized the influence of personal (aptitudes, interests, needs, and values) and situational (e.g.,
community, culture, family, economic) factors of one’s life space (Niles, Herr, & Hartung, 2001). While Super’s work has been credited as one of the first to record career development of women, the stringent life roles and lack of influential contextual factors are not applicable to present non-traditional leaders’ career paths (Fitzgerald, Fassinger, Betz, 1995). Furthermore, while Roe expanded the career development work of Super and Ginzberg et al. and stimulated further research, she was unable to support her propositions that heredity and parental expectations influenced occupational choices (Lavine, 1982).

Whereas Super’s theory believes career development consists of an individual’s life long growth process, Holland perceives career development to be a fit between the vocational environment and an individual’s personality. Since the process of career development may be influenced by an individual’s reaction to the environment, Holland (1959) explained vocational choices with a comprehensive trait-oriented model. In accordance with Holland’s Career Typology (also known as Holland’s Code), six personality traits and occupational environments - artistic, conventional, enterprising, investigative, realistic and social –influence an individual’s career choice. While this career choice content theory provided the impetus for hundreds of studies, it is not appropriate for this investigation due to the gender biases as well as the limiting trait and environmental assumptions. Given that Holland (1959) agrees society channels individuals into traditional gender-dominated occupations, the nature of this study on non-traditional leaders in a non-traditional field calls for a more encompassing theory.

Overall, the application of the above mentioned classical career development theories is not appropriate because of today’s diverse workforce (Brown, 2002; Stitt-
Gohdes, 1997). Due to the representative sample of non-traditional leaders, their career development is different than “the professional work force 20-30 years ago: white, middle-class males” (Stitt-Gohdes, 1997, p. 13). In particular, women’s career development is not as linear as men (Morrisey, 2003), consequently, more sociological impacts, whether positive or negative, are needed to accommodate the career development of non-traditional leaders (Bierema, 1998; Lent & Brown, 1996; Stitt-Gohdes, 1997).

**Frameworks Important to the Career Choices of Non-Traditional Leaders**

By the 1980s, career development frameworks (see Astin’s socio-psychological model; Farmer’s model of career motivation; Gottfredson’s theory of circumscription and compromise, Hackett and Betz’ self-efficacy theory; Krumboltz’s social learning theory) focused on social and cognitive factors that influenced non-traditional leader’s career decisions. One of the first career development theories to emphasize social factors in career decision making was Krumboltz’s social learning theory (1979). The theory focused on the following four decision making components: genetic endowment (e.g., skin color), environmental situations (e.g., economic downturn), learning experiences (e.g., observation), and task skills (e.g., goal setting; Sharf, 2006). Mitchell and Krumboltz (1996) noted women had no control over their genetic endowment, thus, gender stereotyping channels them to traditional occupations. Additionally, racial minorities have been found to glamorize one occupation over the other causing obstruction on one’s career choice (Mitchell & Krumboltz, 1996).

In 1981, Gottfredson’s theory (1981) suggested the gender socialization process begins at the age of six when individuals determine a range of acceptable careers because of perceived ideologies and prestige. In accordance with Gottfredson’s (1981)
investigation, women may have eliminated the career option of a Division I Athletic Director because historically White men held the position (Lapchick, 2011). Although this theory first introduced gender socialization, it did not take into account changes that occur throughout adulthood (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Wicker, 2008). Also in 1981, Hackett and Betz were the first to apply Bandura’s self-efficacy concept to career development processes of non-traditional leaders. While self-efficacy and gender socialization were found to influence the career choices of men and women (Hackett & Betz, 1981), the limitation of this study was the lack of explanation of barriers exiting and entering the workforce (Wicker, 2008).

In the mid 1980’s, Astin (1984) and Farmer (1985) introduced the influence of motivational and sociological factors on one’s career choice. Astin (1984) proposed a socio-psychological career choice and behavior model that included the influence of motivation, gender role socialization, and opportunities. Astin found gender socialization occurred in family, work, and play structures, and then it interacted with opportunities, including stereotype and distribution of jobs (Minor, 1992). In particular, Astin believed women who were exposed to an array of opportunities built confidence to pursue non-traditional career choices (Fitzgerald et al., 1995).

Farmer’s career and achievement motivation model (1985) also recognized motivations influenced by personal characteristics (e.g., intrinsic values, academic self-esteem), background variables (e.g., gender, race, social status), and environmental factors (e.g., role models, parental support). Farmer emphasized the interrelation of behavioral, cognitive, and environmental factors as predictors of an individual’s career choice (Wicker, 2008). While each of these career development frameworks led to the
conception of SCCT (Lent et al., 1994), SCCT is the most appropriate and comprehensive application for this investigation of non-traditional leaders in sport.

**Social Cognitive Career Theory**

Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory was the foundation for the development of social cognitive career theory (Lent et al., 1994). Highlighting the interrelation between social processes and self-referent ideas that guide human behavior, SCCT has become a heuristic application for a variety of psychosocial contexts (Bandura, 1986, 1997). The adaption and elaboration of aspects of Bandura’s theory that were relevant to interest, career selection, and performance helped formulate SCCT. SCCT is also linked to two frameworks stemming from Bandura’s theory: Krumboltz’s career decision making social learning theory (Krumboltz, 1979) as well as Hackett and Betz (1981) concept of self-efficacy in career development. Finally, the comprehensive framework of SCCT was influenced by the cognitive models of academic behavior and career (Brown, 2002); theories of work motivation (Locke & Latham, 1990; Vroom, 1964;); non-traditional leaders’ career development (Hackett & Lent, 1992); contextualized career behavior views (Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986); personality and social psychology (Ajzen, 1988; Moloney, Bouchard, & Segal, 1991).

As a career development theory, SCCT considers individual, social, and environmental factors that influence a person’s self-efficacy, perceived consequences of their actions, ability to overcome barriers and set goals (Cunningham & Singer, 2010; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Lent & Brown, 1996; Stitt-Gohdes, 1997). Through the interaction of personal, environmental, and behavior factors, SCCT provides a way of understanding three career stages, career interest development, career-related choices, and achievement of performance outcomes (Lent et al., 1994).
In managerial literature, the theory has been used to understand managerial aspirations (Van Vianen, 1999), understand career development research (Swanson & Gore, 2002), and predict career choices (Flores & O'Brien, 2002). Recently in the field of sport, SCCT has been used to examine the intentions of undergraduates to enter the sport and leisure industry (Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas, & Fink, 2005), to understand the intentions of assistant women coaches becoming head coaches (Cunningham, Doherty, & Gregg, 2007), and to explore student-athletes' intentions of entering the coaching profession (Cunningham & Singer, 2010).

**SCCT Constructs**

The SCCT framework highlights three social cognitive mechanisms: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and choice goals (Lent et al., 1994). Additionally, vocational interest is predicted by self-efficacy and outcome expectations (Lent et al., 1994). Environmental factors, such as barriers and support, also impact an individual's self-efficacy and expectations (Cunningham et al., 2007; Lent et al., 2000). These variables are displayed in the hypothesized path analysis (see Figure 2-1).

**Self-efficacy.** Career development literature has focused the majority of the attention on the aspect of self-efficacy (Hackett & Lent, 1992; Lent et al., 1994; Locke & Latham, 1990; Swanson & Gore, 2000). Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief about their ability “to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391).

As a central aspect of human agency, these personal judgments predict one's ability to set goals, be persistent in their efforts, and attain expected outcomes (Bandura, 1986). In a leadership context, research has revealed self-efficacy beliefs are significantly associated with various outcomes, including managerial ambitions
(Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2003; Van Vianen, 1999), managerial performance
(Robertson & Sadri, 1993), leadership styles (Sullivan & Kent, 2003), head coaching
intentions (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007), and turnover intentions
(Cunningham et al., 2003).

From a social cognitive view, self-efficacy is a dynamic set of beliefs that are
formulated to meet performance criteria while interacting with other individuals,
behaviors, and contextual factors (Brown, 2002; Lent et al., 1994). Likewise,
persuasion, knowledge, physiological stimulation, and accomplishments interact to
create a self-belief specific to “people, behavior, environment, and contextual factors”
(Wicker, 2008, p. 27). According to Bandura (1986) self-efficacy beliefs are acquired
from four primary learning experiences:

1) Accomplished performance, where an individual experiences a successful
   performance from a given behavior

2) Vicarious learning, which is the process of watching another individual
   successfully perform a behavior

3) Social persuasion, when encouraging support to perform a behavior is received

4) Physiological state, when changes in an individuals’ emotional state occurs while
   performing a behavior

Although these experiences are influenced by social interactions, task difficulty,
and environmental and contextual factors, the most potent source of self-efficacy is
personal attainment (Brown, 2002). For example, a successful experience in a given
task tends to raise self-efficacy, whereas failures lower self-efficacy (Brown, 2002). The
theory of social cognitive assumes one’s intricate human ability and competent
performance, which requires a strong sense of self-efficacy and component skills to
position themselves and their resources effectively (Bandura, 1997). Hence, individuals
are more likely to be interested and pursuant of a leadership position where they believe they can be successful. Therefore, the above literature leads to the first hypothesis of this study.

**Hypothesis 1.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will express lower self-efficacy for becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

**Outcome expectations.** While self-efficacy focuses on an individual's capability of performing a particular behavior (e.g., Can I accomplish this?), outcome expectations concentrates on the consequences of an individual’s performance of a given behavior (e.g., If I accomplish this, what will happen?; Brown, 2002; Lent et al., 1994). Outcome expectations involve numerous types of beliefs about response results, such as extrinsic reinforcement, self-directed consequences, and performance processing (Brown, 2002).

Several theories in vocation (Barak, 1981; Vroom, 1964) and psychology (Ajzen, 1988) believe outcome expectations play an integral role in motivating behavior. Consistent with Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory, one’s behavior is dependent on the outcomes associated with the behavior and the value placed on those outcomes (Cunningham et al., 2005; Cunningham et al., 2007; Lent et al., 1994). For instance, expected positive results can serve as a motivation, conversely, expected negative outcomes may deter pursuit (Lent & Brown, 1996). Using this perspective, an assistant athletic director is more likely to try to become an athletic director if he or she foresees favorable outcomes as a result of their behavior.

Similar to self-efficacy outcome expectations are acquired from learning experiences (Brown, 2002). For example, career outcome expectations derive from
appraisals (e.g., rewards), self-approval, observations and reactions of others (Brown, 2002). Bandura (1986) categorized the outcome expectations into three forms: physical (e.g., monetary, status, and power), self-evaluative (e.g., satisfaction and self-fulfillment), and social (e.g., approval). Each of these outcomes is important for a senior level athletic administrator to understand because of pressures that an athletic director faces. Thus, the second and third hypotheses of this study were derived.

**Hypothesis 2.** Outcome expectations will mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and vocational interests.

**Hypothesis 3.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will express fewer outcome expectations associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

**Choice goals.** Aligned with the theoretical model of Ajzen’s (1988) theory of planned behavior, choice goals are also referred to as behavioral intentions (Cunningham et al., 2007) and are found to be adjacent antecedent of one’s behaviors. In accordance with Bandura (1986) an individual’s determination to engage in a specific action is known as choice goals.

When an individual sets a goal, it helps guide and organize their behavior (Lent et al., 1994). Given that goals are influence by one’s self-efficacy and outcome expectations, when an individual builds their self-efficacy in a specific facet and they have a positive outcome, they are more likely to set and achieve that goal (Lent & Brown, 1996). For example, Cunningham et al. (2007) discovered if an assistant coach pursued an action, such as applying for a head position, they were more likely to pursue it. Specific to this research, if an assistant athletic director intends to apply for an athletic
director position, it is more likely he or she will follow through with the goal. As a result the fourth hypothesis of this study was created.

**Hypothesis 4.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will have higher choice goals (intentions) for becoming a Division I Athletic Director during their career.

**Vocational interests.** Interests can be created as early as childhood when individuals are first exposed to a wide array of activities, such as sports (Brown, 2002). In accordance with Brown (2002) an individual’s pattern of likes and dislikes regarding occupations is known as vocational interest. Particularly, vocational interests are believed to be key determinants of career choice (Betsworth & Fouad, 1997; Hansen, 1984). The likelihood one will intend to pursue a given profession is contingent on an individual’s interest (Lent et al., 1994).

