DETERMINING THE EXISTENCE OF AN ATHLETIC STIGMA ON A NCAA DIVISION II UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO

College of Education

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Jennifer C. M. Parsons, B.A., M.S.

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY

ASHLAND, OH

2010

© Copyright by

Jennifer C. M. Parsons

All Rights Reserved

2010

A Dissertation

entitled

Determining the Existence of an Athletic Stigma on a

NCAA Division II University Campus

by

Jennifer C. M. Parsons

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

Carla Edlefson, Ph.D., Committee Chair	Date
Ann Shelly, Ph.D., Committee Member	Date
Beth Patton, Ph.D., Committee Member	Date
Paul Milton, Ph.D., Committee Member	Date
Judy Alston, Ph.D., Director of Doctoral Studies	Date
James Van Keuren, Ed.D., Dean, College of Education	Date
Wm. Gregory Gerrick, Ph.D., Dean, Graduate School	Date

Ashland University
March, 2010

DETERMINING THE EXISTENCE OF AN ATHLETIC STIGMA ON A NCAA DIVISION II UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

By

Jennifer C. M. Parsons, B.A., M.S.

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY, 2010

Carla Edlefson, Ph.D.

This project replicated a previous study by Simons, Bosworth, Fujita, and Jenson (2007) examining the existence of an athletic stigma on a university campus. For this investigation, the researcher adapted the original instrument and surveyed 252 athletes on a comprehensive Midwestern NCAA Division II university campus. The survey provided both quantitative and qualitative data. The first research question examined how athletes believed professors at the institution perceived and treated them. Despite only 12% of the participants indicating a negative perception from professors, the qualitative data confirmed the presence of a stigma from some professors. The second research question compared this study's results to the previous study. Overall, the participants indicated a more positive perception from faculty at this institution than in the original study.

DEDICATION

To my parents. Your sacrifice and support has allowed me to enjoy success in both athletics and academics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I express my sincere appreciation to the members of my dissertation committee as each member has provided guidance throughout the entire process. Their patience, hard work, and personal attention has helped me complete this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

I.

Introduction……. 1

Identification of the Problem …… 11

Research Methodology ……. 11

Significance of the Study ……. 12

Personal Interest ……... 12

Summary ……... 13

II.

History of "Dumb Jock" Stereotype ……. 15

Academic Achievement and the College Student-Athlete …… 17

Academic Motivation and the Student-Athlete ……... 18

Student-Athlete Roles and Identity ……. 19

Stereotypes, Prejudice, Discrimination, and Stigmas ……. 23

Stereotypes, Stigmas and College Athletics …… 26

Race, Athletics, and Academics ……. 29

Measuring Perceptions of Athletes: Situational Attitudinal Scale ……. 33

Studies Using Instruments Other than SAS …… 37

Summary ……... 39

III.

Research Design …….. 41

Procedures …….. 41

Definition of Terms ……. 42

Participants …… 43

Research Setting …….. 43

Survey Instrument …… 44

Research Questions ……... 45

Data Analysis …… 66

Limitations of the Study …… 67

Summary …… 68

IV.

Development of Themes from Quantitative Data…… 70

Demographic Data of Participants …….. 71

Academic Success or Interest ……. 77

Athletic Identity …….. 85

Perception or Treatment of Athletes by Professor ……. 91

Qualitative Data Results …….. 107

Question 1: Professor Makes a Remark about Athletes in Class …… 107

Question 2: Professor Singles You Out in Class for Being an Athlete 112

Current Results Compared to the Original Study…… ……..…… 114

Summary ……. 117

V.

Review of Methodology ……. 119

Summary of Results …….. 120

Implications ……. 125

Recommendations for Future Research …… 127

Summary ……. 128

REFERENCES ……. 130

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Survey Instrument ……. 140

Appendix B: Research Permission Forms …….. 146

Appendix C: Instructions to Participants …… 149

Appendix D: Statistically Significant Crosstabulation Tables ……... 151

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participants' Year in School …….. 72

Table 2: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' by Race Group …….. 73

Table 3: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' Sport ……. 74

Table 4: Chi-Square Frequencies for Scholarship and Non-Scholarship Groups 75

Table 5: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' Major Course of Study……. 76

Table 6: Participants' Mean GPA by Sport ……. 77

Table 7: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Told to Avoid Harder Classes .. 78

