

Team Subcultures and Academic Values: Gender Differences Among Division I Basketball Players

Michael S. Allen

University of Connecticut

This study utilizes a quantitative research design to assess differences that exist between men and women basketball players with regard to the perceived academic subcultures within their teams. A sample of 656 Division I basketball players completed a Team Socialization Scale, which assessed the socializing influences, that college athletes receive from their coaches and teammates. Results indicated that, despite the increased commercialization and professionalization of women's college basketball, members of women's basketball teams remain significantly more oriented toward academic pursuits than members of men's basketball teams. The two primary variables that differentiated between men and women basketball players were the emphasis placed on the possibility of careers as professional athletes by coaches and teammates. The findings from this study have several practical applications for student athlete support personnel and counselors who interact with student athletes on a regular basis.

A primary goal of college coaches and athletic administrators is to have athletes achieve academically and socially at a level that is better than, or at least comparable to, the general student population. Several researchers have argued, however, that the non-academic subculture of athletic teams, the clustering of athletes in classes and majors that do not require extensive out-of-class preparation, and the tremendous time commitment required for participation in intercollegiate sports, severely limit the academic achievement of athletes (Adler & Adler, 1985; Case, Greer, & Brown, 1987; Edwards, 1984; Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1982). This situation is especially limiting for participants in high profile, revenue producing sports where the athletes are subjected to a rigorous, time consuming athletic schedule (Edwards, 1984). The result of the tremendous time commitment required for intercollegiate sports participation and the subcultures among male athletic teams that are termed "anti-intellectual" (Adler & Adler, 1985) is that many athletes underachieve academically and become overly reliant on specialized support personnel for academic and social success.

Prior to investigating the nature of intercollegiate athletic team subcultures, it is first necessary to provide a general explanation of what constitutes a subculture and how the behavior of individuals is influenced through their involvement within a specific subculture. Donnelly (1981) defines subcultures as groups or organizations in which "new members begin to deliberately adopt mannerisms and attitudes, and styles of dress, speech, and behavior that they perceive to be characteristic of established members of the 'achieved' reference group" (p. 565). This process is believed to occur primarily through direct modeling of behavior. Through this enculturation process, members begin to adapt to the dominant values and perspectives of the group, taking on new roles and modifying others, and thus

establishing new personal identifications (Donnelly & Young, 1988). The identity construction that occurs as a result of these subculture influences is extremely powerful and can have a profound effect on the behavior of individual team members.

In recent years, several studies have been conducted which suggest a pattern of substantive differences between men and women's intercollegiate athletic teams with regard to the various components of their team subcultures and subsequent levels of academic achievement. Specifically, Adler and Adler (1985) in a study of a men's Division I basketball team, and Meyer (1990) in a study of Division I female basketball and volleyball players, both used single university samples and qualitative research designs to examine how the values, attitudes, and behaviors of intercollegiate athletes are shaped through their involvement within their team environments.

The results from both studies suggested that contrary to popular belief, both male (Adler & Adler, 1985) and female (Meyer, 1990) athletes enter college with optimistic and idealistic goals and attitudes about their impending academic careers and likelihood of graduating. This academic optimism among male athletes, however, has been shown to be very temporary. Adler and Adler (1985) found that gradually, male athletes' classroom, social, and athletic experiences caused them to become "progressively detached" from academic concerns and values. One of the primary contributors to this academic detachment among male athletes was the considerable emphasis that their coaches and teammates placed on their athletic achievements compared to the limited emphasis that was placed on academic success.

Contrary to the subculture of male athletic teams, Meyer (1990) found that the female athletic subculture contributed to the continued educational optimism and proactive academic involvement of women athletic participants. Specifically, most of the female athletes in Meyer's study stated that their teammates were good influences on them academically and that there were not any "anti-academic" or "anti-intellectual" pressures put on them by their peers. Instead, there was a "pro-intellectual" environment that existed among the female athletes, as evidenced by their enjoyment of their major areas of study, and their classes, as well as the positive acknowledgment from coaches and teammates that they received for academic achievements. A second difference between the male and female athlete subcultures involved the influence of future aspirations. While most of the male athletes considered college to be a stepping stone toward professional sports, a majority of the female athletes viewed college as an opportunity to develop their professional (non-athletic) careers and to establish their own families (Meyer, 1990).

