

**The National Association of
Academic Advisors for Athletics**

OFFICERS 1993

PRESIDENT

Ferna Phillips
Boston College

REGION III REPRESENTATIVE

Charles Wilson
Michigan State University

PRESIDENT-ELECT

Karl Mooney
Texas A & M University

REGION IV REPRESENTATIVE

Roger Grooters
University of Nebraska

PAST PRESIDENT

Gayle Hopkins
University of Arizona

REGION V REPRESENTATIVE

Jill DeMichele
Arizona State University

SECRETARY

Jill Deese
Winthrop College

PARLIAMENTARIAN

Donald Ferrell
Pennsylvania State University

TREASURER

Jack Rivas
University of California
Santa Barbara

**THE ACADEMIC ATHLETIC JOURNAL
EDITOR**

Kathy Lyons
Iowa State University

REGION I REPRESENTATIVE

Dan Regan
Villanova University

**THE N4A NEWS
CO-EDITORS**

Fred Mims & Carol Gruber
University of Iowa

REGION II REPRESENTATIVE

Ann Hughes
University of Florida

MEDIA COORDINATOR

Joanne Bunnage
University of Notre Dame

**ACADEMIC
ATHLETIC
JOURNAL**

1993

**ACADEMIC
ATHLETIC
JOURNAL**

The Official Publication of the
National Association of Academic
Advisors for Athletics



SPRING 1993
ISSN 0897-165X

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES FOR THE ACADEMIC ATHLETIC JOURNAL

AUDIENCE

The primary audience is the membership of the N4A, that is, athletic academic counselors. The secondary audience includes other professionals working with student-athletes in the fields of education or counseling at the secondary and post-secondary levels.

PURPOSE

Articles should add new knowledge, challenge existing opinion, and/or explain the implications of research. The arguments should be well grounded in theory or research and clearly related to practice. In essence, the material should be original and stimulating without being extremely technical.

SUBJECT

Relevant topics include, but are not limited to, the following: historical overviews of topics related to student-athletes; reviews of publications related to student-athletes; practical applications of theoretical or research-based conclusions; and research on student-athletes, including a full discussion of results and implications.

Please do not submit a text that has been previously published, is scheduled for publication elsewhere, or is being considered for publication elsewhere.

REVIEW PROCESS

The articles will be read by at least three anonymous reviewers. Their comments will be sent to the authors along with recommendations for acceptance, rejection, or revision.

MANUSCRIPT FORMAT

Articles should be 1250-5000 words in length (roughly 5-20 pages of typed, double-spaced text) with ample margins for comments. Amplify the text with appropriate headings/subheadings, figures, and bibliography done in American Psychological Association style. Also include an abstract of not more than 100 words.

Articles for the fall issue should be submitted no later than August 1, and for the spring issue no later than February 1.

Submit the original and three copies to this address: Kathy Lyons, Athletic Academic Counselor, 203 State Gym, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION FOR THE ACADEMIC ATHLETIC JOURNAL

Subscriptions for N4A Members

A one-year subscription is included in the annual dues of all N4A members, who automatically receive the two publications each year. Mailings outside of North America require a surcharge of \$4.00.

Subscriptions for Non-Members

For those who are not members of the N4A, the following rates apply:

\$20.00	Individual rate
\$30.00	Institutional rate
\$13.00	Student rate

Mailings outside of North America require a surcharge of \$4.00.

Subscription Requests

Your request for a subscription should include your name, address, and a check made payable to the N4A.

Mail your request to this address:

Jack M. Rivas
Student Affairs Officer
University of California--Santa Barbara
College of Letters and Science
Santa Barbara, California 93106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Identity Foreclosure, Athletic Identity, and College Sport Participation 1

Alan J. Good
Britton W. Brewer
Albert J. Petitpas
Judy L. Van Raalte
Matthew T. Mahar

Occupational Interest Patterns and Personality Styles of Freshman Student-Athletes 13

Eric L. Denson
Janice M. Jordan
Kelly E. Green
Jennifer A. Harris

An Investigation of Academic Accountability Among College Student-Athletes 27

Gary A. Sailes

Support Services and the Division I Student-Athlete: Experiences, Needs, and Implications 40

Barbara Bedker Meyer

IDENTITY FORECLOSURE, ATHLETIC IDENTITY, AND COLLEGE SPORT PARTICIPATION

Alan J. Good
Ball State University

Britton W. Brewer
Albert J. Petitpas
Judy L. Van Raalte
Matthew T. Mahar
Springfield College

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted with 502 college students (246 non-athletes, 90 intramural athletes, and 166 intercollegiate athletes) to investigate the relationship between self-identity variables (i.e., identity foreclosure and athletic identity) and college sport participation. Results indicated that identity foreclosure and athletic identity increase with level of sport participation. Identity foreclosure was significantly lower for upperclass students than for underclass students among non-athletes, but not among intramural and intercollegiate student-athletes. These findings suggest that intercollegiate student-athletes may commit to the role of "athlete" without exploring alternative identities. Implications of the results for the academic and career development of student-athletes are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

At the typical college or university, several hundred students participate in intercollegiate athletics. Participation in sport at the college level involves an enormous commitment of time and energy. Despite the prevailing notion that sport builds character, empirical investigations have demonstrated that student-athletes lag behind their non-athletic counterparts in terms of

psychosocial development (Blann, 1985; Kennedy & Dimick, 1987; Malismur & Schmitt, 1975; Petitpas, 1981; Schendel, 1965; Sowa & Gressard, 1983).

One reason why college student-athletes may show lower levels of psychosocial maturity is that they engage in selective optimization (Danish, 1983), in which they concentrate on a sport to the exclusion of other activities during their involvement in the sport. Consistent with this idea, it has been hypothesized that student-athletes are at increased risk for identity foreclosure (Nelson, 1983; Petitpas & Champagne, 1988). Rooted in Erikson's (1959) theory of psychosocial development, identity foreclosure is a construct used to describe people who have committed to an occupation or an ideology without first engaging in exploratory behavior (Marcia, 1966; Petitpas, 1978).

Because of the rewards and demands (both physical and psychological) inherent in competitive sport, student-athletes may lack incentive or opportunity to explore identities other than that of "athlete." Preliminary support for this argument was obtained in a study of college males by Petitpas (1981), who found that senior non-athletes were significantly less foreclosed than senior student-athletes, freshman student-athletes, and freshman non-athletes. No significant differences in identity foreclosure were found among the latter three groups of subjects.

Closely related to identity foreclosure is athletic identity (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press), a construct tapping the degree to which an individual identifies with the athlete role. It has been hypothesized that maintaining a strong and exclusive athletic identity can produce problems in adjustment to common sport-related transitions such as terminating competitive sport involvement, dealing with injury, and being cut from a team (Baillie & Danish, 1992; Blinde & Greendorfer, 1985; Pearson & Petitpas, 1990).

Several investigations have provided empirical support for this hypothesis. Hinitz (1988) found that retired gymnasts who strongly identified with the role of "gymnast" and who considered participation in gymnastics to be a central source of self-definition experienced difficult adjustments to athletic retirement. Hinitz's results suggest that people with strong and exclusive athletic identities may fail to adopt alternative occupational identities following their participation in sport. In the realm of injury, Kleiber and Brock (1992) found that among college student-athletes who had experienced athletic career-ending injuries, only those who were invested in playing professional sports experienced a decrease in self-esteem and life satisfaction. Similarly, Brewer (in press) presented four studies in which a strong and exclusive athletic identity was associated with depressed mood following sport injuries.

Assuming that late adolescence is a critical period for identity development (Erikson, 1968), the purpose of this study was to examine identity foreclosure and athletic identity across three levels of athletic involvement (intercollegiate sport participation, intramural sport participation, no sport participation) in male and female upperclass and underclass college students. Based on previous research (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press; Petitpas,

1981), it was predicted that both identity foreclosure and athletic identity would increase with level of athletic involvement. Although females have been found to be lower in athletic identity than males (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press), no gender comparisons have been made to date for identity foreclosure in the context of sport participation. Consequently, no hypotheses were advanced for females with respect to identity foreclosure. Concerning the influence of academic standing, the body of research showing that identity foreclosure generally declines over the college years (Bourne, 1978; Marcia, 1976) and the negative correlation between age and athletic identity obtained by Brewer, Van Raalte, and Linder (in press) suggests that both athletic identity and identity foreclosure should be lower in the upperclass group than in the underclass category.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 502 students enrolled in introductory psychology, physiology, or research courses at four small colleges and universities in the northeast region of the United States. Of this sample, 166 students (71 females and 95 males) were intercollegiate student-athletes, 90 students (50 females and 40 males) were intramural athletes, and 246 students (180 females and 66 males) were non-athletes. As a group, intercollegiate and intramural student-athletes reported involvement in a wide variety of sport activities (e.g., baseball, basketball, field hockey, football, gymnastics, soccer, softball, swimming, volleyball).

Measures

Identity foreclosure was assessed with the foreclosure subscale of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS; Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979). The foreclosure subscale consists of six statements on issues such as politics, religion, and occupation. Respondents are asked to indicate their agreement with each statement on a six-point Likert-type scale with anchors of "strongly agree" and "strongly disagree." Adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .76$) has been demonstrated for the foreclosure subscale (Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979).

Athletic identity was assessed with the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS; Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press). The AIMS is a ten-item scale that measures the strength and exclusivity of an individual's identification with the athlete role. High internal consistency (alphas ranging from .80 to .93) and high test-retest reliability over a 14-day period ($r = .89$) have been reported for the AIMS (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press).

Procedure

Participants completed the questionnaires and a page requesting demographic information during a regularly scheduled class session. In accord with institutional review board policy, participants were informed that return of the questionnaires constituted their consent to participate in the study.

RESULTS

Separate 3 (level of athletic involvement) X 2 (gender) X 2 (class) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed on foreclosure and AIMS scores. These analyses were intended to examine differences in identity foreclosure and athletic identity across the three levels of athletic involvement. Gender and class were included in the ANOVAs because these variables have been found to be related to identity variables in previous research (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, in press; Petitpas, 1981).

Foreclosure

Means and standard deviations of foreclosure scores are presented in Table 1. In the ANOVA performed on foreclosure scores, the main effects for class [$F(1,490) = 7.46, p < .01$] and level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 8.63, p < .001$] were statistically significant. The main effect for gender was not statistically significant [$F(1,490) = 2.41, p > .05$].

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of Foreclosure Scores

Group	Level of Athletic Involvement		
	Non-athlete	Intramural	Intercollegiate
Upperclass			
Males			
<u>M</u>	12.68	15.96	15.96
<u>SD</u>	5.38	3.46	4.67
<u>n</u>	44	26	54
Females			
<u>M</u>	13.49	14.64	16.51
<u>SD</u>	4.80	5.42	5.31
<u>n</u>	130	25	39

Table 1 (continued)

Group	Level of Athletic Involvement		
	Non-athlete	Intramural	Intercollegiate
Underclass			
Males			
<u>M</u>	17.18	15.71	16.54
<u>SD</u>	3.88	5.50	4.28
<u>n</u>	22	14	41
Females			
<u>M</u>	15.10	15.24	16.34
<u>SD</u>	4.44	4.80	4.12
<u>n</u>	50	25	32

The significant main effects of class and level of athletic involvement were superseded by the statistically significant class by level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 3.67, p < .05$]. Inspection of the simple effects of class within each level of athletic involvement revealed that although there were no significant class differences for intramural and intercollegiate student-athletes, upperclass non-athletes had significantly lower foreclosure scores than underclass non-athletes [$F(1,490) = 17.43, p < .001$].