Vocational interests are also a predictor of one’s self-efficacy and outcome expectations (Lent et al., 1994). SCCT asserts that interests are formed when people believe they are competent at a task and when they can produce valued outcomes (Bandura; 1986; Lent, Larkin, & Brown, 1989). Furthermore, if an individual cannot apply their interests, they will select a less interesting occupational path that is available for them to perform adequately (Brown, 2002). Accordingly, if a senior level athletic administrator anticipates he or she will have a positive outcome as a Division I Athletic Director and believes he or she can be successful as a Division I Athletic Director, then that career move will be of interest to them. In return, these interests peak one’s choice goals (Cunningham et al. 2007; Lent et al., 1994) and led to the fifth and sixth hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 5.** Vocational interests will positively influence choice goals.
**Hypothesis 6.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will have more interest in becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

**Environmental factors.** Contextual factors, whether objective or perceived, are an integral part of the career decision process. SCCT drew from the work of Astin (1984) and Vondracek, Lerner, and Schulenberg (1986) to conceptualize environmental influences. An individual's perception of available resources and opportunity structures is derived from cultural, material, physical, and social features of the environment (Brown, 2002). SCCT emphasizes the active role individual's play in evaluating and giving meaning to what the environment provides. Dean (1984) discovered minority groups felt they had less control over their environment compared to dominate groups.

Conceptually, environmental factors have been categorized into two subgroups, proximal and distal, which are appropriate for an individual's career choice. Distal factors are contextual influences based on an individual's background, whereas proximal factors are critical current choices (Brown, 2002). For instance, when an individual is actively searching for a job proximal factors such as informal networks, financial status, job opportunities, and discriminate hiring practices can influence the process (Lent & Brown, 1996). Additionally, role models, support systems, opportunities for experience, and academic pedigree are distal factors, which can affect the decision making process (Lent & Brown, 1996). By categorizing these environmental SCCT investigates how non-traditional leaders cope with perceived barriers throughout their career (Wicker, 2008).

In addition, environmental influences such as support and barriers have been strongly associated to the concept of self-efficacy (Cunningham et al., 2005; Lent et al.,
and social capital) has been shown to have a stronger association than barriers (Lent et al., 2003) with self-efficacy. Stangl and Kane (1991) found informal networks hindered women’s social capital with tokenism and marginalization. In coaching, Cunningham and Sagas (2002) found women to have more experience, education, and training than men coaches, but women received lower returns for their human capital.

Barriers have been displayed by discrimination in hiring practices and limited opportunities (Lent et al., 2000). Cunningham et al. (2007) discovered more barriers for women coaches than men coaches. When individuals compromise their interests because of perceived barriers, limited opportunities, or unsupportive environments, their career choices are made on the basis of self-efficacy, job availability, and outcome expectations (Brown, 2002).

In context to this research, senior athletic administrators’ interests and intentions in regards to becoming a Division I Athletic Director is dependent on their perceptions of the barriers and support in the external environment. Based on these descriptions the remaining hypotheses were proposed.

**Hypothesis 7.** Supports will positively influence self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 8.** Barriers will negatively influence outcome expectations.

**Hypothesis 9.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will perceive fewer supports associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

**Hypothesis 10.** Relative to leaders, non-traditional leaders will perceive more barriers associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director.
Career Development and SCCT of Non-Traditional Leaders

In accordance with Fitzgerald and Betz (1994) progress has been slow in understanding the role of socio-structural factors such as race and gender. Historically, career development theories described these factors in general terms, and focused more on group differences of career outcomes than on processes that affect career development (Hackett & Lent, 1992). SCCT considers gender and race to be socially constructed attributes relevant to career developments because of the reactions they evoke from the environment and the relation they have with opportunities (Brown, 2002). Viewing gender and race as social constructs shifts the focus to cultural, economic, and social conditions that influence exposures to learning opportunities, interpersonal reactions, and outcomes (Brown, 2002).

In terms of gender, the gender-role socialization process explains how context, cognition, and gender contribute to shaping an individual’s educational and professional possibilities. Men and women are encouraged, expected, and treated differently because of sociocultural gender expectations (Arbona, 2000; Eccles, 1994). Therefore, differences exist in the development of their talents, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations (Bandura, 1997; Lent & Lopez, 2002). For example, Hackett and Betz (1981) found biases limited opportunities to observe and practice specific behaviors, as a result, women may develop a higher self-efficacy for feminine-type activities such as domestic or artwork tasks while they may feel less efficacious at more masculine activities, such as athletics (Hackett & Betz, 1981).

Hackett and Betz (1981) also proposed career self-efficacy restricted women’s career choices more than their interest, values, or abilities. They found men to have constant occupational self-efficacy, while women’s self-efficacy fluctuated between
traditional and non-traditional occupations (Hackett & Betz, 1981). Additionally, gender-stereotypes have limited women in non-traditional career opportunities, thus, restricting their ability to find well-paying jobs (Sharf, 2006). Furthermore, role models have been found to influence non-traditional career interests of women (Nauta, Epperson, & Kahn, 1998).

Similar to women, SCCT research on racial minorities’ sense of self-efficacy has revealed significant differences (Sharf, 2006). In 1991, Lauver and Jones found Native American environments hindered their self-efficacy development. A year later, Hackett, Betz, Casa, and Rocha-Singh (1992) discovered Mexican American student’s academic preparation lowered their self-efficacy. Additionally, Flores and O'Brien (2002) found self-efficacy expectations of non-traditional careers to be predicted by how well individuals assimilated to their environment.

In addition to self-efficacy, SCCT literature has been concerned with the perceived barriers that non-traditional leaders encounter. Several notable researchers have identified family-work conflict, discrimination, negative attitudes, role models, stereotypes, and networks as perceived career barriers (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002; Grappendorf & Lough, 2006; Leong, 1995; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Scott & Brown, 2006; Weinberg, Revels, & Jackson, 1984; Wicker, 2008). Not only have these barriers reduced career self-efficacy, Luzzo and McWhirter (2001) reported they have influenced an individual’s occupational success.

In short, the effects of gender and race on career interest, choice goals, and performance are derived from one’s learning experiences. Additionally, career goals are shaped by gender and cultural factors that are linked to opportunity structures and
environmental contexts (Brown, 2002). Thus, applying SCCT to non-traditional leader’s career is appropriate because of the complexity of one’s behavior, cognition, and environment (Wicker, 2008).
Figure 2-1. Hypothesized path analysis.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH PROCESS

Research Design

The use of triangulation is suggested to supplement the reliability and validity of collected data (Adcock & Collier, 2001; Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2007; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). As such a mixed-method approach was used to determine factors contributing to the underrepresentation of non-traditional leaders at the Division I Athletic Director position.

Survey Participants

According to the 2009-2010 NCAA Race and Gender Demographic Report, there were 12.8% racial minorities and 37% women in NCAA Division I senior athletic administrator positions. Therefore, a stratified random sample of senior athletic administrators was used to ensure a representative sample was surveyed. During the summer of 2011 pre-notification email invitations were sent to 1610 senior athletic administrators of NCAA Division I FCS and FBS institutions. One hundred and ninety-two emails were returned for invalid email addresses, and 354 out of office responses indicated individuals had vacationed, retired, or changed positions. A total of 165 NCAA Division I senior athletic administrators (100 non-traditional leaders, 65 traditional leaders) participated in the study for a response rate of 16%. The majority of participants were males (n = 88; 52.7%) with an average age of 43 years (SD = 9.74). In terms of identity, respondents identified themselves as Caucasian/White (n = 132; 80.0%), African American/Black (n = 20; 12.1%), Hispanic (n = 6; 3.6%), Asian American (n = 3; 2%), Native Hawaiian (n = 2; 1.2%), American Indian (n = 1; .6%) or other (n = 1; .6%). On average, senior athletic administrators had seven years (SD =
6.27) of work experience with their institution (i.e., organizational tenure) and 13 years (SD = 7.63) of working experience as an athletic administrator (i.e., occupational tenure). While only 27.1% of the participants had been former collegiate coaches, 52.4% were former collegiate student-athletes.

**Interview Participants**

The non-traditional leaders chosen (see Table 3-1) for this research were senior athletic administrators of NCAA Division I and II intercollegiate athletic departments. Two requirements had to be met to participate: be self-identified as non-traditional, and currently be employed as a senior athletic administrator. Non-traditional leaders meeting these requirements were recruited purposively from the psychometric survey or referred to by participants.

All of the participants were self-identified as non-traditional with an average age of 38, with the oldest being 54 and the youngest being 28. Four of the participants were single, five were married, and only three had children. In terms of education, four of the participants hold a Master’s Degree, three hold a Doctorate Degree, and two were in pursuit of a Doctorate Degree. Sixty-seven percent of the non-traditional senior athletic administrators were former collegiate student athletes, and thirty-three percent were former collegiate coaches. Five of the nine participants worked at a PWI, while the remaining four worked at a HBCU. On average, the participants had 10 years of athletic administration experience, ranging between 2 and 20 years. One participant had been a former NCAA Division II Athletic Director.
Data Collection Methods

Instrumentation

Since the goals of this investigation were to gain an understanding of how gender and race influence non-traditional leaders’ intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director and to explore how non-traditional leaders’ career choices have influenced their collegiate athletic workplace experience, a mixed method approach was considered the most appropriate. To gather data a self-completion questionnaire (see Appendix A) and semi-structured interview (see Appendix B) were framed from SCCT variables.

Whereas questionnaires obtained objective profiles, interviews explored the survey results in context (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006). Since one of the essential characteristics of qualitative research is to reveal the interaction of an individuals’ construct reality with the social world (Merriam, 2001), the qualitative follow up study added value, detail and meaning to the quantitative data (Patton, 2002).

Initially, participants were given an online survey measuring SCCT variables and demographic questions. The SCCT measures were adapted and adopted from the career literature in sport (Cunningham & Singer, 2010; Cunningham et al., 2005; Cunningham et al., 2007; Doherty & Johnson, 2001; Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998; Feltz, Chase, Mortiz, & Sullivan, 1999; Lent et al., 1994) then operationalized (Bryman, 2004; Shoemaker, Tankard, & Lasorsa, 2004) to meet the specific content of this research.

Since Collins (2003) and Adcock and Collier (2001) emphasize the importance of cognitive debriefing to ensure the respondents understand the intent of the researcher’s questions, prior to the release of the survey, reliability and validity were assessed through the use of an expert panel and a pilot test on a sample of six former and current
senior level administrators. The opinions of the expert panel weighed heavily on the
representation of the content areas (Clark & Watson, 1993; Hennessy, Mabey, & Warr,
1998). Therefore, the decision to add one self-efficacy and four barrier items to the
questionnaire was made. Additionally, reliability testing was conducted in SPSS to
assess internal consistency for each of the adapted and adopted measures (Pallant,
2007). Prior to computing statistical analyses the data composite means were
calculated for each of the SCCT variables. After validating the instrument the
Institutional Review Board at the University of Florida approved the research proposal
and design under UFIRB #2011-U-784.

**Self-efficacy.** Nine items were adopted and adapted from existing literature to
measure self-efficacy (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2005, Cunningham
et al., 2007; Cunningham & Singer, 2010; Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). Participants
read statements specific to activities athletic directors perform, and then rated their level
of confidence in accomplishing each activity. Sample items include, “I am confident I
could excel as a Division I AD of a university athletic program” and “I am confident that
as a Division I AD I could effectively identify individuals and groups who can help my
program.” A 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (no confidence) to 7 (complete
confidence) was used to measure self-efficacy items.

**Outcome expectations.** Adopting and adapting Cunningham et al.’s (2005) and
Cunningham and Singer (2010) positive and negative outcome expectations items (α = .84)
were measured. Additionally, consistent with Bandura’s (1986) numerous items
displaying physical (e.g., time constraints, rewards), self-evaluative (e.g., stress,
satisfaction), social (e.g., approval and disapproval) outcomes were included. Sample
outcome expectation items include, “Becoming a Division I AD would be very satisfying to me” and “Being a Division I AD would be very time consuming.” An equivalent 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to rate each outcome expectation item.

**Vocational Interest.** Cunningham and Singer (2010) adopted and adapted three-item instrument will be used to measure an individual’s vocational interest. Example items include, “Becoming a Division I AD is something that interest me” and “I really have no interest in becoming a Division I AD”. The same 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was used to measure vocational interest items.

**Choice goals.** Adopting and adapting Cunningham et al. (2007), Cunningham and Singer (2010) (α = .76), and Hagger, Chatzisarantis, and Biddle’s (2002) conceptualized behavior intentions, choice goals were measured by asking participants the extent to which they intend, plan, or will try to become a Division I AD during their career. For example, a choice goal item states, “I intend to become a Division I AD during my career.” A 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) was also used to measure each item.