In addition to the documented gender differences among college athletes, several studies also have identified a pattern of differences between athletes who compete in "revenue producing" versus "non-revenue producing" sports. In the majority of these studies, football and men's basketball are categorized as revenue producing sports, while the remaining men's sports and women's sports constitute the non-revenue producing category. The majority of research on this topic (e.g., Edwards, 1984; Lederman, 1993; Maloney & McCormick, 1993; Purdy, Eitzen and Hufnagel, 1982; Sack, 1987) suggests that the academic culture and level of achievement among athletes from revenue producing programs is significantly poorer than the academic culture and level of achievement among athletes from non-revenue producing programs. One of the underlying themes from this body of research is the notion that certain non-academic influences from coaches and teammates, combined with a high

level of professional sport aspirations often serve as a deterrent to positive academic values and subsequent levels of achievement among athletes who compete in revenue producing sports.

The present study expands on the work of previous studies by specifically assessing differences that exist between male and female basketball players with regard to their respective team subcultures through a national sampling of college athletes. This quantitative investigation was based upon development of a *Team Socialization Scale* that conceptualizes many of the underlying constructs that were identified in previous studies. This study has become necessary given the substantial changes that have taken place in intercollegiate athletics since the Adler and Meyer studies were conducted; most notably, increased professionalization and commercialization of women's athletics, increased opportunities for women to pursue careers as professional athletes, and increased stringency of NCAA initial eligibility requirements.

Methods and Procedures

Data Collection

Due to access difficulties associated with sampling high profile intercollegiate athletes, a purposive sampling procedure was used. Data were collected using a three-step process. First, participating institutions were selected from the National Collegiate Athletic Association's directory of institutions. In order to obtain a sufficient number of participating institutions, 156 out of a possible 310 Division I schools were selected for inclusion in the study using a systematic random sample. In order to attain consistency among schools with regard to the level of academic standards, institutions that were rated as "most difficult" in terms of a highly selective admissions process in *Peterson's Guide to Four Year Colleges* and community/junior colleges were not included in the final results.

Once participating schools were identified, a letter was mailed to the directors of athletic academic support services asking them to indicate on a business reply postcard whether they would be willing to distribute surveys to the men and women basketball players at their institutions. Due to the focus of the survey on coaching behaviors, coaches were not asked to assist in the distribution of the surveys. Of the 156 Division I schools that were contacted, 72 (46%) agreed to participate.

A non-respondent bias check was conducted in order to identify the various reasons why individuals elected to not have their athletes participate in the study. Through a series of follow-up correspondence, it was determined that the majority of individuals who declined to participate did so because of the extra time constraints that would be placed on their athletes. Potential biases as a result of non-respondents are acknowledged as a limitation to the study.

The third step in the process was to mail the surveys, return envelopes, and instructions to each of the 72 institutions that had agreed to participate. The contact person at each institution was asked to distribute one survey to each member of the men and women's basketball teams. Included in these instructions was an assurance that all of the data received from each institution would be anonymous and confidential and that no data pertaining to any single institution would be tabulated or publicized. Athletes who participated in the study were provided with their own return envelope

in which to return the survey directly to the author. While return rates would have likely been higher if each institution's contact person collected and returned the surveys, it is likely that having the students return them directly back to another university elicited more candid responses from the respondents.

A demographic check was conducted to ensure that a representative sample was obtained, in terms of ensuring equitable distributions between (a) athletes with different roles on their respective teams (starter vs. reserve), (b) the past success of their respective teams (winning vs. losing programs), and (c) athletes' ethnicity and year in school. Outcomes from this demographic analysis are included in the following section.