The gender by class, gender by level of athletic involvement, and gender by class by level of athletic involvement interactions were not statistically significant, indicating that foreclosure scores tended to decrease with advancing class status for both males and females and that foreclosure scores tended to increase with level of athletic involvement for both males and females.

Athletic Identity

Means and standard deviations of AIMS scores are displayed in Table 2. In the ANOVA performed on AIMS scores, the main effects for gender [$F(1,490) = 26.96, p < .001$] and level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 179.19, p < .001$] were statistically significant. The main effect for class was not statistically significant [$F(1,490) = 2.41, p > .05$].

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of AIMS Scores

Group	Level of Athletic Involvement		
	Non-athlete	Intramural	Intercollegiate
Upperclass			
Males			
M	31.21	45.42	51.72
SD	12.74	7.85	9.22
n	44	26	54
Females			
M	24.89	41.16	49.59
SD	12.03	9.29	10.03
n	130	25	39
Underclass			
Males			
M	41.41	46.14	49.29
SD	11.19	6.76	10.75
n	22	14	41
Females			
M	26.18	41.36	50.22
SD	11.10	10.44	7.75
n	50	25	32

Superseding the significant main effects of gender and level of athletic involvement were the following statistically significant interactions: gender by level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 7.24, p < .005$]; class by level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 3.12, p < .05$]; and gender by class by level of athletic involvement [$F(2,490) = 3.32, p < .05$].

Examination of the simple effects of gender within each level of athletic involvement revealed that males had significantly higher AIMS scores than females among non-athletes [$F(1,490) = 42.42, p < .001$]. There were no significant gender effects on the AIMS for intramural and intercollegiate student-athletes. The simple effects of the level of athletic involvement within each gender and within each class showed that AIMS scores increased with level of athletic involvement for both males [$F(2,490) = 195.82, p < .001$] and females [$F(2,490) = 56.39, p < .001$] and for both upperclass student-athletes

[$F(2,490) = 181.08, p < .001$] and underclass student-athletes [$F(2,490) = 56.76, p < .001$].

Inspection of the simple effects of class within each level of athletic involvement indicated that, although there were no significant class differences for intramural and intercollegiate student-athletes, underclass non-athletes had significantly higher AIMS scores than upperclass non-athletes [$F(1,490) = 12.08, p < .005$]. However, the class effect within non-athletes held only for males, since the AIMS scores of upperclass and underclass female non-athletes did not differ significantly.

DISCUSSION

This study examined identity foreclosure and athletic identity in male and female upperclass and underclass college students across three levels of sport participation. Empirical support was provided for the hypothesis that student-athletes are susceptible to identity foreclosure, as foreclosure scores increased with the level of athletic involvement. Similar to the results of Petitpas (1981), upperclass non-athletes were significantly less foreclosed than underclass non-athletes, but no such developmental decrease was observed for intramural or intercollegiate student-athletes. It is possible that the demands of sport participation and the restrictive, sheltered nature of the competitive sport environment discourage student-athletes from exploring alternative identities (Chartrand & Lent, 1987; Nelson, 1983; Petitpas & Champagne, 1988; Shifflette & Galante, 1985).

Bolstering this interpretation are the findings for athletic identity in this study, which, as expected, indicated that strength and exclusivity of identification with the athlete role increased with level of athletic involvement. It is worth noting that athletic identity and foreclosure scores were significantly correlated for the full sample [$r(501) = .21, p < .001$]. This suggests that athletic identity and identity foreclosure are distinct yet related constructs.

No gender differences were found for identity foreclosure. Thus, it appears that the findings of Petitpas (1981) obtained with male college students apply to female college students as well. A gender difference was found on athletic identity only for non-athletes, with male non-athletes having significantly higher AIMS scores than female non-athletes. This finding suggests that male and female student-athletes identify themselves with the athlete role in a similar fashion.

There are several important limitations of this study. First, the cross-sectional design that was used does not permit causal conclusions regarding the relations among sport participation, academic standing, and self-identity (athletic identity and identity foreclosure) in college students. In the future, it would be prudent to employ longitudinal designs to examine more thoroughly identity development in student-athletes. Second, participants in this study were students at NCAA Division II and Division III institutions. Replication of this investigation with NCAA Division I student-athletes is recommended. However,

it might be anticipated that some of the findings of this study might be even more pronounced among students at Division I institutions, where the expectation of "turning pro" by student-athletes is probably much higher than at NCAA Division II and Division III institutions.

Implications

The results of this study imply that college student-athletes may identify strongly with the athlete role to the extent that they fail to explore alternative identities. These findings have ramifications for the academic and career development of student-athletes. Because of their intense involvement in sport, student-athletes may not identify, explore, and eventually pursue academic and career options of potential interest. Although an association between identity foreclosure and career maturity has not been demonstrated empirically in student-athletes, research in non-athletic populations has indicated that identity foreclosure is positively related to a dependent decision-making style that is considered maladaptive in the career development process (Blustein & Phillips, 1990).

Athletes sometimes encounter difficulty upon terminating involvement in competitive sport (Baillie & Danish, 1992; Crook & Robertson, 1991; Gorbett, 1985). For example, documented sequelae of athletic "retirement" include low life satisfaction (Kleiber & Brock, 1992; Werthner & Orlick, 1986), psychological distress (Blinde & Stratta, 1992), and substance abuse (Mihovilovic, 1968). Failure to formulate adequate post-sport career plans may in part account for the difficulties faced by some retired athletes. The findings of this study are of concern to the extent that an exclusive identification with the athlete role prohibits career planning.

The current study and those of Blann (1985), Kennedy and Dimick (1987), and Sowa and Gressard (1983) provide a rationale for career development interventions for college student-athletes (Jordan & Denson, 1990; Lanning, 1982; Nelson, 1982; Pearson & Petitpas, 1990; Petitpas & Champagne, 1988; Riffe & Alexander, 1991; Sanders, 1992; Wilkes, Davis, & Dever, 1989; Wittmer, Bostic, Phillips, & Waters, 1981). Preliminary research suggests that career development programs for student-athletes are effective (Nelson, 1992) and well-received by participants (Petitpas, Danish, McKelvain, & Murphy, 1992; Wilkes, Davis, & Dever, 1989). It is hoped that, through further empirical research and ongoing program evaluation, effective interventions will be developed to ease the difficulties of student-athletes making the transition out of intercollegiate sport involvement.

REFERENCES

- Adam, G. R., Shea, J., & Fitch, S. A. (1979). Toward the development of an objective assessment of ego identity status. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 223-237.
- Baillie, P. H. F., & Danish, S. J. (1992). Understanding the career transition of athletes. The Sport Psychologist, 6, 77-98.
- Blann, W. (1985). Intercollegiate athletic competition and students' educational and career plans. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 115-118.
- Blinde, E. M., & Greendorfer, S. L. (1985). A reconceptualization of the process of leaving the role of competitive athlete. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 20, 87-93.
- Blinde, E. M., & Stratta, T. M. (1992). The "sport career death" of college athletes: Involuntary and unanticipated sport exits. Journal of Sport Behavior, 15, 3-20.
- Blustein, D. L., & Phillips, S. D. (1990). Relation between ego identity statuses and decision-making styles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37, 160-168.
- Bourne, E. (1978). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7, 223-250.
- Brewer, B. W. (in press). Self-identity and specific vulnerability to depressed mood. Journal of Personality.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (in press). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or Achilles' heel? International Journal of Sport Psychology.
- Chartrand, J. M., & Lent, R. W. (1987). Sports counseling: Enhancing the development of the student-athlete. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 164-167.
- Crook, J. M., & Robertson, S. E. (1991). Transitions out of elite sport. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 22, 115-127.

- Danish, S. J. (1983). Musings about personal competence: The contributions of sport, health, and fitness. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11, 221-240.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. Psychological issues monograph, 1. New York: International Universities Press.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity, youth, and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Gorbett, F. J. (1985). Psycho-social adjustment of athletes to retirement. In L. K. Bunker, R. J. Rotella, & A. S. Reilly (Eds.), Sport psychology: Psychological considerations in maximizing sport performance (pp. 288-294). Ann Arbor, MI: Movement.
- Hinitz, D. R. (1988). Role theory and the retirement of collegiate gymnasts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nevada, Reno.
- Jordan, J. M., & Denson, E. L. (1990). Student services for athletes: A model for enhancing the student-athlete experience. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 95-97.
- Kennedy, S. R., & Dimick, K. M. (1987). Career maturity and professional sports expectations of college football players. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 293-297.
- Kleiber, D. A., & Brock, S. C. (1992). The effect of career-ending injuries on the subsequent well-being of elite college athletes. Sociology of Sport Journal, 9, 70-75.
- Lanning, W. (1982). The privileged few: Special counseling needs of athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 19-23.
- Malismur, M. C., & Schmitt, N. (1975). Social adjustment differences between student athletes and student nonathletes as measured by ego development. Sport Sociology Bulletin, 4, 2-12.
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.
- Marcia, J. E. (1976). Studies in ego identity. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University.

- Mihovilovic, M. (1968). The status of former sportsmen. International Review of Sport Sociology, 3, 73-93.
- Nelson, E. S. (1982). The effects of career counseling on freshman college athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 32-40.
- Nelson, E. S. (1983). How the myth of the dumb jock becomes fact: A developmental view for counselors. Counseling and Values, 27, 176-185.
- Pearson, R. E., & Petitpas, A. J. (1990). Transitions of athletes: Developmental and preventive perspectives. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 7-10.
- Petitpas, A. (1978). Identity foreclosure: A unique challenge. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 558-561.
- Petitpas, A. (1981). The identity development of the male intercollegiate athlete (Doctoral dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2508A.
- Petitpas, A., & Champagne, D. E. (1988). Developmental programming for intercollegiate athletes. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 454-460.
- Petitpas, A., Danish, S., McKelvain, R., & Murphy, S. (1992). A career assistance program for elite athletes. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 383-386.
- Riffée, K., & Alexander, D. (1991). Career strategies for student-athletes: A developmental model of intervention. In E. F. Etzel, A. P. Ferrante, & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), Counseling college student-athletes: Issues and interventions (pp. 101-120). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Sanders, E. J. (1992). Implementing a career development program for student-athletes. Academic Athletic Journal, Fall, 24-29.
- Schendel, J. S. (1965). Psychologic differences between athletes and nonparticipants in athletics at three educational levels. Research Quarterly, 36, 52-67.
- Shifflette, B., & Galante, F. (1985). A career development model for college athletes. Journal of College Placement, 4, 27-29.

- Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. F. (1983). Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 236-239.
- Werthner, P., & Orlick, T. (1986). Retirement experiences of successful Olympic athletes. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 17, 337-363.
- Wilkes, S. B., Davis, L., & Dever, L. (1989). Fostering career development in student athletes. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 567-568.
- Wittmer, J., Bostic, D., Phillips, T. D., & Waters, W. (1981). The personal, academic, and career problems of college student athletes: Some possible answers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 52-55.