**Barriers.** According to Lent et al. (2000) barriers have been used to reflect external environmental factors that may influence an individual’s cognitive perception. For example, discriminatory hiring, availability of opportunities, and network contacts have supported or hindered individuals (Lent et al., 2000). Cunningham et al. (2005) found an association between self-efficacy and barriers. Eight items will be used to measure barriers in becoming a Division I Athletic Director. A sample barrier item stated
“People with demographic characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, gender, race) similar to mine typically have a hard time obtaining a Division I AD position.” Each barrier item was rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Supports.** Lent et al. (2000) and Cunningham and Singer’s (2010) support items were adapted to measure human and social capital of senior athletic administrators. The following support sample items include “I have the training to become a Division I AD” and “I feel I know enough people in the field to secure a Division I AD position.” Each of the support items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Procedures**

Since research methods are linked to research designs (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005), it was important the correct data collection method was chosen, thus, a mixed method study was deemed appropriate to collect data. As previously stated, a SCCT questionnaire was pilot tested with a sample (n=6) of current and former senior athletic administrators. To contact NCAA Division I senior athletic administrators, email addresses were collected from athletic university websites. Once a point of contact list was established questionnaires were distributed via email. Initially, an email invitation was sent to senior athletic administrators notifying them of a survey. The invitation introduced the intent of the research and solicited participation in assessing senior athletic administrators’ intent to become a Division I Athletic Director (see Appendix A). If they chose to proceed with the survey, a link to the consent (see Appendix B) and questionnaire (see Appendix C) was available. At the end of the survey, non-traditional leaders were asked if they wanted to participate in a qualitative follow-up interview.
Non-respondents of the survey received an email reminder each week for two weeks following the initial email invitation.

Secondly, semi-structured interviews were used to collect qualitative data. The technique was derived from a phenomenological approach (Lee & Koro-Ljungber, 2007) and previous theoretical lenses used to explain the lack of non-traditional leaders. Participants who provided their contact information or were purposely selected received an email invitation and consent form (see Appendix D) stating the purpose and method. After confirming participation, a copy of the interview questions were sent to each participant (see Appendix E) and an interview time was scheduled. The semi-structured interview protocol stated primary questions with additional probing questions to gain insight into non-traditional senior athletic administrators experience (Hesse-Biber, 2007). With the consent of each participant the interview was audio taped.

Originally coined by German philosopher Edward Husserl, the phenomenological approach studies “how people describe things and experience them through their senses” (Patton, 2002, p. 105). This approach assumes an individual’s perception is the main component to one’s understanding of their experience. Additionally, an individual’s interpretation of experienced events is the focus of a phenomenological approach. Therefore, researchers used a phenomenological approach to interpret in-depth data on the participants’ individualized experiences and ascertain how their perceived experience impacted the collective group (Glesne, 1999; Moustakas, 1994).

In this investigation, the phenomenological approach guided the examination of non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ socialization experiences and described the influences on their intentional career development. Through interviews detailed
experiences of institutional and socio-cultural norms in Division I athletic departments were revealed. Likewise, an assessment of the ability for the athletic environment to influence one’s intentions was explored.

**Interviews**

To access the under-represented voices of non-traditional leaders, three primary types of interview protocols could have been used: unstructured, semi-structured, and structured. Similar to a conversation, unstructured interviews have the most flexibility because the research participant dictates the direction of the interview (Bryman, 2004; Hesse-Biber, 2007). A researcher may ignite the unstructured interview with a single question, and then the interviewee openly responds and dictates the direction of conversation (Bryman, 2004). During semi-structured interviews, the researcher is guided by a list of question (Bryman, 2004). The open nature of semi-structured interviews allows research participants the forum to provide insight into their socialization process. Conversely, the inflexible nature of structured interviews restricts participants’ answers to the specific close-ended questions asked (Bryman, 2004; Fontana & Frey, 2005; Hesse-Biber, 2007).

Depending on the nature of the study, Bryman (2004) and Hesse-Biber (2007) suggest using unstructured interviewed for exploratory data, semi-structured interviews for in-depth understanding, and structured interviews for theory testing. As researchers we had specific concerns guiding the study, therefore, semi-structured interviews were deemed appropriate to investigate the career choices of non-traditional leaders becoming a Division I Athletic Director. A guided interview list of questions was asked to each participant; however, their responses dictated the use of probes to further the
interview. In the event of uncertainty after the transcription, follow-up interviews were conducted for clarification and summarization.

**Data Analysis Techniques**

**Evaluating Quantitative Research**

As aforesaid the SCCT instrument’s reliability was tested to verify internal consistency of each scale. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the variables. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) explored group differences of the six hypotheses relative to the leaders and the SCCT variables. Additionally, due to the sample size direct relations between the SCCT variable were tested and evaluated the remaining four hypotheses by path analytical procedures using SPSS 20 and Mplus. While criticism exists, path analysis is a technique that allows direct and indirect relationship testing of theoretical and empirically supported relationships (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Pedhazur, 1997; Ullman, 1996). Advantageously, a number of studies have implemented path analysis to explore the relationship between SCCT constructs (Lent et al., 1994; Pajares & Johnson, 1996; Pajares & Kranzler, 1995).

The proposed path and self-completion questionnaire properties were investigated using Muthen & Muthen’s Mplus Version 6 and SPSS 20.0. First, the constructs and indicator properties of the self-completions questionnaire were evaluated for convergent and discriminant validity. Mplus displays calculations of standard error regression coefficients to determine significant path coefficients. A critical ration (CR) is produced when the path coefficient is divided by the standard error; statistically significant parameters are signified by an absolute value above 1.96 (Hu & Bentler, 1998). When using Mplus to conduct path analysis goodness-of-fit measures including chi square, comparative fit index (CFI, Tucker-Lewise Index (TLI), a root mean square or error
approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) are yielded. Criteria for the common fit include a CFI and TLI estimate ≥0.95 and a RMSEA estimate ≥0.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell; 2007). Goodness-of-fit measures estimate the credibility of a path analysis for the sampled population whereas path estimates indicate the effects of exogenous and endogenous variables. In this study, path analysis was run to examine the proposed hypothesized relationships, the direct effects and the mediating effect of outcome expectation on self-efficacy and vocational interests; furthermore, SCCT-based paths were assessed to determine the credibility of SCCT predicting senior athletic administrators’ intentions to become a Division I Athletic Director. And compare traditional and non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ intentions.

Confirming quantitative results with a follow-up qualitative analysis are valuable and relevant (Cunningham & Singer, 2010). Therefore, semi-structured interviews assessed the ability for the athletic environment, barriers and supports, to influence non-traditional leaders’ intentions was conducted until theoretical saturation occurred (Bryman, 2004). The interviews were transcribed verbatim and coded into themes and patterns (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Using deductive reasoning and analysis (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006) the SCCT variables guided the interview to reveal specific actions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators.

**Quality Assurance Criteria for Evaluating Qualitative Research**

Qualitative research should meet the following criterions (Bryman, 2004; Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985):

1) trustworthiness
2) credibility (internal validity)
3) transferability (external validity)
4) dependability (reliability)
5) confirmability (objectivity)
6) triangulation

Trustworthiness can be enhanced through credibility, confirmability, transferability, dependability, and triangulation (Bryman, 2004). Marshall and Rossman (1989) suggested the environment and population influence descriptions of a phenomenon; therefore, each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim. Credibility was facilitated with accurate documentations and summaries of my interpretations to the participants (Bryman, 2004; Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Exhaustive descriptions of specific settings were used to assist with the transferability of the data from one context to another (Bryman, 2004; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Themes were coded independently and confirmed by two expert panel members to enhance the accuracy and dependability. To confirm interpretations, researchers remained neutral with an audit of raw data and notes while the qualitative data was gathered and analyzed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Finally, triangulation was utilized to enhance trustworthiness and to evaluate contradicting data (Creswell, 2007; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo Name</th>
<th>Ethnic Racial Identity</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Collegiate Student Athlete</th>
<th>Collegiate Coach</th>
<th>Intent to be a DI AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Baker</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Right</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Cleo Jones</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deneen Renee</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Love</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel King</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Light</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Bachelor/Professional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hatter</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANOVA

MANOVA results were used to identify SCCT variations by leaders. The correlations and reliability coefficients are listed in Table 4-1. In addition, mean differences by leaders are listed in Table 4-2. Preliminary analyses tested for outliers, normality, homogeneity of variance, multicollinearity, and linearity. Since there were no serious violations of assumptions, further analysis was conducted. Significant results demonstrative multivariate effects for leaders, Wilks’ λ = 0.48, F (6, 158) = 28.51, p < 0.001, η² = .52, therefore further examination of the relationships for each dependent variable was warranted.

Due to the fact of multiple analyses, Pallant (2007) suggests the Bonferroni method be set to a higher alpha level to reduce Type 1 error. Thus, the 0.05 alpha level was divided by the six individual analyses and set to 0.01. As a result, between-subject effects were only considered significant if they were found to be equal to or less than 0.01 alpha level. Subsequent univariate analyses revealed a significant effect for barriers, F (1, 163) = 165.35, p < 0.001, η² = .50 (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.04, SD = .78; traditional leaders M = 2.52, SD = .67). With the lower sample size, it is also noteworthy to recognize the between-subject effects that were below the 0.05 alpha level: outcome expectations, F (1, 163) = 4.04, p < 0.05, η² = .02 (non-traditional leaders: M =5.31, SD = .805; traditional leaders: M = 5.56, SD = .73); vocational interest, F (1, 163) = 4.57, p < 0.05, η² = .03 (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.82, SD = 2.00; traditional leaders: M = 5.46, SD = 1.66); and intentions, F (1, 163) = 5.58, p <
0.05, η² = .03 (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.32, SD = 2.09 traditional leaders: M = 5.07, SD = 1.82).

Since there was not a significant leader difference in self-efficacy, hypothesis one, which stated non-traditional leaders will express lower self-efficacy for becoming a Division I Athletic Director, was not supported. Hypothesis three stating non-traditional leaders will express fewer outcome expectations associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director was supported in that non-traditional leaders (M = 5.31, SD = .81) expressed fewer outcome expectations than traditional leaders (M = 5.56, SD = .73). In contrast to hypothesis four, which stated non-traditional leaders will have higher choice goals (intentions) for becoming a Division I Athletic Director during their career, and hypothesis six, which stated non-traditional leaders will have more interest in becoming a Division I Athletic Director, non-traditional leaders revealed lower choice goals (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.32, SD = 2.09; traditional leaders: M = 5.07, SD = 1.82) and less interest (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.82, SD = 2.00; traditional leaders: M = 5.46, SD = 1.66) in becoming a Division I Athletic Director. In terms of the environmental factors, there was no significant leader difference in supports (non-traditional leaders: M = 4.57, SD = 1.39; traditional leaders: M = 4.73, SD = 1.36); therefore, hypothesis nine stating non-traditional leaders will perceive fewer supports associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director, was not supported. However, hypothesis ten, which stated non-traditional leaders will perceive more barriers associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director, was partially supported in that non-traditional leaders (Gender barrier: M = 4.71, SD = 1.74; Ethnic/Race barrier: M = 3.51, SD = 1.73) did perceive more barriers associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director than their traditional
counterparts (Gender barrier: M = 2.12, SD = .78; Ethnic/Race barrier: M = 2.18, SD = .83).

**Path Analysis**

The hypothesized path (Figure 2-1) included all of the SCCT relationships. To accommodate the sample total of 165 cases average variables were created and measurement error variances were inputted into the coding of the path with coefficient alphas.

A correlation matrix was used to test for discriminant validity (see Table 4-1). According to Kline (2005) one of the estimated correlations, vocational interest and intentions, was excessively high ≥ .85. As such, a test for multicollinearity was conducted and with the exception of a high factor correlation the data analyses of the scale were established. Prior to interpreting the results, preliminary analyses tested for linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity to ensure violations did not occur. To investigate the hypothesized path relationships between supports, barriers, self-efficacy, outcome expectations, vocational interest, and intentions, path analysis was conducted. The proposed path results (see Figure 4-1) revealed an adequate fit, with χ²/df of 1.82, CFI of .98, TLI of .97, RMSEA of .07, and SRMR of .05.

Hypothesis seven examined the direct effect of supports on self-efficacy. Results supported the hypothesis stating a significant positive effect (β = .54, p < .01), existed between supports and self-efficacy. The eighth hypothesis investigated the negative effect of barriers, particularly gender, race, and ethnicity, on outcome expectations. Results revealed gender was significant (β = -.28, p < .01), while race and ethnicity (β = .00, p > .05), had no effect on outcome expectations. Thus, hypothesis eight was
Hypothesis two was investigated in path analysis with a three step approach (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Dugard, Todman, & Staines, 2010) to examine the mediating effect of outcome expectations on self-efficacy and vocational interests.