Respondents

The sample for this study consisted of 656 men and women basketball players who participated at the Division I level of competition. The sample of Division I men was 50.4% African American and 40.7% Caucasian compared to the entire population of Division I men which was 62.6% African American and 31.7% Caucasian in 1996 (NCAA Records). A chi-square analysis of these frequencies was non-significant, indicating that the sample proportions mirrored accurately the racial distribution of the entire distribution. Similarly, the sample of Division I women was 26.5% African American and 65.9% Caucasian compared to the entire population of Division I women which was 35.7% African American and 57.6% Caucasian in 1996. The chi-square analysis for the sample of women athletes was also non-significant. The similarities between the racial composition of the sample for this study and the actual racial composition of Division I basketball players suggests that the sample is reasonably representative of the larger population of college athletes.

Two additional demographic factors were analyzed in order to ensure the representatives of the sample. Since participation from schools was voluntary, it was important to ensure that there was an equitable balance between programs with winning traditions and programs with losing traditions. This variable was operationalized in terms of teams' won/loss records as well as the number of post season appearances that teams made during the past three seasons. Demographic data from this sample indicated that 331 (55.7%) athletes were members of teams that lost more than half of their games during the previous year and 263 (44.2%) athletes were members of teams that won more than half of their games. Additionally, 327 (55.0%) of the athletes who were sampled were members of teams which made 0 or 1 appearances in post season competition during the prior three seasons and 268 (45.0%) were members of teams which made 2 or 3 appearances.

A second important demographic factor was whether there was an equitable distribution between athletes who are significant contributors to their teams athletically and athletes who have somewhat limited athletic roles on their respective teams. This variable was operationalized in terms of whether an athlete was a regular starter or a reserve on their respective teams. The sample for this study consisted of 371 (57.3%) reserves and 276 (42.7%) starters. Considering that a typical intercollegiate basketball team carries between 12 to 15 players and only 5 can start, this ratio of starters to reserves appears to be representative of the larger population of basketball players.

Instrumentation

In order to conduct this study, a "*Team Socialization Scale*" was designed to assess the dominant academic attitudes inherent in team subcultures (See Appendix A). This instrument consisted of 21 self-report items, each rated on 6-point Likert scales. Items were recoded so that in each instance, a "6" reflected a positive academic attitude or behavior and a "1" reflected a negative academic attitude or behavior. Items were based on a quantified version of Adler and Adler's (1985) and Meyer's (1990) qualitative analyses of athlete socialization. Each item was designed to assess athletes' perceptions of the dominant academic attitudes that exist within their team subcultures.

The *Team Socialization Scale* contained two specific subscales; the first assessed influences that coaches have on their athletes and the second assessed the influences that teammates have on each other. Both of these subscales consisted of one grouping of items that pertained to perceptions during recruitment and a second grouping that pertained to perceptions once the athletes enrolled in college. Based on the research of Adler and Meyer, relevant issues such as (a) attitudes toward good academic performance, (b) use of academic support services, (c) acceptability of poor athletic performance, (d) priorities of athletic accomplishments compared to academic accomplishments, (e) the importance of class attendance, (f) emphasis on receiving a degree, and (g) emphasis on a career in professional athletics were addressed from the two perspectives mentioned above.

Developing this instrument involved several phases. First, the initial draft of 56 items was reviewed for content validity by 35 university faculty and professional support personnel who specialize in promoting the academic achievement of intercollegiate athletes. All reviewers were asked to rate each item regarding its relative influence for understanding the academic achievement of intercollegiate athletes. Reviewers were also asked to suggest any additional items that they believed should be included in the questionnaire. Based on feedback from reviewers, a revised questionnaire with 56 items was developed for use in a pilot study.

The instrument development process continued with a pilot test of the questionnaire with a sample of athletes ($n=100$) who did not participate in the final study, followed by statistical assessment of the instrument's internal consistency reliability. Following a Chronbach's alpha analysis, several items were dropped from the questionnaire. The end result of this process was the 21 item *Team Socialization Scale* that was used in the present study. Cronbach's alpha for the scale representing the influence of the coach was .77 and the alpha for the scale representing the influence of teammates was .76.