OCCUPATIONAL INTEREST PATTERNS AND PERSONALITY STYLES OF FRESHMAN STUDENT-ATHLETES

Eric L. Denson
Janice M. Jordan
Kelly E. Green
Jennifer A. Harris
University of Delaware

ABSTRACT

The existence and relationship of common personality styles and occupational orientations were explored. Student-athletes and non-athletes enrolled in a freshman seminar completed the Personality Adjective Check List and the Strong Interest Inventory. The results suggest that student-athletes and non-athletes differ on several personality and occupational variables and that personality style has an important relationship to occupational orientation and interests. Implications for athletic counseling professionals are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important developmental tasks college students face is that of establishing their personal identities (Chickering, 1975). While there are many ways and sources from which identity is derived, a primary way in which identity is established is through the choice of careers. Casual observation of interpersonal interactions will bear this out. One of the most common and powerful ways which people use to identify themselves to others is through sharing their work roles or, in the case of college students, academic majors. It is rare to hear people describe themselves without reference to the work they do (or do not do, as in the case of the unemployed) or to the major they are pursuing. This information provides the basis for many interactions and relationships.

Choices made in regard to careers and majors also often provide considerable information about the personality of the individual in question (Holland, 1973). Therefore, it is clear that the task of choosing majors and careers has psychological as well as vocational implications. Directed efforts, such as career counseling, have been shown to enhance psychological functioning in college students uncertain about their future academic and vocational plans (Denson, 1992a).

Student-athletes represent a special population facing a unique set of demands during their college years (Jordan & Denson, 1990). Like other students, they face significant academic, personal, and social challenges. For student-athletes, however, these developmental challenges must be addressed in the context of participating in intercollegiate athletics. Several authors have suggested that participation in intercollegiate sports may preclude participation in activities that foster the development of viable vocational plans (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987; Pinkerton, Hinz, & Barrow, 1989). Student-athletes may, in the process of participating in athletics, prematurely foreclose other identity and role options outside of sport (Petitpas, Danish, McKelvain, & Murphy, 1992). They may anticipate a career in professional sport, despite the enormous odds against attaining that goal (McGowan, 1992). Undoubtedly, many believe they will be the exception and make it in professional sports. For student-athletes fitting these descriptions, there appears to be little effort directed toward career development. Student-athletes appear to be at increased risk of lagging in their career development unless special attention is directed toward the career development process.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT MODEL

It is possible to divide the career development process into four stages: (1) self-assessment of interests, values, and dependable skills; (2) researching vocational options; (3) experiential learning; and (4) decision-making and implementing choices. The first—and perhaps most important—step in this process is self-assessment of interests, values, and dependable skills. In a sense, the self-assessment process requires an examination and understanding of the individual's personality and how it best fits into the world of work. Without such an understanding of the relationship between personality style and occupational demands, there may be an increased likelihood of making an inappropriate choice. Occupational instability and psychological distress may be two likely consequences of inappropriate career choices.

Holland's (1973) vocational theory views vocational choices as expressions of personality. In this theory, Holland identifies six primary types by which people and occupations can be categorized: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Holland's model essentially seeks to maximize the congruence between the personality of the individual and the "personality" of the job. In such maximization lie the most appropriate and satisfying vocational choices.

PERSONALITY STYLES

While Holland's (1973) model was not specifically developed as a personality theory, it is extremely useful because of the way it links vocational interests and personality type. Alternatively, Millon (1981, 1990) has developed a theory of personality that may have vocational applications and may be particularly useful for understanding student-athletes. In Millon's model, eight basic personality types are derived using three polarities.

Polarity Model of Personality

According to Millon, people may be oriented toward either end of an Active-Passive polarity, such that they generally seek to influence their environment and obtain its rewards (active), or they passively react to their environment and await the rewards bestowed by it (passive). The second polarity is Self-Other. In this polarity, people orient themselves toward self-preservation and the fulfillment of their own wishes and needs (self-orientation), or they seek primarily to nurture others (other-orientation). The final polarity is Dependent-Independent. Here people are seen as relying on others to provide rewards (dependent), or they provide their own rewards (independent). This polarity also offers two other possibilities. People may vacillate between dependence and independence (ambivalent), or they may be generally unresponsive to stimulation and reward (detached).

Millon's theoretical model was developed using pathological populations, which limits its direct utility for describing normal people. Strack (1987, 1991) has taken Millon's general conceptual framework and modified it for normal populations, resulting in the Personality Adjective Check List (PACL).

Descriptions of Normal Personality Types

Strack (1991) uses Millon's framework to derive eight basic personality types found in normal populations: Introversive, Inhibited, Cooperative, Sociable, Confident, Forceful, Respectful, and Sensitive. High scores on the Introversive scale of the PACL describe people who prefer distant, limited involvement with others and who work quietly and unobtrusively on the job. Others see them as calm, steady, and reliable. In contrast, the Inhibited scale describes people who also withdraw socially but do so because of fear and anxiety about negative outcomes, rather than because of disinterest. They are sensitive, shy, and difficult to get to know. Vocationally, they are most at ease working alone or with a small group they know well.

The Cooperative and Sociable scales describe people desiring considerable attention and affection. They differ in their approach to obtaining the desired reaction. Cooperative types adapt their behavior and are willing to live according to the mandates of others. They are reliable and considerate and are most at ease when relying on others. They make excellent "team players"

and thrive in work situations in which guidance, structure, and direction are abundant. Conversely, the Sociable type seizes the initiative. This personality is characterized by an outgoing, talkative, dramatic behavioral style. At times, however, Sociable people may appear fickle, superficial, and moody. Easily bored, they constantly seek excitement and novelty. Occupationally, they do well in environments that reward a flashy style and ones in which they can interact with the public and motivate others.

The Confident personality is self-reliant and egocentric and possesses strong senses of entitlement and uniqueness. These people are, however, at times seen as unempathic and insensitive to others. The confident exterior may cover feelings of inadequacy and vulnerability. In the world of work, their self-assurance, charm, and boldness often result in leadership positions. Conversely, the Forceful personality lacks the internalized sense of self-importance; thus, these people often appear driven to prove themselves. They are strong-willed, competitive, and ambitious. They tend to do well in work settings that capitalize on their ability to take control or work independently. However, they may at times demand as much of others as they do themselves, which is potentially problematic.

Respectful personalities are conservative, responsible, industrious, and highly conscious of protocol and authority. They uphold rules and regulations and may be seen by others as formal, perfectionistic, and at times judgmental. In work situations they are hardworking, reliable, and well-organized. High scorers on the Sensitive scale are unconventional and moody and have fluctuating attitudes and interests. Others may see them as dissatisfied, distracted, anxious, and inconsistent. Careers in which independence, creativity, and spontaneity are valued suit them well.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Student-athletes face many pressures and demands for academic and athletic performance. The time demands of these endeavors often detract from the career development process, yet that process is equally, if not more, important for student-athletes than for non-athletic students (Denson, 1992b; McGowan, 1992). Given the severe limitations upon the available time of student-athletes, professionals involved in counseling them must help student-athletes enhance the quality of vocational choices and do so as efficiently as possible. Understanding the relationships between personality style and vocational interests is critical to achieving this goal.

Following Holland's (1973) theoretical view of vocational choice as an expression of personality style, and the related idea that occupations and activities attract individuals sharing personality characteristics, it may be reasonable to assume that the athletic environment also attracts people with personality characteristics in common. Millon's theory (1981, 1990) as implemented by Strack (1991) provides an independent means of identifying the personality styles of student-athletes. The existence of common personality

styles also suggests that certain occupational environments and choices may provide more suitable and congruent options than others. If such a relationship exists, then the benefit for athletic counseling professionals is that they can use the information to help student-athletes make the most appropriate choices of major and career.

The primary purpose of this investigation was to explore the occupational interest patterns and personality styles of freshman student-athletes and to examine the relationship between personality style and occupational orientation. The four primary questions addressed in this study were as follows: (1) Is there a common personality type or pattern among student-athletes? (2) Are there common occupational interests among student-athletes? (3) Are personality styles associated with occupational interests? (4) Are there differences between student-athletes and non-athletes in terms of occupational orientation or personality type?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were freshman undergraduate students ($N = 53$) at a mid-sized Atlantic region university competing in NCAA Division I. The participants were enrolled in the four sections of a freshman seminar. The seminar was a required course for freshman physical education majors and freshman student-athletes. Two of the course sections were comprised primarily of intercollegiate student-athletes, and the remaining two sections consisted primarily of non-athletes majoring in physical education. The sample was 63% male. The student-athlete group contained 36 members, of whom 25 were male. The student-athletes in the sample were participants in intercollegiate basketball, football, baseball, softball, field hockey, lacrosse, cross country, and soccer.

Measures

Two measures were used in this study. The Personality Adjective Check List (Strack, 1991) served as the measure of personality style, and the Strong Interest Inventory (SII; Hansen & Campbell, 1985) was used to assess vocational interests and orientation.

Personality Adjective Check List. The Personality Adjective Check list is a 150-item list of adjectives that describe various characteristics of normal personalities. Respondents simply endorse only those items that are self-descriptive. The PACL is based on Millon's interpersonal and biopsychosocial theory (1981, 1990); however, unlike the Millon inventories, the PACL was designed for use with normal populations and is not designed to assess psychopathology. The PACL posits eight normal personality style variants of the Millon patterns and the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-Revised (DSM-

III-R) personality disorders (American Psychological Association, 1987). For comparative purposes, these classifications are presented in Table I. The PACL demonstrates good stability of scores for both men and women. Test/re-test reliability at three months revealed a median coefficient of .71 for men and .74 for women. For men and women combined (again at three months), scale reliability coefficients ranged from .63 to .86 (Strack, 1991).

Table 1

Comparison of Polarities with DSM-III-R, Millon, and PACL Personality Types

Polarity	DSM-III-R	Millon	PACL
Passive-Detached	Schizoid	Asocial	Introversive
Active-Detached	Avoidant	Withdrawn	Inhibited
Passive-Dependent	Dependent	Submissive	Cooperative
Active-Dependent	Histrionic	Gregarious	Sociable
Passive-Independent	Narcissistic	Egotistic	Confident
Active-Independent	Antisocial	Aggressive	Forceful
Passive-Ambivalent	Compulsive	Conforming	Respectful
Active-Ambivalent	Passive-Aggressive	Negativistic	Sensitive

Strong Interest Inventory. The Strong Interest Inventory is a widely used measure that facilitates the identification of salient vocational interests. The SII is a 325-item inventory in which respondents indicate their interest in a wide range of occupations, occupational activities, leisure activities, academic subjects, and types of people. Respondents indicate "like," "indifferent," or "dislike" for each item.

Three main sets of scores are generated: General Occupational Themes, Basic Interest Scales, and Occupational Scales. The six General Occupational Themes—Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional—reflect the respondent's overall occupational orientation. The Basic Interest Scales report consistency of interests in specific subareas of the six general themes. The first two sets of scores represent interest in various activities, while the Occupational Scales assess the degree of similarity in responses made by the respondent and those made by people employed in the occupation being assessed. The SII possesses high reliability and validity. The psychometric properties of the SII and descriptions of the General Occupational Themes are fully described in Hansen and Campbell (1985).

Procedure

The PACL and SII were administered during the middle of the semester and took approximately one hour to complete. The PACL was completed during a class period, and the SII was completed on computer at the university's counseling center. Following completion and scoring of the two measures, a group interpretation of the meaning of the various profiles and scales was made during class. Participants with questions about their results were encouraged to meet individually with the course instructors.

Analyses

For purposes of the present study, only the General Occupational Theme scores and the Basic Interest Scale scores were included from the SII in the final analyses. All PACL scale scores were included in the final analyses. T-tests were performed to compare student-athletes/non-athletes and males/females on individual scale means. However, only student-athlete/non-athlete comparisons are reported. Pearson product moment correlations were generated for the SII and PACL scales—both across the entire sample and for the student-athlete and non-athlete groups—to address the questions pertaining to the relationship of personality and occupational interests.