First, the direct effect (see Figure 4-2) of the predictor (self-efficacy) on the outcome (vocational interest) without the presence of a mediator (outcome expectations) was investigated. Since a significant relationship existed ($\beta = .34, p < .05$), we continued to step two of the analysis. Step two investigated the fully-mediated path between self-efficacy and outcome expectations and outcome expectations and vocational interest (see Figure 4-3). Step two also revealed significant relationships between self-efficacy and outcome expectations ($\beta = .32, p < .05$), and between outcome expectations and vocational interests ($\beta = .78, p < .05$). In the final step, the proposed path was tested with the addition of the direct path from self-efficacy to vocational interest (see Figure 4-1). Thus, hypothesis two stating outcome expectations will mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and vocational interests was supported.

Finally, the fifth hypothesis, vocational interest would positively influence intentions, was also supported. The direct relationship from vocational interest to intentions ($\beta = .96, p < .01$) was significant.

**Path Comparisons**

Differences between traditional and non-traditional senior athletic administrators SCCT-based paths existed (see Figure 4-1). When focusing on traditional senior athletic administrators’ path, the second, seventh, and eighth hypotheses were not supported. The gender barrier was not found to have a significant direct effect on outcome expectations for traditional senior athletic administrators ($\beta = .21, p > .05$). Furthermore,
outcome expectation was not found to mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and vocational interest for traditional senior athletic administrators, whereas it did mediate the relationship for non-traditional senior athletic administrators. In contrast to the traditional senior athletic administrators’ path, the non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ path revealed a significant negative direct effect of gender barrier on outcome expectations ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .05$).

**Survey Discussion**

The purpose of the dissertation was to reveal how the intersection of gender, ethnicity, and race may influence the intentions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ intentions of becoming Division I Athletic Directors. Therefore, SCCT variable differences were examined by leaders as a means to explain the underrepresentation of Division I Non-traditional Athletic Directors. Contrary to the hypotheses, non-traditional leaders expressed lower vocational interests and intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director. While the influence of sociological factors, such as structural barriers (Inglis et al., 2000) and homologous reproduction (Stangl & Kane, 1991) were disregarded by this study, these two findings are consistent with previous non-traditional coaching literature (Cunningham & Sagas, 2002; Cunningham et al., 2003; Sagas et al., 2000). Conversely, Cunningham and Singer (2010) recently revealed higher vocational interest and intentions of racial minority student-athletes despite the barriers. In addition to the aforesaid sociological factors, these findings suggest the difference between traditional and non-traditional leaders’ intentions is a partial explanation for the underrepresentation of non-traditional Division I Athletic Directors.
Moreover, non-traditional leaders had insignificantly lower administrative self-efficacy and significantly less favorable outcome expectation scores. While the self-efficacy scores challenged previous SCCT sport literature (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007), historically, Lent et al. (1994) have shown differences in self-efficacy led to outcome expectation differences, but in this study it is unclear of the source causing the difference. The presence of outcome expectations leader differences suggest non-traditional leaders, relative to traditional, anticipate fewer rewards, satisfaction, and approval for being a Division I Athletic Director. Thus, to enhance the career literature insight on the antecedents of senior athletic administrators’ vocational interests and intentions, further research is needed to understand why even with similar administrative self-efficacy non-traditional leaders associate less favorable outcome expectations associated with being a Division I Athletic Director than their counterparts, traditional leaders.

Finally, non-traditional differentiated in their perceptions of environmental factors. In contrast to the support hypothesis and previous literature stating women have fewer supports (Inglis et al., 2000; Knoppers, 1992), the findings revealed no support differences by leader. With regard to barriers, similar to Cunningham and Singer’s (2010) findings, non-traditional leaders anticipated significantly more barriers to becoming a Division I Athletic Director than traditional leaders.

**Interview Results and Discussion**

“Oh my God, if a black man can be a president, surely one can be an AD.” The irony in Cleo’s statement, questions the true progress non-traditional leaders have made in the sport workplace. Over the last decade historical non-traditional hires have been made across the nation, but so have the noteworthy defending comments like, “his
selection was not made because he is African-American, but because he was the finest candidate available in the nationwide search” (Orlando, 2006, p. 1). Even the non-traditional hire rebutted the notion that he is the first African-American Athletic Director by articulating “while being African-American is important, I’m just an athletic director.”

This section was intentionally prefaced with highlights non-traditional leaders have endured while accepting leadership positions. Second, these statements raise interest in the institutionalized dominance in hierarchical structures, specifically in athletic administration. Therefore, in addressing the research questions, emphasis was on the formative communal experiences non-traditional senior athletic administrators have faced in their intent to become a Division I Athletic Director.

Obstructed Access and Opportunity: “If the Process is Fair I Feel as Though I got a Fair Opportunity to Win”

While some times subtle, yet overt, discrimination has been experienced by non-traditional leaders in the hiring process as well as in the job itself (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Lopiano, 2001; Messner, 2002; Moran-Miller & Flores, 2011; Salter, 1996; Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Thus, discrimination may assist in the explanation, at least in part, why some non-traditional senior athletic administrators express lower outcome expectations and vocational interest in becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

Levitin, Quinn, and Staines (1971) categorized discrimination into two groups: access and treatment. Discrimination may occur prior to an individual’s entrance in a workplace (e.g., access discrimination) or after an individual is hired by an organization (e.g., treatment discrimination; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Levitin et al., 1971). Therefore, it is important to reveal the role of access and treatment
discrimination of senior athletic administrators in their pursuit of a Division I Athletic Director position.

**Access discrimination.** When individuals of a particular social category are limited to entering a profession or obtaining a job is known as access discrimination (Greenhaus et al., 1990; Terborg & Ilgen, 1975). According to Terborg and Ilgen (1975) examples of these limitations include, but are not limited to having lower starting salaries, failing to hire applications for a job-irrelevant reason, lacking access to higher skilled jobs, failing to recruit candidates for specific positions.

In the sport context, the existence of access discrimination has been demonstrated in several studies. Women coaches, relative to men coaches, faced discrimination in hiring process (Stangl & Kane, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994). Similarly, African Americans coaches faced access discrimination on staffs with White head coaches (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005; Hamilton, 1997). In terms of administration, Longley (2000) discovered the underrepresentation of French Canadian administrators on English Canadian NHL teams.

In terms of recruitment, several participants do not believe non-traditional senior athletic administrators are being actively recruited for Division I Athletic Director positions. Specifically, Mark reiterates this notion when he states

*I don’t believe they [non-traditional senior athletic administrators] are actually being recruited. I think if you go around the country there are a lot of senior level administrators there that are non-traditional, that are ready to take the plunge and go to the next level. It is just about someone giving them an opportunity.*

In addition to the recruitment process, once a non-traditional senior athletic administrator discovers a job announcement for a Division I Athletic Director position, participants felt an obstruction already existed because the position already had an
ideal candidate in mind prior to the interviews being conducted. This is in agreement with Myles’ (2005) argument that once an administration job announcement has been release to the public, it is too late because a name has already been attached to it. Mark reemphasizes if the process was fair his credentials would compete just as well as any other candidate.

I think a lot of people are equipped with the same skills no matter if they are Black, White, Protestant, Gentile, Jewish, Catholic, whatever you know, we are all created equal. I think it becomes a point in time when you just gotta let the best person do the job. Not you friend not your buddy, but the best person. I feel as though any time I go on a job interview, if you bring me into the job interview I’m going to stack up just as good or just as well as any body else you brought in, and if the process is fair I feel as though I got a fair opportunity to win, but if it is done before I get there, it doesn’t matter what I bring to the table. I mean you are just giving me a token interview.

Not only are recruitment and irrelevanct hindrances to one’s access, but so is the limited number of Division I Athletic Director positions. As Kyle noted he intends to be a Division I Athletic Director at a scholastically driven institute such as Duke or Stanford, but he knows “there’s just not that many jobs, and they don’t turn over that fast, so … you have to be in the right place at the right time.”

**Treatment discrimination.** A reduction in surface improvements (i.e., access discrimination) will only provide minimal long-term outcomes, if treatment discrimination is not improved (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). When members of a subgroup “receive fewer rewards, resources, or opportunities on the job than they legitimately deserve on the basis of job-related criteria,” this is known as treatment discrimination (Greenhaus, 1990, pp. 64-65). Illustrated by Greenhaus et al. (1990), differences in treatment stem from social categorized memberships (e.g., being a non-traditional leader), rather than poor work performance. Specific to the sport context, several studies suggest treatment

With respect to gender, several studies have shown women, relative to men, faced limited advancement opportunities (e.g., Knoppers et al., 1991; Whisenant, 2003), more negative work experiences (e.g., Inglis et al., 2000). In a parallel vein, women have been siphoned into overseeing women’s sport rather than men’s revenue generating sport (Clausen & Lehr, 2002). In agreement with Clausen and Lehr (2002), and noted earlier by Laurel overseeing 15 of the 17 sports, everything besides football and men’s basketball. Numerous participants, including each of the women, referenced the lack of training development opportunities, and their persistence to acquire such opportunities.

Joy’s has felt the resistance within her FBS athletic administration,

In terms of what I can do at this level, the involvement that I have, like if I wanted to get involved in contracts, football contracts, that’s probably not going to be something that anybody’s really willing to give me, but that would help me if I wanted to become an AD at an institution with a major football program. So I think in certain things, facility stuff, they don’t think about putting me [a female] in charge of a facility, but yet that’s something that again if I’m an AD I’m going to need to have involvement in. So you know I’ve pushed to try.

As Joy declared, the opportunity to increase her professional development is key to obtaining an athletic director position. Joy’s statements emulates Lough and Grappendorf (2008) argument that “women will continue to systematically be denied access to the athletic director position” without the experience of sport oversight and financial decision-making (p.204).

Not only has treatment discrimination affected women, research has shown racial minorities suffered limitations. In terms of ethnicity and race, Bruening, Armstrong, and Pastore (2005) found unique experience of racial minority student athletes, while Sagas
and Cunningham (2005) discovered fewer coaching promotions and advancement opportunities for racial minorities. Collectively, the contention of Fink, Pastore, and Riemer (2001) emphasize the notion that individuals who differentiate from the majority-White, heterosexual, Protestant, and able-bodied, may face discriminatory practices especially within the sport context.

**Opportunity.** In addition to these two discriminatory categories, the availability of opportunities has hindered individuals in their career development (Lent et al., 2000). In terms of this study, opportunity refers to the future job prospect inclusive of perceived obstacles, access to professional developmental training, and career progression (Kanter, 1977). Opportunity emerged through the participants’ perceptions and experiences throughout their career and foresight of their career intentions in athletic administration.

All of the participants indicated their persistence to seek and pursue opportunities that would assist their career development. While Deneen mentioned she did not have experience with certain aspects of administration, she became knowledgeable and used her resources to offer suggestions on how she “would do it if I were given the opportunity.” If Kyle were given the opportunity to be a Division I Athletic Director, he will be prepared because he has “surrounded myself with opportunities to do a good job in the areas that I know are going to be important in the future. Like things that are related to strategy, technology, TV networks, and fund raising.”

Not only do non-traditional senior athletic administrators have to create their own opportunities, they have to be afforded opportunities by others. Mark claimed
It is going to take someone who has the courage and the conviction to take a chance. I think I may have all the skill sets and everything to do the job; it is just getting the opportunity to do the job.

Edward also agreed the importance of “just being able to get the opportunity,” which became evident to him during a staff meeting.

I can remember this because it was you know kind of like an Ah-ha moment. Our director of athletics made a comment, we were going back and forth about some things that were coming down the pipeline. We were having discussions about if we had a chance to change. If we were given an opportunity to change some things, what would we do, how would we address those things and ......he said until you sit in the seat you won’t know exactly what’s really going on in the state of athletics, and I said well some of us want the opportunity to get in the seat.

These narratives allude to the power decision makers have in creating opportunities and changing the landscape of athletic administration. Overall, the commonality among the participants was their endless perseverance to continue setting themselves apart and creating their own opportunities, so when a Division I Athletic Director position arises, they will be prepared, if not overqualified, for the position.

**Salient Gender: The Barrier of being a “Female in a Male Dominated Field”**

Kanter (1977) references two structural determinants, opportunity and power, which explain the institutionalized structure of sport. The ability of men to maintain power within collegiate athletics is manifested in their dominance of Division I institutions. Since the majority of revenue is generated for the NCAA and its member institutions by Division I Athletic Directors, they maintain leverage over intercollegiate athletics (Whisenant et al. 2002). After the NCAA took control of women’s sport in the early 1980s, Division I members used their financial prowess to implement organizational changes designed for self-governance within the division. This change halted the leadership gains women were making in the lower divisional levels, and
denied them access to power and financial resources within the NCAA (Whisenant et al., 2002).