RESULTS

Results for this study are presented in two subsections, each addressing a specific issue. The first section assesses the general response pattern on the *Team Socialization Scale* for Division I men and Division I women. Results are presented in terms of the percentage of respondents who "agreed" with each item. The purpose of presenting these data in this manner is to simply provide a descriptive analysis of how respondents from the two subgroups responded to the items on the *Team Socialization Scale*. Descriptive results for Division I men and Division I women for all 21 items are presented in Table 1.

The second subsection reports discriminant function analyses that were used to determine whether differences exist between Division I men basketball players and Division I women basketball players with regard to their responses on the *Team Socialization Scale* (see Tables 2 and 3). Group differences were analyzed using two separate discriminant analysis. In the first analysis, the 10 items which assessed the influence of teammates were entered using stepwise discriminant analysis procedures to determine which teammate variables best differentiate the groups under comparison. The second analysis also utilized stepwise discriminant analysis procedures to identify which of the 11 coach-related variables best differentiated the groups under comparison.

TABLE 1

Percentage of Basketball Players Who "Agree" with the *Team Socialization Scale* Variables

	Division I Men	Division I Women
Coach During Recruitment		
1. Emphasized importance of receiving a college degree	94.9	96.1
2. Emphasized career as pro athlete over other careers	33.8	14.1
3. Introduced to challenging majors	75.9	77.3
4. Introduced to faculty/support personnel	94.5	94.5
5. Emphasized athletic over academic success	36.7	22.2
Teammates During Recruitment		
6. Emphasized importance of receiving a college degree	64.7	74.9
7. Introduced to challenging majors	45.1	56.9
8. Emphasized careers as pro athletes over other careers	45.5	11.9
9. Introduced to faculty/support personnel	60.5	68.3
10. Emphasized athletic over academic success	53.4	29.7
Head Coach Behaviors		
11. Encourages to select challenging majors	65.4	70.1
12. Makes demands on time and energy that make it difficult to earn a college degree	45.9	36.8
13. Emphasizes a career as pro athlete over other careers	18.6	5.2
14. Allows to skip practice to attend class	76.0	83.1
15. Makes demands on time and energy that make it difficult to get good grades	42.0	33.7
16. Emphasizes athletic over academic success	28.0	18.4
Teammate Behaviors		
17. Emphasize importance of receiving a college degree	66.8	87.0
18. Select academically challenging majors	61.8	85.7
19. Emphasize careers as pro athletes over other careers	53.8	8.1
20. Skipping classes is an acceptable behavior	45.3	37.1
21. Emphasize athletic over academic success	55.1	28.2

General Response Patterns for Division I Men and Division I Women

DIVISION I MEN

The general pattern of results suggests that the coaches of Division I men portray very positive attitudes and behaviors with regard to academic endeavors during recruitment. For example, 95% of Division I men indicated that their coaches emphasized the importance of receiving their college degrees during recruitment and 95% of Division I men indicated that their coaches introduced them to faculty and/or academic support personnel during their recruiting visits. These overall percentages were obtained by summing across all athletes who scored 4 or higher on the particular item. This positive academic perception of coaches during the recruitment process is to be expected given the fact that many athlete/coach interactions during recruitment take place in the presence of the athletes' parents, who generally are very concerned with academic matters. These positive academic attitudes portrayed during recruitment are also consistent with Adler and Adler's (1990) research pertaining to the pre-socialization process that occurs during the recruitment process.

Descriptive data from the remaining three areas (influence of teammates during recruitment, influence of coaches once athletes enroll in college, and influence of teammates once athletes enroll in college) indicate that considerably stronger non-academic attitudes and behaviors emanate from the coaches of Division I men once the recruitment period is over and athletes officially enroll in college. The attitudes and behaviors of the teammates of Division I men were also particularly non-academic, both during recruitment and while in college. For example, 54% of Division I men indicated that their teammates emphasized careers as professional athletes over other careers during recruitment and 55% of Division I men indicated that their teammates emphasized athletic over academic success while in college. This pattern of relatively non-academic attitudes and behaviors among the teammates of Division I men becomes more pronounced when comparing them to the responses of Division I women (see Tables 2 and 3).