RESULTS

Student-Athletes Versus Non-Athletes

Student-athletes and non-athletes differed significantly on a number of variables on the PACL and SII. On the PACL, student-athletes were more Respectful ($t(51) = 2.53, p = .015$) and less Confident ($t(51) = 2.52, p = .015$) than the non-athletes. On the SII, student-athletes and non-athletes differed significantly only on measures relating to the arts. Student-athletes were less interested in Music/Dramatics ($t(51) = -2.96, p = .005$) and scored lower on the Artistic theme ($t(51) = -2.04, p = .047$). Means for the PACL and SII scales are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Scores of Personality Adjective Check List and Strong Interest Inventory Scales

Scale	Athletes		Non-Athletes	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Personality Adjective Check List				
Introversive	47.31	6.72	47.29	9.09
Inhibited	48.75	7.47	44.76	8.26
Cooperative	49.64	9.05	44.76	10.08

Table 2 (continued)

Scale	Athletes		Non-Athletes	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Personality Adjective Check List				
Sociable	51.86	7.82	54.29	8.96
Confident*	47.64	6.41	53.12	9.18
Forceful	55.81	8.39	57.29	8.71
Respectful*	49.25	7.96	43.29	8.08
Sensitive	51.42	7.15	49.47	11.34
Strong Interest Inventory				
Realistic	42.14	10.03	42.35	9.19
Investigative	40.03	7.42	41.53	7.81
Artistic**	37.28	9.51	42.71	7.95
Social	48.64	9.52	51.94	8.68
Enterprising	47.92	10.44	49.00	8.99
Conventional	45.00	10.83	46.00	9.48
Agriculture	48.28	7.55	48.53	4.94
Nature	39.78	9.85	42.06	8.94
Adventure	58.14	8.94	58.82	7.40
Military Activities	47.86	9.47	48.41	9.95
Mechanical Activities	43.30	9.57	43.71	9.49
Science	40.47	6.50	40.53	6.67
Mathematics	47.14	10.08	49.53	10.63
Medical Science	43.69	9.34	44.53	7.08
Medical Service	47.58	7.60	49.35	8.15
Music/Dramatics**	37.86	7.76	44.35	6.75
Art	40.22	10.29	44.65	8.51
Writing	37.72	8.65	39.65	6.20
Teaching	48.22	10.02	52.88	10.79
Social Service	50.19	9.85	50.82	9.82
Athletics	61.56	7.23	63.94	3.61
Domestic Arts	46.61	9.72	49.12	6.55
Religious Activities	42.42	8.60	43.47	5.59
Public Speaking	42.81	8.39	45.65	9.33
Law/Politics	44.50	8.96	43.65	10.76

Table 2 (continued)

Scale	Athletes		Non-Athletes	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Personality Adjective Check List				
Merchandising	47.42	8.93	46.82	8.13
Sales	52.31	10.25	52.29	8.19
Business Management	44.56	9.27	45.71	9.72
Office Practices	45.22	7.44	45.76	6.51

Note. Athlete $n = 36$. Non-Athlete $n = 17$.

*Means are significantly different at $p < .05$.

**Means are significantly different at $p < .01$.

Personality and Occupational Patterns

Sample Correlations. Several Pearson product moment correlations generated across the entire sample were significant. The PACL's Introverted personality type was significantly negatively correlated with the SII's Social occupational theme ($r = -.27$, $p = .046$) and several basic interest scales. It was negatively correlated with interest in Public Speaking ($r = -.33$, $p = .015$), Law/Politics ($r = -.38$, $p = .004$), Sales ($r = -.28$, $p = .037$), and Business Management ($r = -.34$, $p = .011$). For the Inhibited personality, significant negative relationships were found with interest in Law/Politics ($r = -.30$, $p = .024$) and Sales ($r = -.32$, $p = .026$).

Interestingly, while no relationships were found involving the Cooperative personality, the Social personality was positively correlated with orientation toward the Artistic occupational theme ($r = .32$, $p = .018$) and interest in Medical Science ($r = .36$, $p = .008$) and Music/Dramatics ($r = .32$, $p = .019$).

A positive correlation was found between the Confident personality and orientation toward the Artistic occupational theme ($r = .32$, $p = .02$). The Confident personality was also positively correlated with interest in Writing ($r = .34$, $p = .012$), Music/Dramatics ($r = .29$, $p = .032$) and Public Speaking ($r = .35$, $p = .011$). The only significant correlation involving the Forceful personality was with interest in Military Activities ($r = .37$, $p = .006$).

The Respectful personality type was significantly correlated with orientation toward the Social occupational theme ($r = .30$, $p = .026$) and interest in Teaching ($r = .29$, $p = .036$) and Social Service ($r = .30$, $p = .026$). No significant relationships involving the Sensitive personality type were found.

Student-Athlete Group Correlations. Pearson product moment correlations were generated separately for the student-athlete group. Among the student-athletes, no significant relationships involving the Introverted,

Cooperative, Sociable, or Forceful personalities were found. However, the Inhibited personality negatively correlated with interest in Law/Politics ($r = -.34$, $p = .040$) and Sales ($r = -.34$, $p = .040$) for the student-athlete group. Significant correlations were also found between the Respectful personality and the Social occupational orientation ($r = .42$, $p = .011$), interest in Teaching ($r = .38$, $p = .023$), and interest in Social Service ($r = .35$, $p = .034$). These results are consistent with the findings for the whole sample. Among student-athletes, the Sensitive personality was significantly correlated with interest in Teaching ($r = .37$, $p = .045$).

DISCUSSION

Student-Athletes Versus Non-Athletes

The first question this study explored was whether or not there were differences in the personality styles and occupational orientations of student-athletes and non-athletes. The results of the study suggest that student-athletes and non-athletes show some modest differences in personality styles and occupational interest patterns. One particularly interesting finding was that student-athletes scored lower on the Confident personality scale. This result seemed counterintuitive to the authors since it is commonly assumed that student-athletes possess higher than average confidence. One possible explanation for this counterintuitive finding is that non-athletes may be making their judgments (on items relating to confidence) by comparing themselves only to other freshmen. Student-athletes, on the other hand, may be comparing themselves to upperclass student-athletes and receive feedback from coaches based on the standards established by the upperclass group. As a result, they come up short. This finding suggests that counselors who work with freshman student-athletes may wish to pay particular attention to issues such as confidence and self-esteem in their clientele.

That student-athletes were more Respectful was not surprising since they have been socialized to follow the orders of coaches without questioning. This effect may have been magnified by the awe factor. As freshmen, it is likely that many of the student-athletes might be in awe of their coaches and would be particularly reluctant to disobey or disregard them. This effect might be expected to diminish over time. While the Respectful style does not generally pose problems, in extremes it may indicate a student-athlete who is unwilling to question and challenge the status quo when that might be warranted in personal, academic, and occupational situations. Counselors should be aware of this possibility, especially in terms of the student-athlete's career interests and the nature of the counseling relationship and particularly if a student-athlete is expecting to be told which direction to pursue.

The finding that student-athletes were less interested in artistic endeavors is not surprising. Time that others might devote to artistic pursuits is more than likely devoted to athletic activities. The demands of college probably

serve to eliminate any possibility of artistic pursuits. Furthermore, the Respectful personality may not lend itself to artistic endeavors.

One likely reason that the present findings did not show more and greater differences between the student-athlete and non-athlete groups is that the non-athletes were Physical Education majors. Clearly this group has greater than average interest in and connection with the athletic world. It is likely that many (if not most) were less than a year removed from competing as high school varsity athletes. In that sense, the student-athlete/non-athlete distinction may be rather hazy. If this is the case, then it might be expected that differences between these two groups might become magnified over time. The findings do point out that participants in intercollegiate athletics tend to develop a different "culture." Future research along this line may benefit from a longitudinal approach as well as using a comparison group that contrasts more with the athletic group.

Personality and Occupational Patterns

The second major issue this study addressed was the relationship between personality type and occupational orientation. Here the correlational analyses provide considerable information of interest. For the sample as a whole, the Introversive and Inhibited personality types tended not to be interested in activities that would generally be of an enterprising nature. This suggests that, for students who are more withdrawn (whether they are student-athletes or non-athletes), some careers in business and law may not be optimal choices. Ironically, business-related careers are often seen as highly desirable and are frequently the goals of student-athletes. The findings of this study suggest that the role of personality style needs to be carefully considered with student-athletes before they make a commitment to these fields.

Results of this study suggest that, in general, high scorers on the Sociable personality type scale may wish to explore careers in the arts and in medical science. It is somewhat surprising that this personality type did not correlate significantly with interests in the Enterprising theme. The reason for the significant correlation with Medical Science, rather than Medical Service, is also unclear. Medical Science emphasizes investigation (e.g., medical research), whereas in Medical Service the emphasis is on interpersonal interaction in medically-related settings (e.g., nursing). Confident personalities appear to be interested in the arts and in public speaking, a finding that makes intuitive sense. Artistically-oriented and Confident types appear to have considerable faith in their abilities to function independently and without excessive concern about public pressure. The relationship between the Forceful personality and interest in Military Activities seems intuitively plausible. Careers capitalizing on this interest may be ideal for Forceful types. It should be noted, however, that within the student-athlete subsample neither the Confident-Artistic nor the Forceful-Military Activities relationships held. The reasons for this are unclear and will need to be addressed in future research.

The Respectful personality was significantly correlated with orientation toward the Social occupational theme in general, and with interests in Teaching and Social Service in particular. This relationship held for the general sample as well as the student-athlete subsample. The relationship may be explained by the adherence to rules, protocol, and lines of authority valued by the Respectful type. The classroom (or playing field, for those interested in coaching as well as teaching) and many social service careers are fairly well structured and have clear lines of authority and rules. Counselors may wish to encourage Respectful types to consider careers in these fields if they have not already done so.

The absence of any significant correlations for the general sample involving the Sensitive personality and occupational interests was somewhat surprising. It was expected that these types might gravitate toward the arts. However, if the erratic nature of Sensitive personalities is considered, then it might well be imagined that they would not have consistent occupational interests. Interestingly, among student-athletes the Sensitive personality was associated with an interest in Teaching. The reasons for this finding are unclear and require further study, but it is possible that teaching affords some creativity and a degree of independence from direct, immediate supervision—both characteristics that may appeal to Sensitive types.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study have several important implications for professionals involved in counseling college student-athletes. First, it appears that there are personality variables that must be recognized and accounted for in counseling student-athletes. These variables may distinguish them from other students. Although the profile of a typical student-athlete did not clearly emerge, there appears to be justification for the use of personality measures to help identify an individual student-athlete's personality style. Second, by identifying the personality type, it appears possible to help student-athletes make more informed judgments about which careers may be most suitable for them. It should be clearly understood that this suggestion does not imply that student-athletes should be stereotyped or herded into any particular career. Rather, it is suggested that counselors use this information to encourage the exploration of careers that may be consistent with each student-athlete's personality style.