Despite the fact that twenty-first century sport literature has focused on the increased market share of women leaders in sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Cunningham & Sagas, 2008); eight of the nine participants believe gender discrimination is one of the main hindrances for job mobility to a Division I Athletic Director position. These findings echo Grappendorf and Lough (2006) study that revealed 75% of respondents mentioned gender bias/discrimination. The perceived barrier that a women cannot lead, reinforces the idea that sport is still viewed as a male controlled and dominated field, and the ideologies regarding women’s ability to lead continue to hinder their progression (Grappendorf & Lough, 2006). Joy, a 15-year athletic administrator veteran, explicitly states,

My gender, it’s probably the biggest one because it’s just getting that first foot in the door. I think, in my mind, there is a perception that …people have to feel that they know the woman before they’ll hire them because it’s an unknown commodity. They don’t know on this emotional specter where they’ll be.

Laurel realizes “I am a female in a male dominated field,” and believes it will be more difficult for her to obtain a Division I Athletic Director position. Deneen, who has been a previous Division II Athletic Director, extends Laurel statement by claiming, “I’m a realist. I don’t deal with what should or shouldn’t be I just deal with ways and this is a male dominated society…it’s white male dominated.”

The dominance of White men in intercollegiate athletic leadership roles perpetuates the illusion that management is a White man’s domain. As Coakley (2009) notes, ideologies may influence the biases and norms in the landscape of athletic administration, making it likely female candidates will be viewed as less qualified than
their male counterpart. Joys’ comment that she would “have a better opportunity at a school without football or a lower division,” emulates the gender ideology found in sport leadership positions. While these factors exist in our American culture, in the realm of sport they can be detrimental (Anderson, 2008), especially to the perception and expectations of what an athletic administrator embodies.

Williams’ (1985) modern concept of hegemony, work originated from Gramsci (1971), suggests the powerlessness of women has become common sense, normal reality, or the natural order of things (Donaldson, 1993). Specifically sport, one of the most prominent hegemonic social institutions (Sage, 1998), has limited women’s progression because of men’s control and power (Theberge, 1987). Whisenant, Pedersen, and Obenour (2002) believe sport for administrators has been considered a generic domain of men. Maurice, agreed on the perception of women as leaders could cause difficulty for women becoming Division I Athletic Directors,

If you’re strong and you’re hard-nosed, you know, if you’re female and you’re that way then you can be seen, it can be seen, as a negative, but if you are a male doing those same things it’s, you know, he’s somebody that gets stuff done. And I think that perception is hard to change.

Another male participant, Maurice, supported the struggle women face in comparison to minority men, “I think because of sports and kind of the way that people think about them, being a female is harder than just being a minority male.”

While some literature proposes women adapt and fit into the male-dominated field, numerous scholars have suggested women challenge the hegemonic found in sport organization (Burrell, 1984; Mills & Tancred, 1992). Throughout Deneen’s 18 years in athletic administration she has seen women challenge the ideology and felt the recourse,
A woman who can effectively manage a Division I athletic program with football, God forbid successful football, there has got to be something about her that is just not right in terms of being a woman. And if not right then certainly not desirable because we know, generally speaking, from a sociological standpoint women who are tough, women who are aggressive, and effective problem solvers outside the home, that’s not what we generally value.

Another hindrance of the job mobility for women senior athletic administrators is the influence of family. Coakley (2009) notes sport organizations are rarely organized in a family-friendly ways. Since sport job expectations were developed over the years by men who had wives raising children, providing emotional support, and coordinating schedules (Coakley, 2009), today’s women senior athletic administrators interested in becoming a Division I Athletic Director, such as Kris, have to acknowledge the work-family dynamic,

One of the drawbacks for females is that we’re always thinking about our families. Ok, where I want my child to go to this school, I mean they have that school over there. Also, think I’m married and all these things like, what if my husband can’t find a job. I don’t want to make him feel uncomfortable, you know, moving around every five years or something like that. But those are conversations that have to be had.

Statements like this may stimulate discussions on the ability of women to manage a work-family life balance as a Division I Athletic Director, which support Inglis, Danylchuk, and Pastore’s (2000) findings that women administrators had quite limited time trying to balance work, family, and other commitments. Not only did women participants mention the influence of family dynamic on becoming a Division I Athletic Director, Maurice alludes to Inglis et al.’s (2000) findings when he stated women candidates have a hard time because of the family dynamic. Females that are in these roles or aspiring to be in these roles because of the time commitment, because of the expectations in terms of where you need to, how you need to be there, how we need to present ourselves and those things; I think that takes more
precedence over whether or not somebody can do a job based on their race. I just think the first thing when you get a female applicant for anything is do they have kids already, how old are their kids, do they want to have kids.

Consequently, Maurice’s statement contends McKay’s (1999) notion that sport organizations are not sensitive to the responsibilities of family because his narrative acknowledges administration recognizes the position a family dynamic puts on a woman and the organization. While the same may hold true for family men, only Mark spoke of the influence of his family dynamic when he stated, “professionally, for me I believe I could go anywhere, but socially for my wife and kids, you want your home to be happy.”

Overall, the influence of family dynamic on becoming a Division I Athletic Director was mentioned by every participant, but the perspectives of women demonstrated a concern for their professional ability being question, whereas men displayed a concern for the social well being of their family if they were to take the opportunity.

**Positional Segregation: “We Can Have All of the [FCS] Jobs, but We Shouldn’t Have the [FBS] Jobs”**

Although sport has evolved, Lapchick (1996) recognized similarities between racial stacking and positional segregation of non-traditional athletic administrator. First coined by Harry Edwards in 1967, racial stacking does not assign athletes based on their ability. The phenomenon of racial stacking, placement of athletes into specific positions based exclusively on their race, was an outcome of the integration of sport (Blackburn, 2007; Coakley, 2009; Eitzen & Sandford, 1975; Smith & Harrison, 1997). Comparable to stacking of athletes into peripheral positions that lack decision-making authority, non-traditional senior athletic administrators have been streamlined into peripheral athletic administration positions (i.e., senior woman administrator, athletic directors of other divisional levels).
Positional segregation occurs when administrators are placed into certain positions, thereby creating a hierarchy in administration (Blackburn, 2007). Similar to stacking, such segregation leads to inequalities in decision-making and disparities in salary (Blackburn, 2007; Coakley, 2009). Thus, non-traditional senior athletic administrators are constrained and the status quo enables traditional senior athletic administrators maintenance of their place at the crest of the hierarchy, Division I Athletic Director.

Not only have men continued their domination of Division I institutions, but within the institution, they maintain the power structure through supervision of revenue generating sports. According to Salter (1996) women are more likely to become president of their institution than they are to become the athletic director. It was not until 1992, when the second women, Merrily Baker, served as an athletic director of a Division I basketball and football program. Coincidentally, three years later she resigned when a male senior athletic administrator garnered control over the football, men’s basketball, and ice hockey programs to allegedly free her time and responsibility for other duties (Salter, 1996). Sixteen years post this incident, Deneen still agrees “boys don’t like girls who run schools with football.”

These examples echo McKay’s (1997) notion of “sex segregation of labor forces” where women are more likely to be in lower pay and status positions, while men are more likely to be found in well-paying, powerful positions (p.13). Throughout Deneen’s 18 year career she has noticed not only women, but racial minorities in lower status positions, “so you know we [non-traditional] can have all of the UNC- Wilmington and Asheville jobs, but we [non-traditional] shouldn’t have the University of Maryland or
Alabama, we [non-traditional] shouldn’t have those jobs.” Furthermore, Laurel, an SWA with 20 years of experience has overseen 15 of her institution’s 17 sports, but “guess which two I haven’t overseen, football and basketball.” She struggles with this lack of supervision of revenue generating sports because she has contemplated the NCAA pathway program, yet the program application prefers skills and experience of revenue sport oversight, therefore,

I personally thought that that was a barrier that they were putting up. In my opinion, the women’s athletic committee should say you’re only going to consider those that oversee football and men’s basketball, well you know how many women get that opportunity. I know that the women who are ADs had to request on numerous times to be able to get that. And so, you know one of the barriers is that being given the opportunity to oversee, the football or men’s basketball.

Sport oversight, inclusive of, but not limited to, fiscal responsibilities, donor relationships, coaching staff subordinates, exposure to decision makers, or sport supervision, is an integral component in achieving job mobility to a Division I Athletic Director position. Each and every participant mentioned the importance of sport oversight and the struggle to obtain such opportunities. Fortunately, for Maurice after requesting increased oversight he, recently, gained decision-making authority by participating on the athletic director search committee,

I was a part of the search committee. A lot of times people [like myself] don’t get to be a part of that search committee, and during that process you get to see how an AD interview is conducted. You get to have the conversations with the provost and have the conversation with the president as to what your opinion is. Um, that doesn’t happen very often.

Maurice continued to emphasize how much of an anomaly it was for a non-traditional senior athletic administrator to have this decision-making ability, but also how vital it was for him and others to have this type of opportunity to make a career advancement.
We [non-traditional] don’t know as many people because we’re [non-traditional] not on those committees, we’re [non-traditional] not involved the same way and we’re [non-traditional] not kind of pooled to be involved and I don’t think a lot of times we’re [non-traditional] knocking down the doors to get on those various committees and to totally extend ourselves ... Without having those examples and not being included in some of those conversations, we’re [non-traditional] not going to apply for those roles because we [non-traditional] don’t feel like we can get them.

These narratives support the social construction of structure of labor and power suggested by Connell (1987) and affirm the notion of positional segregation in athletic administration.

The frustration of positional segregation was heard in Cleo’s voice when she recounted a story of a female athletic administrator. Cleo recalled this fifty year old athletic administrator who had been second in charge for over 15 years, had just “grown tired of the pursuit” to an athletic director position. As such, Cleo’s optimism that her 36 year young, energetic mindset that “she can change the world,” is tempered by “the idea I’m supposed to have at this age anyway, but what happens when you don’t get there.”

Coincidently, in this study, women had a higher average age and occupational tenure, when compared to the participants average 10 years of athletic administrative experience and 38 year olds.

**Contract the “Good Old Boys’ Network,” Expand Your Network: “In this Industry You’ve got to Know Somebody to get a Job”**

Good old boys’ network. The existence of cathexis (Connell, 1987) within the institutionalized structure of athletic administration is evident by the networks established by those with control. The network, or “good old boys’ network,” allows White men to retain hold of athletic administration and to systematically minimize the intrusion of non-traditional senior athletic administrators into their circle. The prominence of the “good old boys’ network” was mentioned by each of the participants.
Cleo asserted “you want to hire someone who you feel comfortable with and most presidents are white males. They don’t feel comfortable with a black female. Let alone a black male, but definitely applies to females, with football,” and Joy reinforced “even over time people want to hire people that look like them. So if all your people in authority are white males, that’s who they hire.” Deneen also alluded to influence of the “good old boys’ network” by stating hiring decisions are based on a set of unwritten rules created by a group or groups that you’re not a part of. It’s hard to gain an understanding of what those rules are, or might be, or when they do change, and when they aren’t applicable.

Sixteen years post Salter’s (1996) declaration that “it is flat out the effects of the old boys’ club. It is an area of change that has been very slow to come, and it is almost the last…..old-fashioned male bastion…It is a different kind of club and they haven’t wanted to admit women” (p. 68), Maurice proclaims the presence of men’s social dominance in sport is still prevalent because guys mostly look at sports and are more engaged in sports or at least that’s the feeling or the perception. So, they are going to hire other guys and they are going to keep that network going because when you have that chalk talk or you have those conversations where you’re sitting in a hotel lobby or what have you, a lot of times they feel more comfortable talking to a male, especially, if another male is hiring that position.

Even Kris, the youngest senior women athletic administrator in this study, understood the enduring influence of the “good old boys’ network” because presidents and chancellors are the ones that hire athletic directors and firstly minorities aren’t in those circles. I mean you can look around … president are elderly white men, there’s nothing wrong with that, but they’re only going to look at people who are in their circles and I think that’s just how it is.

Kris’ statement echoes Schein’s (1985) stance that “organizations tend to find attractive those candidates who resemble present members in style, assumptions,
values, and beliefs” (p.235). Fittingly, the influence of financial donors on the athletic administration hiring decisions (Myles, 2005; Rosellini, 1987) causes an extension of the “good old boys’ network,” and Kyle is well aware of the role donors and their influence on the process. Donors tend to be older, ethnically homogenous, full of white guys, and the influence of those people will probably lead to more ADs being hired who are similar to them. Whether it’s explicit or implicit…there’s certainly a comfort level when an AD is easily able to interact with a donor, like the donors feel they are more comfortable with that AD. I think that’s where it starts.