DIVISION I WOMEN

In general, the descriptive analysis presented in Table 1 suggests that Division I women basketball players perceive that their coaches and teammates consistently portray positive attitudes and behaviors with regard to academic endeavors. Similar to Division I men, attitudes and behaviors of coaches during the recruitment process were especially positive. A total of 96% of Division I women indicated agreement that their coaches emphasized the importance of receiving their college degrees during recruitment and 95% indicated that their coaches introduced them to faculty and support personnel during their recruiting visits. Coaches' positive academic attitudes and behaviors during recruitment are consistent with Meyer's (1990) conclusions regarding the positive academic pre-socialization that occurs for Division I women during recruitment.

A second trend among Division I women was that neither their coaches nor teammates appear to place strong emphasis on the possibility of careers in professional athletics. Specifically, 14% and 12% of Division I women indicated that

their coaches or teammates, respectively, emphasized careers as professional athletes over careers in other fields during recruitment. This emphasis grew even smaller once athletes enrolled in college with only 8% and 5% of Division I women indicating that their coaches or teammates emphasize careers as professional athletes over other careers. This trend is particularly notable considering the growing opportunities in professional basketball for qualified women. The considerable discrepancy between Division I men and Division I women with regard to the emphasis that is placed on careers as professional athletes is documented further via discriminant function analysis.

Comparisons between Division I Men and Division I Women Basketball Players

TABLE 2

Variables Best Discriminating Division I Men (N = 248) From Division I Women (N = 408) on the Academic Influence of Teammates

	Men (Means)	Women (Means)	Standardized Discriminant Coefficient		
Teammates emphasize careers as professional athletes over other careers	3.50	1.74	0.66		
Teammates emphasized careers as professional athletes over other careers <i>during recruitment</i>	3.31	1.88	0.39		
Teammates emphasize the importance of receiving their college degrees	3.88	4.75	0.23		
Skipping classes is an acceptable behavior for teammates	3.25	2.90	-0.17		
Teammates select challenging majors	3.76	4.57	0.16		
Eigenvalue	Canonical	Lambda	Chi Square	DF	Significance
.56	.60	.64	267.4	5	p < .001
Classification Rate:	Men 76.2%		Women 80.6%		

In general, data revealed that there are strong differences between the academic cultures of Division I male and female basketball players, particularly with regard to the academic influence of teammates (see Table 2). Specifically, men and women were shown to be significantly different on five of the ten measures, with the teammates of Division I men exhibiting the least positive academic attitudes and behaviors on all five differentiating variables. The most significant teammate difference was the relatively greater emphasis placed on possible careers as professional athletes by team members of Division I men, both during recruitment and once they were enrolled in college. The existing literature (Adler & Adler, 1985; Meyer, 1990) suggests that this emphasis by Division I men on careers as professional athletes over more “traditional” careers has several negative implications with regard to academic motivation and subsequent achievement.

Along with these distinctions regarding the professional sports aspirations of their teammates, men and women respondents also differed on several other teammate measures. The teammates of Division I men were significantly (a) less likely to emphasize the importance of receiving their college degrees, (b) more likely to deem skipping class to be an acceptable behavior, and (c) less likely to select challenging majors than the teammates of the women. This pattern of responses suggests that the peer networks of female athletes provide a significantly more positive academic influence than the corresponding support systems of male athletes.

TABLE 3

Variables Best Discriminating Division I Men (N = 248) From Division I Women (N = 408) on the Academic Influence of the Coach

	Men (Means)	Women (Means)	Standardized Discriminant Coefficient		
Coach emphasizes career as professional athlete over a career in another field	2.32	1.60	0.53		
Coach emphasizes career as professional athlete over a career in another field <i>during recruitment</i>	2.82	1.90	0.54		
Coach encourages selection of a challenging major	3.87	4.09	0.30		
Coach emphasized importance of receiving a college degree <i>during recruitment</i>	5.36	5.31	-0.37		
Coach provided opportunity to meet faculty and support personnel during recruitment	5.25	5.44	0.23		
Eigenvalue	Canonical	Lambda	Chi Square	DF	Significance
.15	.36	.87	852	5	p < .001
Classification Rate:	Men 54.8%	Women 72.8%			

The Division I men and women basketball players were also significantly different on five items relating to the academic influence of the coach. Again, the greatest difference centered on the concept of professional sport career aspirations, such that the male respondents indicated that their coaches were significantly more likely to emphasize careers as professional athletes over careers in other fields than were the coaches of the women. This strong emphasis on professionalism by coaches of men was consistent both during the recruitment process and once students were enrolled in college.