While the results are informative, this study represents a first step along this line of inquiry, and as such there are several limitations which must be acknowledged. It would be desirable to have a larger sample and a comparison group of non-athletes that is more distinct and heterogeneous than the one employed. It would also be important to study an upperclass sample to determine if the relationships between personality style and occupational orientation are stable and consistent over time. The possibility of differences along gender lines needs to be explored. It would also be informative to include participants in individual sports in the student-athlete sample. Finally, it would

be valuable to study the personality-occupational orientation relationship by using high-point profiles of each (i.e., considering the relationship between an individual's two highest scores on both the PACL and the SII). In reality, people are more accurately described by combinations of occupational themes and combinations of personality styles, rather than single themes. It is hoped that future research will address these issues.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed., rev.). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Chickering, A. W. (1975). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Denson, E. L. (1992a). An investigation of the effects of two career counseling interventions upon psychological well-being, self-efficacy, and locus of control. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Denson, E. L. (1992b). Choosing a major and a career. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hansen, J. D., & Campbell, D. C. (1985). Manual for the SVIB-SCII (4th ed.). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Holland, J. L. (1973). Making vocational choices: A theory of careers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jordan, J. M., & Denson, E. L. (1990). Student services for athletes: A model for enhancing the student-athlete experience. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 95-97.
- Kennedy, S. R., & Dimick, K. M. (1987). Career maturity and professional sports expectations of college football and basketball players. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 293-297.
- McGowan, S. (1992, February). Getting student-athletes back in the career game. AACD Guidepost (pp. 1.6).
- Millon, T. (1981). Disorders of personality: DSM III, Axis II. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Millon, T. (1990). Toward a new personology. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Petitpas, A., Danish, S., McKelvain, R., & Murphy, S. (1992). A career assistance program for elite athletes. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 383-386.

Pinkerton, R. S., Hinz, L. D., & Barrow, J. C. (1989). The college student-athlete: Psychological considerations and interventions. Journal of American College Health, 37, 218-226.

Strack, S. (1987). Development and validation of an adjective check list to assess the Millon personality types in a normal population. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57, 345-355.

Strack, S. (1991). Manual for the Personality Check List (rev. ed.). Pasadena, CA: 21st Century Assessment.

AN INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG COLLEGE STUDENT- ATHLETES

Gary A. Sailes
Indiana University

ABSTRACT

This investigation examined the degree of control that college student-athletes felt they had regarding their academic experiences. Findings indicate that student-athletes have high academic aspirations but face structural as well as personal obstacles in maintaining control over their academic experiences. Time demands of their sports, lack of high school preparation, and inadequate personal study habits collectively contribute to the academic problems experienced by student-athletes. In addition, partial qualifiers under Proposition 48, All-American student-athletes, and white student-athletes demonstrate more control over and more seriousness about their academic experiences when compared to Proposition 48 full qualifiers, all other student-athletes, and black student-athletes, respectively.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Recent attention disclosing perceived low graduation rates among student-athletes at NCAA Division I institutions has generated much criticism, leading to Congressional intervention and NCAA reforms. Student-athletes are generally viewed as victims caught in an institutional incongruity: the "win at all costs" philosophy and business mentality of intercollegiate athletics versus their amateur status and the imposed academic integrity of higher education (Coakley, 1990). Because of the visibility of student-athletes and the sensitive issues currently permeating intercollegiate athletics, colleges and universities are vulnerable to media and public scrutiny. Consequently, student-athletes are held accountable to a higher standard of academic excellence and moral values than typical students are (Coakley, 1990).

Research on the academic experiences of student-athletes emanates from dichotomous findings which make the validity of assumptions about academic accountability seem paradoxical. The primary focus hinges on the dual role conflict experienced by student-athletes and their inability to balance the role expectations placed on them academically and athletically (Adler & Adler, 1987; Funk, 1991; Lance, 1987; Leonard, 1986, 1987).

One segment of the literature argues that the time demands of NCAA Division I revenue-producing men's sports (football and basketball) are incompatible with the academic component of the student-athletes' college experience and lead to academic failure or low graduation rates (Adler & Adler, 1982, 1987; Coakley, 1990; Kiger & Lorentzen, 1986; Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1982). Lower grade point averages and lower graduation rates among college student-athletes as compared to high school student-athletes confirm that contention (Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1982).

The academic problems associated with dual role conflict has sometimes led to unethical practices and cheating (Blann, 1990; Leonard, 1986, 1987). The academic clustering of men's basketball players into physical education "jock" courses undermines the academic role of student-athletes and perpetuates negative stereotypes of anti-intellectualism among college student-athletes (Case, Greer, & Brown, 1987; Raney, Knapp, & Small, 1983; Sailes, 1993). "Grade fixing" or altering transcripts is another allegation permeating some athletic departments (Leonard, 1986). Most often it is black male student-athletes who are falling off the graduation track at higher rates than their white counterparts (Case, Greer, & Brown, 1987; Kiger & Lorentzen, 1986; Lederman, 1992; Nyquist, 1985; Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1982).

The antithetical inquiry indicates that student-athletes demonstrate high levels of expectation, motivation, and academic ideals during their freshman year (Adler & Adler, 1985; Leonard, 1987). Other inquiries indicate that student-athletes have higher grade point averages and graduate at approximately the same percentage as the general student population at most major universities (Coakley, 1990; Henschen & Fry, 1984; Lederman, 1992). It is widely held that the revenue-producing sports and their time demands are the chief variables negatively affecting the academic success of student-athletes (Blann, 1990; Leonard, 1986). However, many Division I football and men's basketball programs are able to graduate relatively higher percentages of their student-athletes than the graduation rates of traditional students (Eitzen, 1987). Student-athletes who would not have met academic eligibility requirements as incoming freshmen under NCAA Proposition 48 have made successful academic progress and have gone on to graduate (Walter, Smith, Hoey, Wilhelm, & Miller, 1987). In addition, the NCAA has passed some reforms and is currently reviewing others which are designed to protect the rights of student-athletes.

CONCEPTUAL MODEL

Many of the studies investigating academic accountability among student-athletes examine the impact of structural (i.e., organizational or institutional) variables. It appears to be universally accepted that the time demands of athletic participation, specifically in football and men's basketball, contribute chiefly to the problems associated with the dual role expectations placed upon student-athletes. Consequently, much of the scrutiny examines the philosophies and politics of university athletic departments and questions the ability of the NCAA to govern its member institutions and protect the rights of student-athletes to receive an education and graduate from college.

Few, if any, studies have examined student-athletes to determine their perceptions regarding personal control over their academic experiences while immersed in their dual roles as "student" and "athlete." The intent of this investigation was to conduct a study to ascertain such perceptions and to answer the following question: Is the institution primarily responsible for the academic/athletic dilemma of the student-athlete, or does the student-athlete also contribute to the problem?

The dependent variable employed in this investigation was perception of academic accountability, while the independent variable was athletic participation. For the purpose of this investigation, the variable "academic accountability" refers to the subject's willingness to accept and engage in the behaviors essential to achieving academic success (e.g., regularly attending class, attending study tables, organizing or participating in a study group in preparation for an exam, setting high academic standards and not settling for minimal eligibility requirements, reorganizing class notes, and utilizing academic counseling).

It was hypothesized that, regardless of the organizational and institutional demands placed on student-athletes, they maintain some degree of control over their academic outcomes but choose to defer that control.

METHOD

Instrument

To complete this investigation it was necessary to develop a questionnaire. Informal interviews with student-athletes as well as precedents in the related literature about academic accountability among students were used as guides in the development of that instrument.

The instrument was designed to reveal the perceptions and beliefs of the subjects regarding their academic experiences at their respective institutions. The questionnaire contained thirty items employing a five-point Likert scale coded in the same direction and ranging as follows: (5) strongly agree; (4) agree; (3) undecided; (2) disagree; (1) strongly disagree. Among the questions

included in the instrument were the following: "I could do more to get better grades;" "I study only enough to remain eligible to participate in athletics;" "I do not have enough time to prepare for my studies;" "I have good study habits." (See appendix for the complete text of the questionnaire.)

Subjects

The questionnaire was administered to 918 male student-athletes in more than 100 NCAA Division I institutions throughout the country. The distribution of the sample is shown in Table 1. Coaches and academic counselors were identified and asked to administer the instrument to the student-athletes under their guidance.

Table 1

Subjects

Group	N
African American	236
Caucasian	552
Other/Undeclared	130
Freshmen	438
Sophomores	144
Juniors	173
Seniors	163
Men's Basketball	120
Football	270
Other Men's Team Sports	246
Men's Individual Sports	282
Student-Athletes on Athletic Scholarship	617
Student-Athletes Not on Athletic Scholarship	301
Qualifiers	755
Partial Qualifiers	163
All-Americans	207
Not All-Americans	711
TOTAL SAMPLE	918

RESULTS

Comparison of Grade Point Average

A preliminary examination of the data and the cross-tabular inquiry revealed certain trends (see Table 2). The number of student-athletes who received A's and B's in high school dropped when they went to college. Correspondingly, more student-athletes received C's and D's in college as compared to high school.

Table 2

Comparison of Grade Point Average

GRADE	HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE	CHANGE
A	21%	4%	- 17%
B	52%	38%	- 13%
C	17%	37%	+ 20%
D	11%	20%	+ 9%

Comparison of Behavior and Perceptions

The chi square ($\chi^2 \geq 53.7$, $p = .005$) statistical procedure was employed to determine significance (distinct patterns of behavior or perceptions within the sample responses) within the cross-tabular inquiry. Significance was disclosed among the following measures:

(1) Of the sample, 82 percent would have attended college even if they had not been offered an athletic scholarship; however, 48.6 percent discovered they were academically unprepared to attend college.

(2) 41 percent believed that the academic requirements for college were too difficult, with 80.3 percent requiring academic counseling to maintain athletic eligibility.

(3) 82 percent studied only enough to remain eligible, while 55.3 percent admitted to not having good study habits.

(4) 80 percent disclosed that sports were more important to them than their studies, and 96.1 percent said they were capable of doing better academically.

(5) 73 percent reported being able to balance the roles of student and athlete, but 62.2 percent said they were fearful of losing their eligibility due to low grades.

(6) 59 percent said they could get better grades if they had more time for their studies; however, 44.7 percent disclosed that they got better grades when their sport was in season.

(7) Approximately 66 percent of the sample indicated a commitment to their academic majors.

(8) 67.3 percent expected to graduate by the time their eligibility expired, 42.5 percent planned to continue on to graduate or professional school, and 75.2 percent planned to use their college degrees to secure employment.

Comparison by Group

The analysis of variance ($F \geq 1.08$, $p = .005$) was employed to determine variability among the groups by race (black and white), academic eligibility (partial and full qualifiers under Proposition 48), and level of athletic performance (All-American and not). Significant differences were uncovered on all three constructs (see Table 3).

Table 3

Comparison by Group (Analysis of Variance)

Group I	Group II	F
Whites ($\bar{X} = 77.8$)	Blacks ($\bar{X} = 72.8$)	1.28
Partial Qualifiers ($\bar{X} = 80.3$)	All Others ($\bar{X} = 72.6$)	2.35
All-Americans ($\bar{X} = 74.4$)	All Others ($\bar{X} = 71.5$)	1.12

($F \geq 1.08$, $p = .005$)

In a comparison by race, white student-athletes ($\bar{X} = 77.8$) displayed more academic accountability than black student-athletes ($\bar{X} = 72.8$). In a comparison of academic eligibility status, student-athletes who were partial qualifiers under NCAA Proposition 48 ($\bar{X} = 80.3$) revealed more academic accountability than student-athletes who met the specific academic eligibility requirements for freshman student-athletes ($\bar{X} = 72.6$). All-Americans ($\bar{X} = 74.4$) had a higher degree of academic accountability than student-athletes who were not All-Americans ($\bar{X} = 71.5$).