These narratives suggest the advancement of non-traditional senior athletic administrators into athletic director positions have been a result of this organizational barrier (Hall, 1989). The gross underrepresentation of non-traditional sport leaders (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011) signals to non-traditional leaders that sport is a White male institute where non-traditional leaders are not fully welcomed or embraced into the leadership ranks of athletic administration. The White men dominance in intercollegiate athletic leadership roles (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchik, 2011) perpetuates the illusion that management is a White man’s domain and they will continue to hold the decision-making power to hire and fire.

Hall (1989) suggested changes in hiring and promoting practice must occur. Even though the culture of the organization may be strengthened by recruiting and selecting homogeneous individuals that align with the mission, such practices become problematic and exclusive (Schein, 1985; Slack, 1997). When this systemic exclusion occurs it is referred to as homosocial reproduction of managers (Kanter, 1977). While inclusive athletic director hires have been on the rise (Lapchick, 2011), Mark remains reluctant of the “good old boys’ network’s” commitment to the hire.

Sometimes you just have to be able to stay the course, but sometimes I don’t think with non-traditional, they don’t stay the course. If it is not instant
success they bolt on it. You know, we’ve got to stay the course. You know if you sign a person to an X number of years contract, give them an opportunity to execute that.

Recent non-traditional athletic director resignations have stimulated Maurice’s concern for becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

If I use an example [of a southern university], I think everybody used him as an example at first. But then over time, it became challenging because by him no longer being there, then it is like wow that’s another example of he made a mistake and now where is he. You know is this possible for me.

After making historical hires at the University of Georgia and the University of Central Florida, when their non-traditional athletic director resigned, the institutions’ next hire reverted to another traditional athletic director. The blatancy was recognized by Cleo when she exclaimed, “I mean let’s just look at what we see right now that’s going on. Oh my.” She continued to indicate the aftermath of these resignations on the hiring of another non-traditional athletic director by stating “it is a wrap for the SEC.”

**Expand your network.** The recent growth of non-traditional athletic administrators (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012; Lapchick, 2011) has helped fill the pipeline of qualified future athletic director candidates for potential consideration. Additionally, these positions have allowed them the opportunity to demonstrate their leadership abilities, and to expand their social network. Since networking has had significant effect on managers’ success rates (Michael & Yukl, 1993), non-traditional senior athletic administrators looking to advance can initiate, develop, and nurture relationships, which will extend their social network and enable career advancement. Cleo understood networking within professional societies is great for professional development, but it takes an extensive personal network to “get you the job.” Throughout Deneen’s athletic administrative career, she noted the purposefulness and sustainment of networking.
The network of people that I’ve built up over these 17-18 years of being in and around it. I mean he introduced me to the people at the top and put me in a position to have informal conversations with those people. Such that, when they saw me in later years, I was someone that if nothing else they recognized, Oh that’s the young lady who’s at [an eastern university]. So it’s been those kinds of associations that I think have really helped me over the years.

As Deneen and other participants insinuated one of the main attributes to ensure visibility and career growth is cultivating relationships especially “with people who are on the inside,” which emulates Wicker’s (2008) notion that, “it’s all about networking” (p. 94).

Non-traditional senior athletic administrators may need to consider Zweigenhaft and Domhoff (2003) study of African Americans living amongst White elite. They discovered individuals with formal network connections formed valuable relationships that led to security of an interview and job. Deneen has done just this and it allowed her to gain some glimpses into that and take the information that you garner from those glimpses and build on it. Everything that isn’t fair, isn’t to be thrown away. Keep it in your pocket because one day that piece might connect to another piece that makes sense for you. That then will allow you to create a connection that helps you create the next connection. Because of that fact I don’t throw away every white man that is not useful to me. The relationships that I’ve cultivated over time, I mean some of it literally, that I have learned have been because of people that I would never emulate, but those lessons where equally valuable as the ones that you know taught me what I do want to do. I think too often if somebody doesn’t present what we think we need, we dismiss the lessons, [but] we can learn from them.

Even a decade post Zweigenhaft and Domhoff (2003) study, the findings still resonate a challenge for some non-traditional senior athletic administrators, especially Maurice, who entered athletic administration from the private sector through his network, but sees the hesitation of non-traditional senior athletic administrators becoming Division I Athletic Directors because
the biggest challenge [is] not having those examples and that’s what is discouraging and that’s what brings people to not apply for all these roles because they say well I’m not going to get that. They’re going to hire somebody else. You know it’s one of those you’ve got to know somebody. In this industry, you’ve got to know somebody to get a job. Well I don’t know anybody there, so I’m not going to apply.

One can allow the institutionalized structure of athletic administration to hinder their networking opportunities or chose an alternate course such as Deneen. Early in Deneen’s career she was aware of the limited non-traditional athletic directors, and embraced the reality through expanding her network with the decision makers, “I didn’t meet very many women because in my very realistic, practical mind, those were not the people who were making the decisions about who got hired. So I set out making myself acquainted with the people who did do…those things.”

While each participant mentioned networking, only four participants cited mentors. According to Ilgen and Youtz (1986) a mentor is important to one’s success in an organization. Usually a mentor has personal interest in an individual's career and provides guidance to that individual (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986). Since mentors were not mentioned as a part of their network, a gap exists between recognizing influential individuals and including them in one’s network. Due to the lack of non-traditional leaders in sport, Maurice noted the difficulty of purposely extending his network through a mentor.

The hard part is trying to find that mentor because when you look at the handful of examples that you are familiar with, there are people all over the country trying to reach out to that same person. Um, so it makes it very difficult to really establish that relationship. It’s one thing to have a phone call conversation or exchanging emails, but it’s another thing that true relationship with that mentor. So that’s something that I’m still looking for and actively pursuing.
Half the participants mentioned there were only a handful of successful role models, but then they noted the discouragement and set back on the longevity of their career. For example, Maurice noted

I think that’s what is somewhat discouraging to some is that…you don’t have that example to show, wow they were successful, wow this is positive, wow you know these are the possibilities.

Kris echoed the discouragement, “I’ve looked at the women who have been ADs who have been African American and they’re no longer ADs anymore. They are only in it for two or three years because they always get ousted out.” Specifically, the lack of non-traditional athletic director role models impedes the creation of one’s aspiration to become a Division I Athletic Director. Maurice felt like non-traditional senior athletic administrators need

to be able to see successful examples. If you’re around examples to say you can do it. What I mean by that is if there’s only 5 or 6 you know non-traditional athletic directors and you don’t have the ability to work for them or work with them. You don’t see that so you don’t necessarily…aspire to it, you might talk about it but without seeing it you don’t really believe that you can do it.

As revealed in this study, the institutionalized networks and workforce are displayed in athletic administration as White men. Thus, proactive hiring processes by decision makers, and persistence by non-traditional senior athletic administrators to participate in networking and mentoring activities, are essential to breaking the social dominant institutionalized structure found in athletic administration.

**Phenomenon of Non-Traditional Athletic Directors: “The Doers”**

The theoretical tenet of SDT (Sidanius et al., 2001) is on both the structural and individual factors contributing to group-based oppression (Sidanius et al., 2001). Thus,
Maurice noted the structural constraints felt by non-traditional senior athletic administrators when

we’re seen as the doers, not necessarily as the managers. You know you’re good at...if I use academics as an example, you know the non-traditional folks are good at having relationships with student athletes because the majority of student athletes are minorities, but in terms of managing your own area, we’ll hire somebody else to do that.

Kris referenced the individual factor of SDT that occurs after hours when “we go home different ways, you know you go to your side of the town and people go to their side. That’s so weird to me when we work side by side all day long.”

In addition to the structural and individual factor within the social institution of athletic administration is institutional discrimination formed by the “good old boys’ network” (Myles, 2005). This hierarchical control became prevalent to Edward when he noted the phenomenon.

Well it’s a shame. One of the things that was said in our leadership institute was about the reality of the hiring process or even the steps as we make moves in our career. That one of the I guess unspoken challenges is that often times people of color are seen as great academic leaders, great compliance leaders, but maybe not necessarily the one to lead the department. And that was a pretty eye opening hearing that from some professionals who are being candid. The systems that have been in place over the years have not been looked as favorably to non-traditional candidates and so that’s frustrating.

These informal power structures continue to limit the progression of non-traditional leaders (Mainiero, 1986), and may cause unconscious self-limitations when non-traditional leaders respond to daily racial and gender ideologies.

While men support the idea of gender equity, few are willing to relinquish their power and transform the culture of sport organizations to achieve parity (Gregory, 2009), thus, the hegemonic masculine institute of intercollegiate athletics (Connell, 1987; Kane & Disch, 1993) may accept non-traditional men before women. Although
there are five women athletic directors at the Division I FBS level (Lapchick, 2011), Cleo professed there are numerous women ready, it is just a matter of “who’s going to get the opportunity first and who’s going to do it, if they get the opportunity.”

Cleo’s statement supports Coakley's (2001) argument that “unless there are changes in the cultures of sport organizations, gender equity will never be achieved in the [administrative] ranks” (p.220). Thus, Joy's belief reinforced Coakley’s (2001) statement and the presence of hegemonic masculinity in sport because “you’re still going to see more African American males getting into those roles [athletic director] than females, but I don’t think that’s a bad thing because…it needs to evolve in whatever way that it can.” One non-traditional participant ready to welcome that opportunity is Maurice,

I want to be that model minority that lets people know that it is possible. There are good minorities out there. That can do the job and do it better than just about anybody, so I definitely feel like we’ve got something to prove and I have something to prove. If it’s not just for me, personally, it’s also because of my race and my background and all that good stuff. I think a lot of people ought to have that and can get discouraged when things don’t happen as planned, but I’m still fighting the good fight.

Overall these narratives support hegemony and hegemonic masculinity (Gramsci, 1971; Whisenant et al., 2002). Non-traditional senior athletic administrators are aware they are at a disadvantage in the White male institutionalized Division I athletic administration. Likewise, the participants are aware non-traditional men may have an advantage to more opportunities over their non-traditional women counterparts, which suggests the origin of hegemonic masculinity has evolved from the political and economical historical situations of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971). However, all of the non-traditional senior athletic administrators have accepted this unfair treatment as
commonsense (Whisenant et al., 2002), which is rooted by the history of hegemony in athletic administration.

**Evolution to Break the Glass Ceiling: “You’ve got to be in There to Change”**

The last emerging theme was the evolution of sport leaders. Participants mentioned two main factors that will influence the progression of non-traditional Division I Athletic Directors. First, job equality in sport will take time, but during this time non-traditional senior athletic administrators must position themselves competitively, if not exceptionally, to their White male counterpart (Farrell, 1999; Naughton, 1998). Second, transformation of the existing social dominance will have to come from within an institution, when decision makers and non-traditional leaders both take a committed chance.

**Time.** While some believe in a spirit of optimism, Edward claimed equitable hiring processes of non-traditional athletic directors will happen in a “matter of time.” A decade ago Coakley (2001) noted “job equality in most sport organizations will not come until today’s twenty-year-olds are grandparents” (p. 219). While Maurice is in agreement with Coakley’s (2001) forecast, he hopes to contribution to the progression by proclaiming it “might not happen in my life cycle, but I definitely want to be able to contribute to making somebody else’s life cycle better and give somebody else an opportunity.”

Since her first sport internship, twenty years ago, Joy has watched the business of collegiate sport and presence of women leaders evolve. She emphasized change takes time, but our “society [is] very quick, very reactionary, we want a response right now, but I don’t think that this is going to happen overnight.”

During this time the participants had numerous suggestions for non-traditional senior athletic administrators. As recommended in the positional segregation section,
non-traditional senior athletic administrators must take initiative and inquire about additional sport oversight. Kris admitted “everyday I’m learning how to get outside of my comfort zone. Learning how to talk to people and let people feel comfortable with my leadership.” Similarly, Laurel described the educational component that comes with initiation “because you’re learning it, because you teach yourself” While Kyle is only two years in to his athletic administrative career he plans to “just keep my head down and do my job as well as I can knowing that opportunities will arise.”

Also the “good old boys’ network” barrier facing non-traditional senior athletic administrators from entering or advancing in athletic administration (Myles, 2005) must be understood by prospective athletic director candidates. Even though Deneen had no intention of becoming a Division I Athletic Director, she recognized

to be successful, in my mind, I’ve got to understand where all of those people might be coming from. What they may or might not see or expect from me as a professional in this business, and take all of that information and use it to determine what I’m going to say, when I’m going to say it, and how I’m going to say it.