Three additional coach-related items differentiated men and women basketball players. Specifically, women's coaches were significantly more likely than the men's coaches to (a) encourage their athletes to select a challenging major and (b) provide their athletes with the opportunity to meet university faculty and support staff during the recruitment process. Conversely, the coaches of men were significantly more

likely than the coaches of the women to emphasize the importance of receiving college degrees during the recruitment process. Given the small mean difference between men and women on the latter two variables, these findings have limited practical significance. However, the fact that both means for these variables were over 5.2 is further evidence that athletes generally perceive their coaches as being very positive regarding academic pursuits during recruitment.

It is particularly notable that the two groups did not significantly differ on items which asked if coaches make demands on their time and energy which make it difficult for them to graduate, or earn good grades in their courses. Considering Edward's (1984) finding that Division I male basketball players often spend over 40 hours per week preparing for and participating in athletic contests, and Sack's (1987) finding that 48% of Division I athletes experience demands from coaches that make it difficult for them to be top students, it is worth pointing out that differences did not emerge between the male and female athletes in this sample. One possible explanation for the lack of group differences on these time measures could be that the increased professionalization of Division I women's basketball programs has caused the coaches of the women's teams to make time and energy demands on their athletes that are similar to the demands made by the coaches of the men's teams.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings from this study revealed several trends regarding the academic subcultures of male and female basketball players who compete at the Division I level of competition. Most notably, the academic subcultures of Division I male athletic teams are characterized by weaker intellectual attitudes and fewer academically oriented behaviors relative to female athletic teams. It appears that one of the primary causes of such relative anti-intellectualism among Division I men is an overemphasis on athletic activity that often occurs at the expense of academic commitment. Similar to the qualitative work of Adler and Adler (1985), the findings presented here suggest that the socializing influences of teammates and coaches are primary contributors to the relatively more impoverished academic subcultures that exist within male athletic teams.

While the differences between men and women were shown to exist in several areas (e.g., less encouragement by the teammates of men to select challenging majors, less emphasis by the teammates of men placed on the importance of receiving their college degrees, etc.), the largest differences exist in the area of encouragement to pursue careers as professional athletes. Male respondents reported that both their coaches and teammates placed greater emphasis on the possibility of professional athletic careers, while down playing entry into more "traditional" careers. This overemphasis on professional athletic careers reportedly begins during the recruitment process and continues while athletes are in college.

These findings help explain the conclusions from several researchers who suggest that males from revenue producing sports (Adler et al., 1985; Lapchick, 1991; Telender, 1989), and African American males in particular (Edwards, 1983; Sailes, 1996; Sailes, 1987; Scales, 1991; Simons, 1997), are often encouraged to pursue careers in professional athletics at the expense of preparation for more "traditional" career paths. Current results also support Sailes' (1996) contention that Division I men exhibit unrealistic expectations regarding the possibility of obtaining careers as

professional athletes. These findings suggest that the peer influence of teammates may be a strong contributor to the formation of professional sport aspirations among Division I men.

This relative overemphasis on the pursuit of careers as professional athletes within the subcultures of Division I men's basketball teams is particularly disturbing considering the limited opportunities that exist for success at the professional level. As explained in a recent NCAA Report, less than three percent of college seniors will go on to play one year of professional basketball, and the odds of a high school basketball player making it to the professional level are approximately 10,000 to 1 (NCAA, 1997-98; Harris, 1993). Further, the average NBA career only lasts 3.4 years so many of the athletes who actually participate at the professional level are essentially retired before they turn thirty. As Coakley (1986) suggests, many professional athletes end their athletic careers at about the same time other individuals are just beginning their more "traditional" careers.