DISCUSSION

Overall, a paradoxical relationship exists when academic accountability among intercollegiate student-athletes is examined. While a

large percentage of student-athletes aspire to do well academically, their behavior indicates otherwise. The student-athletes did, however, take responsibility for their lack of preparation.

The behavior of the student-athletes appears antithetical to their academic aspirations. The findings indicate the following: (1) most study only enough to remain eligible and believe that sports are more important than studies; (2) most believe they are capable of doing better academically; and (3) the majority do not have good study habits.

Another paradox surfaced. While many subjects reported the academic requirements for their courses were too difficult and most seemed fearful of losing their eligibility because of low grades, more than half thought they could do better academically if they had more time to pursue their studies. However, when the student-athletes had the least time available to them (i.e., during their sports season) almost half of the sample said their grades were higher during that period than they were in the off-season.

This confounding paradox could be interpreted in one of two ways. First, it could be an indication that student-athletes took less demanding courses or were clustered into "jock" courses during their seasons of competition (Case, Greer, & Brown, 1987). Second, it could be an indication that the student-athletes' time is more structured during their sports seasons because of the time demands of competition. Consequently, during their playing seasons, student-athletes probably are more disciplined and focused as compared to the off-season (Sailes, 1986). Since it is difficult to determine which interpretation is prevalent without more evidence, further investigation needs to be conducted in this area.

It is not surprising that black student-athletes scored lower on the variable "academic accountability" than white student-athletes. The literature on the academic performance (e.g., grade point averages and graduation rates) of black student-athletes consistently shows them trailing white student-athletes (Case, Greer, & Brown, 1987; Kiger & Lorentzen, 1986; Lederman, 1992; Nyquist, 1985; Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1982). The disadvantaged educational background of black student-athletes more than likely accounts for their lower scores on this variable.

The findings that All-Americans and partial qualifiers are more serious about their studies than other student-athletes appear to justify intuitive expectations. Both groups have much more to lose by demonstrating a less serious attitude about their academic requirements. All-Americans probably are starters and need to do well academically to maintain their starting positions; partial qualifiers stand to lose another year of eligibility and/or competition after having forfeited their freshman year.

SUMMARY

This study was able to disclose that a paradoxical relationship exists in the role expectations of student-athletes at NCAA Division I institutions. While the student-athletes in the sample had academic aspirations, several structural variables such as time demands of sport participation and lack of high school preparation prevented them from reaching their academic goals. Further, student-athletes did little more academically than meet the minimum requirements necessary to maintain their athletic eligibility. A number of student-athletes used the academic counseling services offered by their respective institutions; unfortunately, indications were that this was not enough to offset the anxiety of losing athletic eligibility or graduating by the time their eligibility expired. Further evidence revealed that those student-athletes with the most to lose had stronger values relative to their academic success. However, it appears that black student-athletes were not able to overcome the disparities illustrated in the related literature.

This study was revealing. In a time when student-athletes are being subjected to more academic scrutiny, it appears that the messages of going to class, getting an education, and graduating are heard but not listened to. Although the academic aspirations of student-athletes may be sincere, their actions do not parallel those thoughts.

In light of these findings, it becomes imperative that coaches, academic counselors, and teachers make a greater effort to affect the academic values of student-athletes and help them develop the positive attitudes regarding their academic responsibilities that would lead to behavior modifications and ensure success in the classroom and beyond.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. Sociology of Education, 58, 241-250.
- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1987). Role conflict and identity salience: College athletics and the academic role. The Social Science Journal, 24, 443-455.
- Blann, W. (1990). The relationship of level of intercollegiate athletic competition and student's educational and career plans. In L. Vander Velden & J. H. Humphrey (Eds.) Psychology and sociology of sport, vol. 2: current selected research (165-176). New York: AMS Press, Inc.
- Case, B., Greer, H., & Brown, J. (1987). Academic clustering in athletics: Myth or reality? Arena Review, 11, 48-56.
- Coakley, J. (1990). Sport in society: Issues and controversies. Boston: Times Mirror/Mosby.
- Eitzen, S. (1987). The educational experiences of intercollegiate student athletes. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 11, 15-30.
- Funk, G. (1991). Major violation: The unbalanced priorities in athletics and academics. Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.
- Henschen, K., & Fry, D. (1984). An archival study of the relationship of intercollegiate athletic participation and graduation. Sociology of Sport Journal, 1, 52-56.
- Kiger, G., & Lorentzen, D. (1986). The relative effects of gender, race, and sport on university academic performance. Sociology of Sport Journal, 3, 160-167.
- Lance, L. M. (1987). Conceptualization of role-relationships and role conflict among student-athletes. Arena Review, 11, 12-18.
- Lederman, D. (1992, July 5). Black athletes graduate at a higher rate than other blacks, NCAA reports. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A31-32.
- Leonard, W. III (1986). The sports experience of the black college athlete: Exploitation in the academy. International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 21, 35-47.
- Leonard, W. III (1987). Situated behavior of the student athlete in NCAA basketball. Arena Review, 11, 79-93.
- Nyquist, E. (1985). The immorality of big-power intercollegiate athletics. In D. Chu, J. Seagrave, & B. Becker (Eds.), Sport and higher education (101-114). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Purdy, D., Eitzen, S., & Hufnagel, R. (1982). Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of college athletes. Social Problems, 29, 439-448.
- Raney, J., Knapp, T., & Small, M. (1983). Pass one for the gipper: Student athletes and university coursework. Arena Review, 7, 53-60.

Sailes, G. (1986, November). Academic clustering at selected NCAA division I schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Las Vegas, NV.

Sailes, G. (1993). An investigation of campus stereotypes: The myth of black athletic superiority and the dumb jock stereotype. Sport Sociology Journal, 10(1), 88-97.

Walter, T., Smith, D., Hoey, G., Wilhelm, R., & Miller, S. (1987). Predicting the academic success of college athletes. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 58, 273-279.

APPENDIX

Survey Questionnaire

YOU ARE BEING INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN A STUDY TO DETERMINE THE PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT ATHLETES ABOUT THEIR ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES AT THE COLLEGE THEY ATTEND. YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY IS STRICTLY VOLUNTARY. PLEASE DO NOT PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION THAT MAY IDENTIFY YOU OR YOUR SCHOOL. ANSWER EACH QUESTION AS ACCURATELY AND COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE. DARKEN THE APPROPRIATE SPACE ON YOUR RESPONSE SHEET FOR EACH QUESTION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS STUDY OR WOULD LIKE A COPY OF THE RESULTS, PLEASE CONTACT DR. GARY A. SAILES, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, AT 812-855-0538.

1. What is your ethnic background?
 - a. African American
 - b. Caucasian
 - c. Hispanic
 - d. Asian American
 - e. Native American
 - f. Other
2. In what sport do you currently participate?
 - a. basketball
 - b. football
 - c. baseball/hockey
 - d. lacrosse, soccer, track & field, wrestling
 - e. tennis, golf, swimming & diving, other

3. What is your current year in school?
 - a. freshman
 - b. sophomore
 - c. junior
 - d. senior
 - e. fifth year senior
4. What is your current grade point average (based on 4.0=A)?
 - a. 4.0-3.5 (A average)
 - b. 3.4-3.0 (A to B average)
 - c. 2.9-2.5 (B average)
 - d. 2.4-2.0 (B to C average)
 - e. Below 2.0 (C average or below)
5. What was your grade point average when you graduated from high school?
 - a. 4.0-3.5 (A average)
 - b. 3.4-3.0 (A to B average)
 - c. 2.9-2.5 (B average)
 - d. 2.4-2.0 (B to C average)
 - e. Below 2.0 (C average or below)
6. Were you able to meet NCAA Proposition 48 requirements when you graduated from high school?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
7. If you were not able to meet NCAA Proposition 48 requirements, which requirement were you unable to meet?
 - a. ACT score
 - b. SAT score
 - c. grade point average
 - d. I met NCAA Proposition 48 requirements when I graduated from high school.
8. Did you receive an athletic scholarship to play sports at this school?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
9. Were you a high school All-American?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
10. Are you currently a college All-American?
 - a. yes
 - b. no

THE REMAINING QUESTIONS ASK FOR YOUR HONEST AND MOST SINCERE OPINIONS. PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ACCORDINGLY:

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 5 | STRONGLY AGREE |
| 4 | AGREE |
| 3 | UNDECIDED |
| 2 | DISAGREE |
| 1 | STRONGLY DISAGREE |

11. I would have attended college even if I had not received an athletic scholarship.
12. In high school, sports were more important to me than my studies.
13. In high school, I studied only enough to remain eligible.
14. Currently, sports are more important to me than my studies.
15. In high school, I had enough time to participate in varsity sports and pursue my studies.
16. I currently have adequate time to pursue my studies.
17. I had good study habits while in high school.
18. I currently have good study habits.
19. My high school classes prepared me for college academics.
20. I am very serious about and committed to my academic major.
21. I plan to graduate by the time my eligibility expires.
22. Upon graduation, I plan to continue my education by attending graduate or professional school.
23. I am capable of doing better academically.
24. Upon graduation, I plan to pursue a career within the field of my educational training.
25. I found the academic requirements for my courses difficult.
26. I find it difficult to concentrate on my studies after a game.
27. My athletic commitments demand too much of my time.

28. I get better grades during the playing season.
29. I am sure I could get better grades if I had more time to concentrate on my studies.
30. I take advantage of the academic counseling available to me to ensure my eligibility.

SUPPORT SERVICES AND THE DIVISION I STUDENT-ATHLETE: EXPERIENCES, NEEDS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Barbara Bedker Meyer
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

ABSTRACT

This paper examines typical support service experiences of Division I football and men's basketball players. Specifically, the paper provides insight into the types of support services generally received by Division I revenue-producing sport student-athletes, discusses perceptions of these services and the service providers, and offers opinions on how future student-athletes might be better served. Based on these findings, both long- and short-term recommendations for athletic personnel are proposed.

INTRODUCTION

One of the first articles to document the experiences of college student-athletes appeared in the popular press in 1980. Underwood (1980) focused on the educational experiences of student-athletes and in particular described how many male student-athletes often changed academic majors so they would not have to take the more difficult classes, had tutors or others complete their assignments, allowed athletic advisors to plan their every move in order to circumvent the system, and focused on professional sport careers to the exclusion of all else. Underwood came to the following conclusion: "The 'dumb jock' has now come into flower in the American educational system. He is fast becoming a national catastrophe. He is already a national disgrace. . ." (p. 40).

A decade after Underwood's consciousness-raising article, another piece (this one focusing on football and men's basketball) appeared in the popular press. According to Telander (1989), college athletes today are in no better circumstances than those who preceded them. In addition to detailing academic improprieties, Telander pointed to illegal use of professional sports

agents, rampant violation of recruiting regulations, widespread illegal inducements given to student-athletes, and numerous felonies committed by college student-athletes which are promptly covered up or summarily dismissed by coaches and universities.