Furthermore, she attributed her success to the importance that “you can speak your mind clearly, that you pay attention to timing, and know not only what to say, but when to say it. I think that combined with the people that I’ve been introduced to.”

**Within the organization.** Changes will be more likely to occur when non-traditional leaders who participated in sports as athletes, coaches, or administrator can critically assess sport organizations from the inside (Coakley, 2009). Deneen agreed “you can’t change systems from the outside, so you’ve got to be in there to change them. To get in them to some extent you have to play the game as it exists to get in it.”

The game, is Deneen’s allusion to the influence of the “good old boys network” and the current landscape of athletic administration, therefore,
if you’re not willing to learn the rules and play the game by the rules, then start using those rules to your benefit, then you won’t get there. You can’t...if you’re waiting for things to be fair and even and truly to be a meritocracy then you’re always going to be sitting where you are complaining about it.

Likewise, Mark realized the influence of the “good old boys network” on hiring decisions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators. He asserted it will take a strong president, a strong board of trustees, to step out and say hey, we are going to turn it over to this guy [non-traditional] because we feel as though he is the best. Now he may not look like me, but he is the best guy for the job. And then once you give him the job, you’ve got to give him the same support that you would give somebody who looks like you the job even though he is not the best candidate.

Joy echoed this sentiment and accentuated the chance decision makers took on her non-traditional athletic director hire.

A significant few who take the chance and hire people that don’t look like them and hopefully those people are getting into those positions more and more. Our board of directors or our trustees, whomever made the decision, took a chance in my mind and I think it was a great. Obviously, it was a great opportunity and it has changed the way that our athletic department looks.

Once this non-traditional athletic director was hired, Joy agreed with Coakley’s (2009) suggestion of changes occurring from within by proclaiming “when you get people of different backgrounds, different genders, different racial backgrounds that get into positions of authority, things change because then they hire people that look like them.” Joy experienced this trend when her athletic director, a non-traditional, came into position. Prior to his arrival she was the only female working with 14 traditional men, five years post his arrival and the landscape of athletic administrators is diverse. Maurice experienced a similar situation when his female athletic director was hired.

She has done a good job of hiring a diverse staff, which I think is unique, so we need more people like her to say I’m going to hire the best person not just fit. I’m going to hire the best person for the job that can get whatever I
need done. Not just [someone] who looks a certain way or is a certain way. We need more people like that. I think she’s more sensitive to it because she’s non-traditional and we just need more people to get in those roles and do what she’s doing by hiring non-traditional folks as well.

When this change does come, non-traditional leaders must embrace it and create a forum for network and mentor groups to exchange knowledge and experience of their athletic leadership role (Lough, 2001). To have an evolution of the institutionalized workforce of intercollegiate athletic administration, influential time and transformation within institutions is essential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supports</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vocational Interest</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choice Goals (Intentions)</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender Barrier</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethnic/Race Barrier</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach α</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05
Table 4-2. Means of SCCT Variable for Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Traditional</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcome Expectation*</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supports</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vocational Interests*</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Choice Goals (Intentions)*</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender Barrier*</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ethnic/Race Barrier</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>β1</th>
<th>β2</th>
<th>β3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Interest (DV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p < .05
Figure 4-1. The comparison path analysis. Estimates for the entire sample (N=165) are shown first in bold and non-traditional leaders are shown second in parentheses (n=100). * p < .05
Figure 4-2. The direct effect path. * p < .05
Figure 4-3. The fully-mediated path. * p < .05
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

Conclusion

The goals of this dissertation were:

1) to reveal and illustrate how the intersection of gender and race may influence the intentions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators becoming NCAA Division I Athletic Directors

2) to explore how career choices have influenced their collegiate athletic workplace experience.

Athletic administration has been a segregated field dominated by White males, especially, at the most powerful leadership position, Division I Athletic Director (Lapchick, 2011).

The unique career development experience of non-traditional leaders working in intercollegiate athletics is scant in the literature. Investigating one’s intention to become a Division I Athletic Director is necessary to understand how they attempt to overcome an apparent glass ceiling and explain the disparity in intercollegiate athletic administration representation (Lapchick, 2011). The following research questions were intended to investigate this phenomenon:

1) What are the differences between traditional and non-traditional senior athletic administrators and their career intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director?

2) Have formative experiences influenced the intended career path of non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ pursuit of a Division I Athletic Director position?

3) What are the common factors of non-traditional senior athletic administrators decision to pursue or not pursue a Division I Athletic Director position?

A mixed-method approach was used to examine these research questions.

Overall, the findings suggest traditional and non-traditional alike are capable of being a
Division I Athletic Director, however, social dominance, environmental factors, obstructed access and opportunities are influential in hindering non-traditional leaders career advancement to a Division I Athletic Director position.

The first part of the dissertation used a survey to examine and compare the intentions of traditional and non-traditional Division I senior athletic administrators. Results suggest that although traditional and non-traditional senior athletic administrators had comparable support and self-efficacy, non-traditional perceived more barriers and lower outcome expectations associated with becoming a Division I Athletic Director. Therefore, non-traditional senior athletic administrators had significantly lower vocational interest and intentions to become a Division I Athletic Director than their traditional senior athletic administrator counterparts. These results are similar to SCCT sport literature (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007) barriers and negative outcome expectations were highly correlated with lower vocational interests and intentions. Given the differential treatment, it should not be a surprise that non-traditional leaders in the sport industry often have differentiating career goals and outcome expectations than non-traditional leaders. Nevertheless, non-traditional senior athletic administrators had nearly equivalent self-efficacy and supports to traditional senior athletic administrators, but expressed significantly higher barriers and lower outcome expectations, vocational interest, and intentions. Further research needs to investigate the relationship of these variables in the sport workplace.

The second part of the study used semi-structured interviews to explore the perceptions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators SCCT variable in the pursuit of becoming a Division I Athletic Director. The non-traditional senior athletic
administrators met two criteria: identify as non-traditional and be a current senior athletic administrator. Results suggested the hegemonic social institution in which the social dominance of White men perpetuates exclusive institute powers over the landscape of athletic administration. Even though non-traditional senior athletic administrators believed change is slowly progressing, the path to a Division I Athletic Director position is obstructed by a lack of access and opportunity to sport oversight. Furthermore, the strong residual of the “good old boys’ network” still relinquishes the decision making power, reducing the commitment to make necessary socio-cultural inclusive changes for non-traditional leaders.

**SCCT Application**

The process of career development promotes relevant career choices through identification of occupational interests (Lent et al. 1996). As such, non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ responses were applied to the aforementioned SCCT framework. In particular, the foundations of self-efficacy and outcome expectations were analyzed.

**Self-Efficacy: “I Feel Confident in All of Those Tasks”**

As described by Wicker (2008) self-efficacy is one’s confidence in performing specific career tasks. Hackett and Brown’s (1996) mentioned several sources of building self-efficacy – social persuasion, vicarious learning, and performance accomplishments, which were used to exemplify non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ self-efficacy. For this study, social persuasion was a constant reference of the participants. Specifically, Cleo referenced the endless conversations amongst her network of non-traditional senior athletic administrators and their encouragement of one another to take the next opportunity and become a Division I Athletic Director.
Another pillar of building self-efficacy is vicarious learning, which emerged in the theme of positional segregation. While non-traditional senior athletic administrators noted the hindrance of their lack in sport oversight, each of the participants had initiated supplementary responsibility. While supervisory assignments may be out of their control, each of the participants had taken ownership of their educational experience. One hundred percent of the participants had an advanced degree, and over half were either in pursuit of a doctorate or obtained a doctorate. While there is no codified path to a Division I Athletic Director, these educational accomplishments and their extensive careers in athletic administration reinforce the need for non-traditional applications to have exceptional qualifications (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Teel, 2005; Whisenant, 2003: Yee, 2007).

As such, non-traditional leaders’ self-efficacy for becoming a Division I Athletic Director was evident. Therefore, stronger recruiting strategies to bring non-traditional senior athletic administrators to Division I Athletic Director positions are needed to cultivate and retain their self-efficacy beliefs.

**Outcome Expectations: “We need to be able to see successful examples”**

Similar to self-efficacy, outcome expectations may be acquired from learning experiences (Brown, 2002). Lent and his colleagues (1996) discovered individuals avoid careers with positive outcomes (e.g. higher salary or higher social status), if they believe they are not capable. In the realm of this study, non-traditional senior athletic administrators believed they were capable of being a Division I Athletic Director, but they were hesitant to actively pursue the position because of the negative outcome expectations and short-lived examples seen in the landscape of athletic administration. In agreement with Brown (2002) findings that outcome expectations derive from
observations and reactions of others, Maurice and Kris asserted that non-traditional leaders “need to be able to see successful examples” sustain a career as a Division I Athletic Director.

According to Brown and Lent (1996) individuals may eliminate a viable career because of low self-efficacy, less favorable outcome expectations, or a combination of the two. As revealed in this study, non-traditional senior athletic administrators had adequate self-efficacy to pursue a Division I Athletic Director position; however, perceived outcome expectations, opportunity, access, and barriers hindered their perception.

**Career Assessment**

The relationship between these SCCT constructs allowed for a snapshot of non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ career development to a Division I Athletic Director position. While each of the participants revealed sufficient self-efficacy for accomplishing athletic director’s tasks, they were negatively impacted by the perceived barriers and outcome expectations of becoming a Division I Athletic Director. These findings support Brown and Lent (1996) argument that even with well-developed career interests an individual is unlikely to pursue a career path with perceived entrance and advancement barriers or unfavorable outcome expectations. One contrasting revelation of this study challenged Brown and Lent (1996) suggestion that barriers moderate the relationship between vocational interest and choice goal. Participants of this study reiterated the direct hindrance of barriers on their outcome expectation prior to having interest or intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director. Consequently, progressive endeavors should focus on building positive outcome perceptions for non-traditional senior athletic administrator careers.
Implications for the Sport Workplace

As stated in the introduction, while numerous studies have examined the underrepresentation and decline of non-traditional athletic administrators, one’s intention to become an athletic director has yet to be addressed in the literature. Therefore, this dissertation study addresses the void in the career sport literature. Furthermore, the theoretical and practical significance manifested as the non-traditional leaders recounted their experience in athletic administration.

The main theoretical contribution of this study was the path comparison between the SCCT variables of traditional and non-traditional Division I senior athletic administrators. Significant differences revealed gender negatively influenced non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ outcome expectations. Also, non-traditional senior athletic administrators’ outcome expectations mediated the relationship between self-efficacy and vocational interest. This addition to the sparse sport career development literature (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007) examined the intersection of race, ethnicity, and gender on career development. While the findings of this dissertation challenged the SCCT literature in coaching (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007), it laid a foundation for athletic administration. Finally, this research extended the social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 2001) suggesting the institutionalized structures of sport organizations justify the lower status and pay of non-traditional leaders (McKay, 1997).

In terms of practical contributions, similar proactive diversification initiatives from the national level must be replicated at the institutional level. Similar to the NCAA’s Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males and Females and the Pathway Program, institutions should have a diversity progress report, comparable to the academic
progress report for student athletes. Since the lack of self-efficacy does not appear to be the reason for the underrepresentation of non-traditional athletic directors, the presence of perceived barriers, such as sociological forces, needs to be reduced through these initiatives. Furthermore, including a faculty member or a non-traditional representative on the hiring search committee may make individuals self-evaluate of their subjective biases, while also changing the perception that non-traditional applicants are welcomed and recruited for Division I Athletic Director positions.

Limitations

As with all research limitations must be noted. One limitation of the interviews was the small, restricted sample; therefore, the findings are only transferable to other individuals and institutions. Future research (employing a larger sample size) is warranted across different divisions. Second, it would be desirable to increase environmental factor items measuring the perceived barrier of age, donor relationships, and former student-athlete identity. Finally, only Division I senior athletic administrators were sampled, with the exception of one interview with a former Division I and current Division II senior athletic administrator. The intense financial and competitive atmosphere at the Division I stage may differ from other divisional levels. In addition, the non-traditional leaders at those levels may have varying perceptions of this phenomenon.

Future Research Recommendations

Further research should apply SCCT to other traditionally led sport workplaces. Since this study revealed non-traditional leaders expressed similar self-efficacy and support, but had lower outcome expectations, vocational interest, and intentions, future investigation on the significant impact of barriers is warranted. To gain insight into
recruiting process further investigation may want to focus on the hiring managers’ (i.e., university presidents or donors) attitudes and perceptions. Since every participant expressed the influence of the “good old boys’ network,” interviewing presidents and donors may provide insight into the support they provide during the athletic director hiring process. Furthermore, hiring managers can be provided educational material prior to actively seeking and recruiting qualified non-traditional candidates.