In contrast to the pattern for Division I men, it appears that neither the coaches nor teammates of Division I women place substantial emphasis on the possibility of professional athletic careers. Further, even if the coaches and teammates of Division I women actually do consider professional sports to be a realistic option, they do not encourage pursuit of this career path without at least keeping the possibility of other career options open. This pattern in the data is particularly notable considering the increased national and international opportunities for talented women to pursue careers in professional basketball. Even with all of the changes that have taken place in Division I women's basketball during the seven years since Meyer's (1990) study (e.g., growth of women's professional leagues, increased emphasis on winning and revenue production, increased fan support, etc.) it appears that Division I women still maintain a more equitable balance between their academic and athletic commitments than their male counterparts. Despite the growing similarities to male Division I basketball teams, the subcultures of female Division I basketball teams still seem to foster environments that promote a more beneficial balance between the commitment to pursue careers in professional sports and the commitment to pursue academic success and "traditional career" opportunities. This orientation is maintained even though no differences exist between male and female respondents on perceived time and energy demands.

The conclusions from this study reaffirm the need for the coaches and administrators of Division I men's basketball programs to place a stronger emphasis on educating their athletes about the realities of being successful in professional athletics. These findings also suggest that steps need to be taken to prevent a similar pattern from occurring among Division I women basketball players. As the opportunity structure and financial rewards in professional basketball continue to increase for qualified women, there is the strong possibility that the value system among Division I women's teams will start to mirror the value system that currently exists among Division I men's teams. In an attempt to protect against this trend from occurring among Division I women's teams, coaches, counselors, and administrators need to continue to promote team environments that foster a healthy balance between academic, athletic, and career development.

APPENDIX A

The following survey takes 5 to 10 minutes to finish and is **completely anonymous**. Please make an effort to answer every question as best you can. Once you have completed the survey, please return it in the attached business reply envelope. Thank you very much for your participation.

Please respond to the statements below using the following scale:
(Circle the appropriate number)

- 6 = Strongly Agree 3 = Slightly Disagree
5 = Moderately Agree 2 = Moderately Disagree
4 = Slightly Agree 1 = Strongly Disagree

A. Recruitment

*****(If you were not a recruited athlete, please skip to question 11)*****

Items 1-5 are concerned with how the coaching staff at the school you are now attending recruited you for athletics. Please do not consider recruitment by other colleges or universities. Each question begins with the words:

“When I was being recruited by my current school, the coaches who recruited me”.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
1. emphasized the importance of receiving my college degree.	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. emphasized a career for me as a professional athlete over a career in another field.	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. introduced me to challenging academic majors.	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. provided me with an opportunity to meet university faculty and/or academic support personnel (e.g., academic counselors for athletes, tutors, etc.).	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. emphasized my future academic achievements.	6	5	4	3	2	1

Items 6-10 are concerned with your involvement, during recruitment, with athletes who were currently members of the athletic team that **you were recruited to play for**. Please do not consider recruitment by other colleges or universities. Each question begins with the words:

“When I was being recruited by my current school, members of the team I was being recruited for”.

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
6. emphasized the importance of receiving their college degrees.	6	5	4	3	2	1
7. introduced me to challenging academic majors.	6	5	4	3	2	1
8. emphasized careers as professional athletes over careers in other fields.	6	5	4	3	2	1
9. introduced me to faculty members and/or academic support personnel (e.g., academic counselors for athletes, tutors, etc.).	6	5	4	3	2	1
10. emphasized athletic success over their academic achievements.	6	5	4	3	2	1

Please respond to the statements below using the following scale:

(Circle the appropriate number)