These two articles were valuable because they helped to make the public more aware of what was going on in the world of big-time college sports. A lack of empirical evidence, however, may have left some people questioning the validity of Underwood's and Telander's claims. Consequently, researchers have begun to investigate various dimensions of intercollegiate athletics. The academic and career development of student-athletes has been studied (Adler & Adler, 1991; Blann, 1985; Kennedy & Dimick, 1987; Meyer, 1990), as have the effects of specific counseling programs aimed at enlightening student-athletes in these particular areas (Harney, Brigham, & Sanders, 1986; Nelson, 1982; Whitner & Myers, 1986). While these and many other studies (for an overview see Coakley, 1990) have been helpful in increasing public awareness about the types of programs available to student-athletes and the resulting effectiveness of these programs, very few researchers have talked to the student-athletes themselves in an attempt to understand and improve athletic counseling. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to use in-depth interviews to examine the actual support service experiences of Division I football and men's basketball student-athletes and to explore their perceptions of individual counseling needs.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The participants in this study consisted of 26 letter-winning male former student-athletes who graduated from an NCAA Division I university (hereafter referred to as BDU) between 1980 and 1990. Twenty of the men had been members of the BDU football team, while six of the men had been members of the BDU basketball team. Nineteen percent of the participants were African-American; the remaining 81% were white. The sample was comprised of both scholarship and nonscholarship student-athletes, as well as men who had participated in professional athletics (27%). The distribution of graduation years was equal across the decade, with only two years yielding no graduates.

Procedure for Data Collection

After each student-athlete consented to participate in the study, appointments for interviews were made. During the interviews, developing a positive rapport was important, so each participant was given an explanation of the purpose of the interview, a description of the criteria by which he was selected, and further assurance about confidentiality (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

Undergraduate athletic experiences held in common by the participant and interviewer were shared whenever appropriate.

Each interview was expected to last approximately two hours, a fact of which the participants were made aware when the appointment was made. This estimation proved fairly accurate, as the average interview lasted approximately two hours and thirty minutes.

Finally, each interview session was conducted in a relatively consistent but flexible manner. Inconsistencies inevitably arose as some participants offered answers more freely than others. Similarly, some men jumped ahead and discussed topics out of order. The variation in interview format should not have affected the results, however, since the information, not the order in which it was obtained, is most important.

Design and Instrumentation

The topics discussed during each interview focused on four areas which were expected to provide the best understanding of the student-athletes' support service experiences and their perceived counseling needs. The four areas of interest were as follows: (1) academic support; (2) career support; (3) support personnel; and (4) missing links.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Academic Support

Colleges and universities nationwide provide support services to their student-athletes in the hope of helping them develop good study habits and eventually enhance their achievement in the classroom. The two primary academic services available to student-athletes are study halls and tutors (Greer, Moore, & Horton, 1986; Harden & Pina-Tallmon, 1988; Harney, Brigham, & Sanders, 1986). The student-athletes at BDU were no exception. The following section examines the study hall and tutoring processes at BDU and the student-athletes' support service experiences and perceptions, as well as their opinions of how the services could be changed to better serve future student-athletes.

Study Hall. At BDU study hall was mandatory for all first-term freshman scholarship student-athletes and for those student-athletes whose grade point averages fell below 2.00. The study hall was held for two hours each evening from Monday through Thursday. Student-athletes from all the BDU teams attended the same study hall held in a dormitory (in classrooms or large rooms with dividers). In the mid-1980s the BDU football team separated itself from the larger group and began conducting its own study hall in the football complex; football coaches cited convenience as the reason for the move.

The student-athletes were required to sign in and out of study hall; monitors were present to make sure that the required individuals were in attendance and that no one had left in the middle of a session. Similarly, it was not uncommon for assistant coaches to make an appearance at study hall to make sure that required student-athletes were present. If they were not, the absent student-athletes could expect to receive some sort of discipline: morning running (called "the breakfast club" by the football players) was a common punishment.

Tutoring. The other major component in the BDU academic support system was tutoring. Tutors were available at study hall on a "first come, first served" basis and were present primarily to help the student-athletes with their general education classes (e.g., English Composition, Introduction to Psychology, Algebra). Tutors for specialized and upper-level courses such as Differential Geometry and Immunobiology were available at the request of the student-athletes and the approval of the athletic academic advisor. Student-athletes who lived off campus or who were not required to attend study hall were also allowed to walk in and meet with tutors present at the study hall.

When participants in this study were asked about methods to improve study hall, the most common suggestion was to divide the student-athletes into smaller, more manageable groups. The student-athletes recommended small student-athlete/tutor ratios, question and answer sessions with tutors, and more study hall monitors. The participants thought that fewer people in each room would prove more conducive to actual study. They also thought that study hall would be a more positive experience if the athletic academic advisors and tutors took a genuine interest in the educational needs of the student-athletes, rather than in maintaining eligibility.

Finally, the participants questioned the days and times that the study hall was held. The student-athletes were often tired and physically sore after practice, making it almost impossible for them to concentrate from 8:00 to 10:00 every evening. They suggested different times during the day when study hall could be held, and several participants even mentioned a drop-in program. Similarly, the student-athletes wondered if it were necessary to go to study hall four nights a week; perhaps they did not have assignments due the next day or were suffering from "burnout" and just needed a break.

Overall, the study hall and tutoring programs described by BDU student-athletes were very similar to the academic support services provided at other universities (Harney, Brigham, & Sanders, 1986; Roper & McKenzie, 1988), which are based on the premise that "student-athletes will perform better academically if their study time is structured and prearranged for them" (Harney, Brigham, & Sanders, 1986). The reason for the popularity of this particular structure may be that it allows athletic departments to easily serve large numbers of student-athletes, thus fulfilling their obligation to provide academic support (Harney, Brigham, & Sanders, 1986; Roper & McKenzie, 1988; Whitner & Myers, 1986). Taking individual differences as well as various developmental levels into account, as the participants in this study

Journal, Spring 1993

suggested, may lead to more efficient service delivery and ultimately more productive student-athletes (Petitpas, Finley, & Votter, 1989; Roper & McKenzie, 1988; Whitner & Sanz, 1988).

Career Support

It became evident from talking to the student-athletes that little had been denied them in terms of support services. The prevailing notion was that, if they asked for something, it was provided; the student-athletes had only themselves to blame if they did not ask.

Of those student-athletes who reported receiving some type of career guidance, a great number received direction from sources outside the athletic department. Student-athletes who wanted career guidance sought counsel in the same places their non-athletic peers went for advice, namely academic advisors, professors, and university placement services. One participant described the career guidance he received at BDU in the following way:

[I did not receive any services] that weren't available to anybody as far as using the Placement Services Office and that type of thing, and the College of Business and the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management has the Hospitality Association. [There was] the student organization and all that kind of stuff, so that was all there—but that was available to anyone. But as far as I know [there was] nothing athletic-specific or athletic-related.

Support Personnel

Through discussions with the participants in the sample, it was learned that BDU employed a variety of people to assist in monitoring the academic progress and eligibility of its student-athletes. The most frequently mentioned "helpers" were the athletic academic advisors and the athletic tutors, who appeared to play an important role in the lives of many student-athletes. The participants' opinions were solicited on what the roles of the athletic academic advisors and athletic tutors were and on how those roles could be modified to meet the needs of student-athletes more effectively.

Athletic Academic Advisors. Two different men, Joe Martin and Steve Hardy (pseudonyms), held the position of athletic academic advisor during the time period under study. It was not surprising, then, that the role of athletic academic advisor as perceived by the student-athletes varied according to who held the position. The participants at BDU during Joe Martin's tenure thought he was sincerely concerned about the overall well-being of student-athletes, even though his major responsibility was to keep them eligible. One participant thought that Joe was honest with the student-athletes (an uncommon occurrence in the athletic department) and that he worked to stop the exploitation of student-athletes. The participants did not look as favorably upon Steve Hardy, whom they characterized as demeaning and patronizing.

The student-athletes were asked about how the role of the athletic academic advisor could be changed to be more effective. The most commonly mentioned suggestion was that more advisors were needed. Some participants thought the athletic academic advisors would be more effective if they took a genuine interest in student-athletes as human beings and developed a more personal relationship with each individual student-athlete. Still other participants thought the athletic academic advisors could be more effective if they were given more power, e.g., as in helping decide, based on classroom performance, which student-athletes would participate in upcoming athletic contests.

Athletic Tutors. The other group of people who provided the BDU student-athletes with academic support were the tutors hired by the athletic department. The participants were asked what they perceived to be the function or role of the tutors, as well as how they thought the tutoring system could be more effective. The majority of the participants in the study thought the tutors were genuinely concerned about helping them learn the necessary material. Conversely, other participants believed that the tutors were responsible for getting the student-athletes' work done one way or another and ultimately helping keep the student-athletes eligible for competition.

In discussions with the participants about their experiences with the athletic tutors, it became apparent that there was a variety of tutor types with different views of their roles. One participant's description of the athletic tutors he came into contact with summarized the interactions of student-athletes and tutors: "Some of 'em were intrigued to be affiliated with athletes, [for] some of 'em it was a part-time job, [and] some of 'em had a genuine interest in helping someone."

Similarly, contradictions arose as the participants discussed their ideas on how to make the BDU tutoring system more effective. The most popular response was to hold the student-athletes more responsible for their own actions and grades. In this scenario, the tutor would take a less active role, asking questions and facilitating the general learning process of the student-athlete, rather than completing the work. Another popular suggestion for improving the effectiveness of the tutoring program was to provide the student-athletes with individual tutors or, at the very least, a small student-athlete/tutor ratio. Additionally, the student-athletes mentioned providing tutors at various times throughout the day, cutting down on the noise and associated distractions in study hall during the tutoring sessions, and hiring more tutors.

While all the participants had suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of BDU's tutoring program, many realized what a difficult job the tutors had trying to motivate people who did not want to attend tutoring sessions. The student-athletes were also quick to admit that they had worked better with a likeable tutor, i.e., someone who had a good personality and with whom they felt comfortable. The participants also thought a tutor should be someone with whom they could be friends, which apparently was often the case.

The final topic discussed in this section on support personnel focused on the skills and characteristics of effective athletic academic advisors and tutors. The most commonly mentioned attribute was that they have some athletic experience, preferably at the collegiate level. As mentioned throughout the interviews, the participants also thought it was important for athletic academic advisors and tutors to take a personal, genuine interest in the student-athletes.

Since most of the participants referred to the athletic academic advisors and tutors as "he," they were asked if the positions should be filled by men. The majority of the student-athletes responded that gender was not very important; several, however, did mention a preference. Those who thought the positions should be filled by women claimed that young men would be more receptive to a nurturing mother figure, particularly after being yelled at by male coaches all day. For similar reasons, other participants felt that men would be better suited to dealing with student-athletes than women. As one such person explained:

I don't want to sound like a male chauvinist—but when you're dealing with football players and hockey players, you almost have to have a guy. Because guys just don't respect females. Not when you're 18 and 19 years old, chest is blown out because you're some big . . . supposed to be some big stud football player. I think a woman could do fine, but you really have to establish yourself the first two years. I'm not saying that a woman couldn't do it, [but] it would be hard.

As noted in the discussion of academic support services above, very little research to date has examined the topic of collegiate athletic support personnel. The research which has been done has focused on the involvement of former student-athletes in the support system. Petitpas, Furley, and Vottero (1989) suggest that previous athletic participation by an athletic academic advisor may facilitate the development of a good relationship with student-athletes and coaches. At the very least, "the counselor needs to understand how skills are learned and be sensitized to the frustrations and peak experiences inherent in sports participation" (Petitpas, Furley, & Vottero, 1989, p. 6). This philosophy is consistent with the opinions of the student-athletes in this study, who felt that it would be easier to relate to someone who understood what they were experiencing.

Missing Links

Throughout the interviews the participants discussed the types of support services available to BDU student-athletes, impressions of those who provided the services, and opinions on how the services could be improved. In the final section of the study the participants addressed the types of support services which may have enhanced their college experiences, as well as such details as time and place for providing the services.