Also, numerous moderating variables such as athletic achievement, family dynamic, and leadership styles may add interesting outlets to this topic. Finally, it would be of interest to further investigate the intentions component of SCCT by comparing models such as the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1985) or the self-determination model (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci & Flaste, 1995). Theory of planned behavior examines subjective norms, attitudes, intentions, and behavior. An individual’s attitude and perception of subjective norms drive their intentions and evaluation of their behavior of a valued outcome (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1985). For example, “I believe that becoming a Division I Athletic Director is more important to my career success than remaining a senior athletic administrator.” The self-determination theory investigates motivational tendencies and may add to our understanding of what predicts non-traditional leaders’ intentions of becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

Summary

Grounded in a hegemonic, social dominant, reproducing society, non-traditional leaders may be considered absent in specific sport positions, Division I Athletic Director being one of the most obvious. Homologous reproduction, hegemony, and social dominance are still prevalent in athletic administration. Similar to McKay’s (1997) tenet of a gendered structure of labor, power, and cathexis (Connell, 1987), the systemic,
institutional foundation of intercollegiate athletics perpetuates the social dominance within the management of collegiate athletic administration.

For several reasons it is important for non-traditional leaders to be equally represented and visible in Division I Athletic Director positions. First, merit based hiring practices and promotions promote equality. Second, in order to assist non-traditional leaders define sport and sport participation for their future role models need to be seen in leadership positions (Coakley, 2009). When misconstrued valuations are drawn about the overwhelming representation of current traditional leaders’ abilities, gender and racial equity in sports is hampered (Coakley, 2009; Liqutom-Kimura, 1995). As such, it reaffirms social dominancy exists in sport. Third, homologous reproduction is present in hiring decision. For example, Acosta and Carpenter (2012) revealed women athletic directors had a higher proportion of women coaches than their counterpart, men. Thus, networking with other non-traditional administrators may help increase the number of non-traditional colleagues and subordinates.

To break the cyclical institutionalization of intercollegiate athletics, measures designed to give non-traditional senior athletic administrators equal access to the employment market place must be adopted. One should note that findings from this study do show some progress has been made on the national level, but increases can be made on the institutional level. Specifically, two interview participants noted being graduates of the NCAA Leadership Institute for Ethnic Minority Males and Females. Another participant stated her continued interest in the NCAA Pathway Program.

However, a need remains for decision makers regarding the hiring of athletic directors to identify, pursue, recruit, hire, and maintain qualified non-traditional
candidates to fill these crucial leadership positions. Furthermore, non-traditional senior athletic administrators should be vigorously encouraged to increase their responsibility for sport oversight because these experiences will prepare them to assume the coveted Division I Athletic Director position.
Dear Senior Athletic Administrator:

The purpose of this email is to invite you to participate in an interview for my study titled *Social Cognitive Intentions of Becoming an Athletic Director: An Investigation of Non-Traditional Senior Athletic Administrators*.

My name is Janelle Wells and I am a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Florida in the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management. My research interest is in organizational change and non-traditional leaders in sport workplaces. As a former collegiate volleyball player and assistant coach, I have witnessed the lack of non-traditional (e.g., women, ethnic, and racial minorities) role models in leadership positions. Therefore, I have an interest in discovering the influence of race and gender on career choices of non-traditional leaders.

Below are athletic administrator highlights from the 2009-2010 NCAA Race and Gender Demographics, 2010 Racial and Gender Report Card: College Sport, and Women in Intercollegiate Sport Reports that ignited this research:

- In the 2009 athletic season, there were only 4 females and 16 racial minority athletic directors at Division I Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) in the FBS.
- Across all Division I athletic departments, only 9% of athletic directors, respectively, were women.
- 45% non-traditional leaders represent the hiring pool of senior athletic administrators.

The implications from this research are to gain insight into the formative experiences that have influenced your career choices. If you chose to participate, a 30 minute interview will be scheduled at a time of your choice. Also your identity will be kept anonymous to everyone besides the researchers and you will be known exclusively by an alias.

If you are willing to participate, please respond to this email at your earliest convenience for more information. Thank you for your time and I look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Janelle E. Wells, MBA
Doctoral Candidate
University of Florida
jmcverrywells@hhp.ufl.edu
APPENDIX B
SURVEY CONSENT

Protocol Title: Social Cognitive Intentions of Becoming an Athletic Director: An Investigation of Non-Traditional Senior Athletic Administrators

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: To reveal and illustrate how the intersection of gender and race may influence the intentions of non-traditional senior athletic administrators (e.g., executive associate AD, senior associate AD, associate AD, and assistant AD) becoming NCAA Division I ADs

What you will be asked to do in the study: As a senior athletic administrator, you will be asked to complete a survey on your intentions of becoming a Division I AD.

Time required: 10-15 minutes for the on-line survey

Risks and Benefits: No more than minimal risk. The disclosing of identities are minimized because no names, IP addresses or other potentially identifying individual information will be collected, and not even the researchers will be able to associate names or programs with individual surveys (or words to that effect). The direct benefit to the participants in this research is gaining insight into the lack of non-traditional leaders at the Division I AD position. The need to research non-traditional experiences and intentions is necessary to understand how they attempt to overcome an apparent glass ceiling as well as explain the disparity in intercollegiate athletic administration representation.

Compensation: There is no compensation for this survey.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your name will not be collected. The demographic information we obtain will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study: Janelle E. Wells, Doctoral Candidate, College of Health and Human Performance, FLG Room 300, PO Box 118208, Gainesville, FL 32611; email jmccverrywells@hhp.ufl.edu
Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 352.392.0433.

Agreement:
"Click here" to acknowledge that you have read the procedures described above, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study. By clicking on this button, you will then gain access to the questionnaire.
APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The following questions focus on activities Division I Athletic Directors would perform. Please rate the level of confidence you have that you could complete these tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence</th>
<th>Full Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resist the interference by parents, alumni, boosters, and other groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accurately assess the abilities of your coaches.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change administrative strategies if they did not work.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Select the coaches best suited for your institution’s athletic administrative strategies.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identify individuals and groups who can help your program or teams.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Be self-assured in dealing with problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Modify your strategies according to the strengths and weaknesses of your opponent.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Determine your administrative strengths.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make intelligent athletic administrative choices.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to the following items concerned with the outcomes you might expect from being a Division I Athletic Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Becoming a Division I Athletic Director will mean high status.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will earn a high salary by becoming a Division I Athletic Director.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would have a meaningful career if I were to become a Division I Athletic Director.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I would earn approval from others if I became a Division I Athletic Director.

5. People close to me think I should become a Division I Athletic Director.

6. I would have the social support needed to become a Division I Athletic Director.

7. Becoming a Division I Athletic Director would be very satisfying to me.

8. My career satisfaction would be high if I became a Division I Athletic Director.

9. Becoming a Division I Athletic Director is important for me to feel complete as a person.

Please respond to the following items concerned with the factors that might influence your decision to become a Division I Athletic Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. People of my gender have a hard time obtaining a Division I Athletic Director position.

2. People of my race have a hard time obtaining a Division I Athletic Director position.

3. It would be difficult for society to accept people with the same gender as myself in a Division I Athletic Director position.

4. It would be difficult for society to accept people with the same race as myself in a Division I Athletic Director position.

5. I anticipate having a hard time obtaining a Division I Athletic Director position because of my gender.

6. I anticipate having a hard time obtaining a Division I Athletic Director position because of my race.
7. Gender discrimination would make it hard for me to be a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Racial discrimination would make it hard for me to be a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. There is a lack of opportunities to become a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. It would be hard for me to become a Division I Athletic Director because there are so few positions available. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I have the experience needed to become a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. I have all the training needed to become a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I have sufficient contacts to help me become a Division I Athletic Director. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I have a large enough network of contacts to make becoming a Division I Athletic Director possible. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I feel I know enough people in the field to secure a Division I Athletic Director position. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

---

Please respond to the following items concerning your interest in becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Becoming a Division I Athletic Director is something that really interests me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have thought about becoming a Division I Athletic Director in the past.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really have no interest in becoming a Division I Athletic Director.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to the following items concerning your intentions in becoming a Division I Athletic Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I intend to become a Division I Athletic Director following this position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I will try to pursue a Division I Athletic Director position sometime during my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I have no plans on becoming a Division I Athletic Director.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographics:

Please write or check the appropriate answer:

1. Your age:_____

2. Gender: □Female □Male □Other:_____

3. Which of the following categories best describes you? (Please check one or more boxes)
   □American Indian or Alaska Native □Asian American
   □Hispanic or Latino □Black or African American □
   Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander □White □Other_________________________

4. Marital Status: □Single □Divorced □Widowed □Married □Partnership

5. Do you have any children? □Yes □No

6. Were you a former collegiate student-athlete? □Yes: Sport:_______ □No

7. Were you a former collegiate coach? □Yes: Sport:_______ □No

8. What is your current title (regardless of your department)?
   □Executive Associate AD □Senior Associate AD □Associate AD
   □Assistant AD □Other_________________________

9. Which of the following categories best describes your current Athletic Director?
   □Female and American Indian or Alaska Native
Female and Asian American
Female and Hispanic or Latino
Female and Black or African American
Female and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
Female and White
Male and American Indian or Alaska Native
Male and Asian American
Male and Hispanic or Latino
Male and Black or African American
Male and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
Male and White
Other __________________________

10. How many years have you been in your current position at this organization? _____

11. How many years have you been an athletic administrator? __________

12. Which of the following describes your highest level of education?
   □ HS            □ Associate    □ Bachelor    □ Master    □ Doctorate

13. Would you like to participate in a follow up interview?
   □ Yes: please provide your email or email me at jmcverywells@hhp.ufl.edu
   □ No
   □ No, but I’d like a copy of the final report Email: __________

Thank you for your participation
APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW CONSENT

Protocol Title: Social Cognitive Predictors of Becoming an Athletic Director: An Investigation of Non-Traditional Senior Athletic Administrators

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: To explore how career choices have influenced non-traditional senior athletic administrators (e.g., executive associate AD, senior associate AD, associate AD, and assistant AD) collegiate athletic workplace experience.

What you will be asked to do in the study: As a non-traditional senior athletic administrator, you will be asked to participate in tape recorded semi-structured phone interview.

Time required: 30-45 minutes for the interview

Risks and Benefits: No more than minimal risk. The direct benefit to the participants in this research is gaining insight into the lack of non-traditional leaders at the Division I AD position. The need to research non-traditional experiences and intentions is necessary to understand how they attempt to overcome an apparent glass ceiling as well as explain the disparity in intercollegiate athletic administration representation.

Compensation: There is no compensation for this survey.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. To ensure confidentiality your name will not be recorded. The demographic information we obtain will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:
Janelle E. Wells, Doctoral Candidate, College of Health and Human Performance, FLG Room 300, PO Box 118208, Gainesville, FL 32611; email jmcverrywells@hhp.ufl.edu

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 352.392.0433.
Agreement:
By signing this document, you acknowledge that you have read the procedures described above, and that you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.
☐ I consent to be audio taped
☐ I do not consent to be audio taped
APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Describe the career path you took to your current position. How do you see your career progressing? What supports (i.e., role models, professional societies) have you had to date? What barriers (i.e., discrimination in hiring, access discrimination, implicit/explicit discrimination)
   a. PROBES: Education, athlete, coach,

2. Describe the lack of non-traditional (women and racial minorities) leaders as Division I AD.
   a. PROBES: Is there a lack of interest by nontraditional leaders (e.g. difference women and/or racial minorities? Lack of social acceptance? Lack of role models? Discrimination?
   b. PROBES: Are non-traditional leaders welcomed, recruited, retained, or encouraged, or promoted to become Division I ADs?

3. Have you ever considered pursuing a Division I AD position? Does the level (e.g. Division I, II, III, NAIA) matter? Why? With that said have you ever pursued or been recruited for a Division I AD position?

4. What would be some of the factors that would make you want to be a Division I AD? Are there some factors that would NOT make you want to be a Division I AD?
   a. PROBES: Supports? role models/mentors? Discrimination?

5. Do you foresee any barriers (i.e., discrimination in hiring, access discrimination, implicit/explicit discrimination) in being a Division I AD? How do you plan to overcome those barriers?
   a. PROBES: How much discrimination (Types of discrimination: access, occupational, treatment) do you think you would encounter in trying to become a Division I AD? Why?

6. What are some of the outcomes you would expect from becoming a Division I AD?
   a. PROBE: What would it mean for you personally to be a Division I AD?

7. Is there anything else you would like to add to this conversation? Is there any other topic area that you would like to discuss?
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