6 = Strongly Agree

5 = Moderately Agree

4 = Slightly Agree

3 = Slightly Disagree

2 = Moderately Disagree

1 = Strongly Disagree

B. Behaviors of Head Coach

Please Answer Questions 11-16 Based on the Behaviors of Your Head Coach

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
11. My head coach encourages me to select a challenging major.	6	5	4	3	2	1
12. My head coach makes demands on my time and energy that make it difficult for me to earn a college degree.	6	5	4	3	2	1
13. My head coach emphasizes a career for me as a professional athlete over a career in another field.	6	5	4	3	2	1
14. My head coach would allow me to skip practice so that I could attend an important class.	6	5	4	3	2	1
15. My head coach makes demands on my time and energy that make it difficult for me to get good grades in my courses.	6	5	4	3	2	1
16. My head coach emphasizes athletic success over my academic achievements.	6	5	4	3	2	1

C. Behaviors of Teammates

Please Answer Questions 17-21 Based on the Behaviors of Your Current Teammates

	AGREE			DISAGREE		
17. My teammates emphasize the importance of receiving a college degree.	6	5	4	3	2	1
18. My teammates select academically challenging majors.	6	5	4	3	2	1
19. My teammates emphasize careers as professional athletes over careers in other fields.	6	5	4	3	2	1
20. Skipping classes is considered an acceptable behavior by my teammates.	6	5	4	3	2	1
21. My teammates emphasize athletic success over their academic achievements.	6	5	4	3	2	1

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1990). Backboards and blackboards: College athletes and role engulfment. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. Sociology of Education, 58, 241-250.
- Case, B., Greer, S., & Brown, J. (1987). Academic clustering in athletics: Myth or reality. Arena Review 11:2 48-56.
- Coakley, J. J. (1986). Sport in society: Issues and controversies. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Donnelly, P. (1981). Toward a Definition of Sport Subcultures. In M. Hart & S. Birrell(Eds.) Sport and the Sociocultural Process, (3rd edition) p. 565-588, Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
- Donnelly, P. & Young K. (1988). The construction and confirmation of identity in sport subcultures. Sociology of Sport Journal, 5, 223-240.
- Edwards, H. (1984). The collegiate arms race: Origins and implications of the rule 48 controversy. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 8, 4-22.
- Edwards, H. (1983). The exploitation of black athletes. AGB Reports, 28, 37-48.
- Harris, L. (1993). The 1993 Harris study on high school athletics. Boston: Northeastern University Center for the Study of Sport in Society.
- Lapchick, R. (1991). Five minutes to midnight: Race and sport in the 1990's. Lanham: Madison Books.
- Lederman, D. (1993). 43% of male basketball players earned degrees within 6 six years: Fact file: Graduation rates for athletes and other students who entered college in 1985-86. Chronicle of Higher Education, 39, A32-33.
- Maloney, M. T. & McCormick, R. E. (1993). An examination of the role that intercollegiate athletic participation plays in academic achievement. Journal of Human Resources, 28, 555-70.
- Meyer, B. B. (1990). The academic performance of female college athletes. Sociology of Sport Journal, 7: 44-57.
- Purdy, D. A., Eitzen, S. & Hufnagel, R. (1982). Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of college athletes. Social Problems 29: 439-448.
- Sack, A. I. (1987). College sport and the student-athlete. Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 11, 31-48.
- Sailes, G. (1996). A comparison of professional sports career aspirations among college athletes. Academic Athletic Journal, 11, 20-28.
- Sailes, G. (1987). A socio-economic explanation of black sports participation patterns. Western Journal of Black Studies, 11, 164-167.
- Scales, J. (1991). African American student athletes: An example of minority exploitation in college athletics. In Etzel, Ferrante, & Pinkney (eds.), Counseling College Student-Athletes: Issues and Interventions. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology Inc. p. 71-100.
- Simons, J. (1997). Improbable Dreams. US News and World Report, March.

Telender, R. (1989). Something must be done...The nation's universities are shamelessly exploiting the players and debasing themselves by perpetuating the myth of the amateur athlete. Sports Illustrated, 71, 92-113.

Author Note. Michael Allen, Ph.D. is an academic counselor in the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes at the University of Connecticut. He received his doctorate in the sociology of sport from the University of Connecticut in 1997. Correspondence should be directed to Michael Allen, C.P.I.A., Box U-194, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269.