

The Impact of Mentoring Opportunities and Reward Structure on Role Behavior Expectations in Mentoring Relationships Among Sport Management Faculty

Amy Baker, Belmont University
Damon P.S. Andrew, University of Tennessee

**Session 16: Management/Leadership
Presentation (25-minute)**

Friday, June 1, 2007

10:30 AM - 10:55 AM

Mentoring is deemed to essentially be a developmental relationship encompassing the growth and advancement of an individual (Kram, 1985). Much of the theoretical basis for mentoring is found in business literature. Mentoring in business allows opportunities for individuals to develop skills, build self-confidence, and prepare for difficult decision-making (Reich, 1985). Mentoring is also a common occurrence in educational settings as well. Just as in business, people in academic settings move up through the ranks. In higher education, after completing doctoral study, faculty members begin their academic lives as assistant professors. The academic career ladder then proceeds up through the associate, and ultimately full, professional ranks. Young academics need the assistance of seasoned academics to help guide them in learning to balance the rigors of research, teaching, and service as they move along the path to tenure and promotion. While this is true across all academic disciplines, the current study examines one particular field of study "C sport management. As a relatively new field, sport management academics have just recently begun studying their own discipline (Hums, Brown-Foster, & Fay, 2001; Jackson, Lapchick, Staurowsky, & Polite, 2003; Mahony, Mondello, Hums, & Judd, 2004; Mondello, Mahony, Hums, & Moorman, 2002). An area which has not yet been examined is the development of mentoring relationships between junior and senior sport management faculty members.

Several theoretical frameworks have been proposed that detail factors influential in the development of mentoring relationships as well as potential outcomes associated with these relationships. Weaver and Chelladurai's model (1999) illustrated how similar mentor and protege characteristics lead to mentor-protege compatibility, which subsequently leads to a mentoring relationship with associated outcomes assuming that barriers to the mentoring relationship are overcome. Young and Perrew (2000) specifically examined the interaction and exchange between the mentor and protege and how that relationship can lead to outcomes for the protege, mentor, and the organization. Recently, Baker (2006) created a new hybrid theoretical framework, based on the respective strengths of the Weaver and Chelladurai and Young and Perrew's models, to further explore the mentoring relationship and exchange process. This framework incorporated the dyadic exchange variables proposed by Young and Perrew as well as key barriers to the mentoring relationship that were proposed by Weaver and Chelladurai.

In a study that incorporated the hybrid framework, Baker, Hums, and Andrew (2006) found that females did not report higher levels of perceived barriers than males. Similarly, racial/ethnic minorities did not report higher levels of perceived barriers than whites in establishing mentoring relationships in the field of sport management. These findings were similar to the results of Young and Perrew's (2004) study, which surveyed scholars in the field of management. Perhaps the academic environment, which promotes diversity, progressiveness, and open thought, helps facilitate these mentoring relationships. The present study moves beyond the exploration of potential racial/ethnic and gender differences to examine factors that may influence protege expectations of role behavior from the mentor. According to the Young and Perrew (2000) and Baker (2006) frameworks, the expected role behavior of the mentor by the protege is a key element in the development of protege and organizational outcomes. Environmental factors, specifically mentoring opportunities and reward structure, were analyzed in the present study as antecedents of expected role behavior from the perspective of the protege (i.e., the extent to which a protege expects a mentor should engage in specific career and social support behaviors).

The population for the current study included all faculty members in North America currently teaching sport management at the time of data collection (N = 504). The list for this population was obtained from the following sources: (a) 2005 North American Society for Sport Management membership list, (b) sport management program web pages, and (c) 2005 Directory of Graduate Programs in Sport Management (Comfort, 2005). All subjects in the sample received a pre-notification email alerting them of the study. Following a three-day time period, the participants received a link to the survey via email. Follow-up email reminders were sent two-weeks after the initial notice to the participants in order to elicit more responses. The response rate was 34% and the respondents were primarily male (64%). Only respondents who indicated they had a current mentor were included in further analysis.

The survey asked a variety of closed-ended questions, including items querying role behavior expectations ($\bar{Y}_A = .85$), perceived mentoring opportunities ($\bar{Y}_A = .82$), and perceived rewards of the mentoring relationship ($\bar{Y}_A = .83$). Simple linear regression analyses were utilized to determine the effects of organizational environment factors and environmental rewards on expectations

2007 North American Society for Sport Management Conference (NASSM 2007)

for the mentoring partner. Surprisingly, perceived mentoring opportunities did not significantly predict expected role behavior [$F(1, 88) = 1.327, p = .252$]. Furthermore, perceived environmental rewards did not significantly predict expected role behavior [$F(1, 86) = 1.247, p = .267$]. Therefore, the availability of potential mentors and any organizational rewards associated with mentoring did not influence specific career and social support behaviors expected from the mentor by the protege. Perhaps the academic environment, which may be unique compared to non-academic settings, was responsible for the lack of significant findings. In addition, other antecedents of expected role behavior including the mentoring relationship phase (e.g., initiation, cultivation, separation, and redefinition), career factors (e.g., career goals, career progression, position level, job experience, status), relationship factors (e.g., attraction, power/performance potential, general affect for mentoring, mentoring experience, perceived commitment), relationship type (e.g., informal versus formal), and/or additional organizational (e.g., organizational climate) and individual (e.g., disposition, altruism) factors that have not yet been studied may be more influential predictors of expected role behavior. Future research should explore these potential antecedents of expected role behavior as well as the numerous proposed individual and organizational consequences of these expectations if they are met by corresponding role behaviors from the mentor.