Although the student-athletes in this study received several different types of support services, a great majority thought they would have benefited from some type of career development or counseling. Specifically, the participants thought information should be available concerning particular majors, jobs, and interview skills.

Aside from career assistance, the next most frequent reply was that the student-athletes needed some type of alcohol and drug awareness programs; the participants were particularly interested in information about steroids. Finally, the participants thought that more personal contact with counselors and advisors throughout college would be helpful for future student-athletes.

After suggestions for additional services were discussed, the interviews concluded with questions concerning the logistics (i.e., where and when) of athletic support services. The participants responded with a variety of suggestions as to the geographic location for athletic support services. Approximately half of the participants wanted the services to be available in their respective athletic facilities (e.g., the football practice building or the basketball arena). Since the student-athletes spent a great deal of their time in these buildings, the locations were convenient. The remaining student-athletes thought the support services should be located in an academic environment; apparently in order to concentrate on academics or careers, they needed to get out of the athletic environment. No matter where the participants wanted to receive support services, they agreed that the area should be private so that non-athletes could not stare at them and contribute to potential feelings of inferiority.

Finally, the student-athletes in this study talked about what time of day support services ideally should be provided. The most popular response was to maintain the status quo and make the services available after practice. Although the participants admitted that they were tired after practice, they could not think of a more suitable time to take advantage of tutors, career guidance, or other services. The next most common reply was "not after practice." Their mental and physical exhaustion after practice, especially when accompanied by a big meal, made it difficult for them to concentrate on their studies. Other student-athletes thought that a flexible drop-in or morning support service schedule would be most conducive to retention. A drop-in system might be preferable because it would allow student-athletes to seek help when it best fit into their schedules, while morning sessions would be productive because the student-athletes were refreshed and alert.

Research (Lanning, 1982; Petitpas, Finley, & Vottero, 1989; Whitner & Sanz, 1988) supports the participants in this study who claim that student-athletes should be provided with more than the rudimentary study hall programs they currently receive. Specifically, Whitner and Sanz (1988) suggest that traditional study skill programs alone do not adequately address the needs of student-athletes. Therefore, athletic departments may do well to provide student-athletes with additional services such as the career counseling and the alcohol and drug awareness programs suggested by the men in this study.

Career counseling for student-athletes has received much attention in the past few years, with researchers (Blann, 1985; Kennedy & Dimick, 1987; Lanning, 1982; McCurdy, 1983; Nelson, 1982; Whitner & Sanz, 1988; Wilkes, Davis, & Dever, 1989; Wittmer, Bostic, Phillips, & Waters, 1981) confirming the opinions of the participants in the study who thought that some type of career counseling would have helped them in their post-college lives. The need for such programs is supported by studies which have examined the career maturity of college student-athletes. For example, Blann (1985) found that freshman and sophomore male student-athletes in both Divisions I and III formulated less mature career plans than their non-athletic counterparts. Similarly, the football and men's basketball players in Kennedy and Dimick's (1987) sample had lower levels of career maturity than other college students; their average career maturity score resembled that of the typical ninth grader. Thus, the development of career counseling programs for high school and college student-athletes appears to be justified, as Kennedy and Dimick (1987) stated:

These findings seem to suggest that by developing the career maturity at which their athletes function, college administrators would be enhancing the athletes' perspectives in the direction of a more realistic and possibly more rewarding career choice after graduation (p. 297).

IMPLICATIONS FOR ATHLETIC PERSONNEL

The purpose of this study was to examine the actual support service experiences of the BDU student-athletes, as well as explore their perceptions of counseling needs. It was hoped that this information would assist athletic department personnel in planning future programs for student-athletes. The participants' experiences with athletic academic advisors and tutors have led to suggestions on the implications of this study for athletic personnel.

First, do the current support services provided by a particular athletic department help or hinder student-athletes? In the current study, these programs served to facilitate dependency training and an internalization of ideas. While the majority of the participants emerged from the intercollegiate athletic experience as independent individuals, a few believed the myth that someone would always be there to take care of them. Mandatory programs, along with training table, seemed to further alienate the student-athletes from the non-athletic student body, admittedly causing them to miss out on "normal" college life. Their associations with non-athletes seemed to help most of the student-athletes stay on track for graduation. Therefore, athletic departments should take care not to isolate student-athletes from the university atmosphere in general and from non-athletic students in particular.

Secondly, the requirement that student-athletes attend study hall must also be viewed as a mixed message. Specifically, the student-athletes in this study were required to study for eight hours a week, which perhaps suggested to

them that college students needed to study only that amount. The participants apparently had managed to get away with studying less than ten hours a week in high school, but college courses generally require significantly more work. The fact that 62.5% of BDU's football and men's basketball players were "special admits" in 1989 (Lederman, 1991) indicates that they may need to devote even more time to academics than the average student-athlete. If universities are going to admit such student-athletes into their institutions and allow them to participate in athletics, then the institutions should consider the time demands and intellectual challenges faced by "special admits" and design support services accordingly.

Subsequently, athletic department personnel need to be aware that they may be perceived as not giving equal value to the roles of student and athlete. Although athletics was going to be part of these student-athletes' lives for only a short time, the participants believed that the coaches and athletic academic advisors at BDU stressed athletics more than academics—consciously or unconsciously, explicitly or implicitly. While the football and men's basketball players in this study were required to study only eight hours a week, they would not have practiced only that amount: their coaches would not have allowed it.

Another suggestion for athletic department personnel would be to put the needs and the best interests of the student-athletes first, perhaps teaching student-athletes to take more responsibility for their own academic decisions and actions. Student-athletes must learn that they are ultimately responsible for their own lives, rather than allowing someone to take care of their lives for them. While the athletic department may benefit by "bailing out" student-athletes in trouble (i.e., keeping them eligible and thus using them to win games), the student-athletes are the ones who eventually suffer because other talented student-athletes are always waiting on the sidelines. The athletic department must then devote time to these new superstars, and the "old" student-athletes may be left with nothing. A "tough love" approach whereby the athletic department forces student-athletes to be independent from their freshman to senior years could help develop self-reliant and successful people. An attempt to do this has already taken place at the University of Florida (see Wittmer, Bostic, Phillips, & Waters, 1981).

These four suggestions are long-term recommendations which require institutional change. There are also, however, short-term recommendations which could be implemented within the current system, enabling student-athletes to have more meaningful and successful college experiences. First, athletic support personnel should show a genuine interest in the student-athletes with whom they work. Counselors, tutors, and other support personnel would do well to learn as much about the student-athletes as possible. By taking an interest in the student-athletes' backgrounds, strengths, weaknesses, interests, and goals, athletic support personnel would be showing the student-athletes that they care about them as human beings. This may increase the student-athletes' trust in the athletic personnel both on and off the field. An attempt to do this

has already taken place at the University of Toledo (see Whitner & Myers, 1986).

In addition, universities should implement more extensive career counseling programs for all students. While the student services and placement services at most universities provide such assistance, it is typically reserved for seniors who are about to enter the work world. All students, and student-athletes in particular as a result of their low levels of career maturity (Blann, 1985; Kennedy & Dimick, 1987; Sowa & Gressard, 1983), may need guidance before their fourth or fifth years of college. As the participants in this study suggested, it would have been nice to talk to someone about the "shape" of certain majors and jobs, the state of the job market in the years ahead, and the transfer of skills from the sports world to the work world. Such guidance would be a valuable asset for student-athletes and non-athletes alike. An example of such a program is located at the University of California at Los Angeles (see McCurdy, 1983).

Finally, athletic departments should examine the practice of mandatory study hall. As the comments made by the participants in the current sample illustrate, student-athletes did not gain a great deal from the study hall experience. They were tired after practice, the atmosphere was not conducive to studying, and they often resented being told that they had to study at a particular time. As a result, most of them attended only to avoid the punishment inherent in skipping. Student-athletes should be trusted and encouraged to study when they need to, and if they do not study, they should pay the consequences, including loss of eligibility or academic probation. The participants in the sample who actually accomplished something at study hall probably would have studied on their own anyway and may have achieved more in a quiet environment after taking a brief nap. If student-athletes are expected to act like responsible adults, they must be treated as such. Forcing them to study for eight hours a week only reinforces their dependency training and focuses on eligibility. Therefore, a drop-in study center as suggested by several of the student-athletes in this study may be an ideal way for athletic departments to encourage educational achievement while at the same time promoting independence.

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout this study, the participants provided insight into the types of support services typically received by Division I revenue-producing sport student-athletes, discussed perceptions of these services and the service providers, and offered suggestions on how future student-athletes might be better served. While the participants were generally satisfied with the types of support they received, greater emphasis on career development and guidance, a larger number of athletic academic advisors with whom to consult, and more concerned advisors may have enhanced the student-athletes' college experiences both on and off the field. These student-athletes did not ask for unrealistic treatment but merely for access to services available to the entire

student population. By listening to these voices, sport scientists, athletic department personnel, and policy makers may improve their understanding of the needs of this population and enhance their college and life experiences.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1991). Backboards and blackboards: College athlete and role engulfment. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Blann, W. (1985). Intercollegiate athletic competition and students' educational and career plans. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 115-118.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Coakley, J. J. (1990). Sport in society: Issues and controversies. (4th ed.) St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Greer, R. M., Moore, T., & Horton, H. (1986). Athletics and academics: One student affairs effort. Journal of College Student Personnel, 11(2), 527.
- Harden, J., & Pina-Tallmon, J. (1988). A comprehensive academic support program for the student-athlete. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 173-174.
- Harney, M. K., Brigham, T., & Sanders, M. (1986). Design and systematic evaluation of the freshman athlete scholastic training program. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33(4), 454-461.
- Kennedy, S. R., & Dimick, K. M. (1987). Career maturity and professional sports expectations of college football and basketball players. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 293-297.
- Lanning, W. (1982). The privileged few: Special counseling needs of athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 19-23.
- Lederman, D. (1991, March 27). College athletes graduate at higher rates than other students, but men's basketball players lag far behind, a survey finds. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 38-44.

- McCurdy, J. (1983, September 14). UCLA counseling athletes on careers after their glory days are over. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 23-26.
- Meyer, B. B. (1990). From idealism to actualization: The academic performance of female collegiate athletes. Sociology of Sport Journal, 7(1), 44-57.
- Nelson, E. S. (1982). The effects of career counseling on freshman college athletes. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 32-40.
- Petitpas, A., Finley, M., & Vottero, R. (1989). A developmental approach to counseling the intercollegiate athlete. Unpublished manuscript.
- Roper, L. D., & McKenzie, A. (1988). Academic advising: A developmental model for black student-athletes. NASPA Journal, 26(2), 91-96.
- Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. G. (1983). Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 236-239.
- Telander, R. (1989). The hundred yard lie: The corruption of college football and what we can do to stop it. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Underwood, J. (1980). Student-athletes: The sham, the shame. Sports Illustrated, 52(21), 36-72.
- Whitner, P. A., & Myers, R. C. (1986). Academics and an athlete: A case study. Journal of Higher Education, 57(6), 659-672.
- Whitner, P. A., & Sanz, D. L. (1988). Evaluation of a study skills program for student-athletes. Academic Athletic Journal, Spring, 1-10.
- Wilkes, S. B., Davis, L., & Dever, L. (1989). Fostering career development in student-athletes. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 567-568.
- Wittmer, J., Bostic, D., Phillips, T., & Waters, W. (1981). The personal, academic, and career problems of college student-athletes: Some possible answers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 52-55.