Table 8: Chi-Square Frequencies of Responses to a Professor's Negative Attitude Towards Athletes …… 81

Table 9: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Going to Professors' Office Hours …….. 82

Table 10: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Attending Class ……. 83

Table 11: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Turning in Assignments on Time …… 84

Table 12: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Signifying They Were Identifiable as an Athlete …… 86

Table 13: Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Hiding Their Identity from Professors …… 87

Table 14: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Would Not Identify Themselves as Athletes If Not for Road Trips ……. 88

Table 15: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Sit With Other Athletes in Class …… 89

Table 16: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Reacted to a Professor's Negative Attitude by Keeping Their Identity Hidden…… 91

Table 17: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving Special Treatment from Professors …… 92

Table 18: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving a Higher Grade Than Deserved ……. 93

Table 19: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving a Lower Grade Than Deserved ……. 94

Table 20: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Suspected or Accused of Cheating by a Professor …… 95

Table 21: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Race/Ethnicity Positively Influencing How They Were Treated ……. 96

Table 22: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Race/Ethnicity Negatively Influencing How They Were Treated ……. 97

Table 23: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Given a Hard Time or Refused Accommodation by a Professor …….. 99

Table 24: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Indicating a Professor Made a Negative Remark in Class …….. 100

Table 25: Frequency of Professor's Negative Remarks Towards Athletes in Class Heard by Participants …… 102

Table 26: Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Indicating a Professor Made a Positive Remark in Class …….. 104

Table 27: Frequency of Professor's Positive Remarks Towards Athletes in Class Heard by Participants ……..... 105

Table 28: Chi-Square Frequencies for Professors' General Perceptions of Athletes as Indicated by the Participants …….. 106

Table 29: Differences Between the Two Studies Depicting Professors' Perceptions of Athletes as Reported by Participants …….. 116

CHAPTER I

Introduction

During major television broadcasts of college sports, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) frequently runs advertisements reinforcing the idea that gifted athletes are also serious students. One advertisement stated, "There are over 380,000 NCAA student-athletes and just about all of them will be going pro in something other than sports" (NCAAStudent.org, 2007). The NCAA also devised a webpage specifically devoted to future student-athletes. The website offers aspiring college athletes information such as the mission and values held by the NCAA, the differences among the three divisions, and a guide highlighting the necessary steps to become eligible to participate.

As the NCAA advertisement and website suggest, athletic participation can offer many potential benefits. Studies have demonstrated that sport participation can develop leadership skills and work ethic (Wright & Côté, 2003), create team-cohesion and increase health and well-being (Boone, 2004), and produce higher self-esteem (Armstrong & Oomen-Early, 2009). Banks (1983) suggested that certain values are learned through athletic competition, "The athletic arena is a crucible in which human values emerge white hot through structured struggle…Sport activities are pressure cookers in which values ferment, blend, and boil" (p. 93). Unfortunately, these ideals are often over shadowed by well-publicized scandals involving college athletes. Opponents of athletics would argue sport participation causes more detriment to the student than the benefits of the previously listed virtues. As Matheson (2005) stated, "Instead of sports as

character-building for life, we have sports building characters who have no life" (p. 2). The debate over the true role and merits of athletics has continued for over a century.

History of athletics in higher education

The tenuous balance between academics and athletics in higher education has created controversies that date back to the late 1800s (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). Collegiate football was the first sport to gain widespread popularity mainly due to increased media coverage and lucrative sponsorships (Watt & Moore, 2001). Although college sport initially was designed to provide recreation for the student-body on campus, student athletes soon wanted to compete against other institutions. As a result, intercollegiate athletics emerged (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Sojka, 1983). Football became so aggressive and dangerous that during the 1905 season, 18 athletes died while numerous others were seriously injured. Demonstrating how popular college sport had become, President Theodore Roosevelt demanded reform leading to a set of established rules and the precursor of the modern NCAA.

Athletics at the college level had already become an important means of raising funds for the university. With irregular appropriations from state legislatures and unreliable donations from churches and other civic organizations, college presidents were forced to find other sources of revenue (Chu, 1985). College administrators soon realized increased enrollment and steady funding from alumni and sponsorship agreements often were tied to successful sports teams. Powerful alumni donors and athletic directors would "dominate weak presidents, disorganized faculties, and powerless students" while strongly encouraging interest in and support of their athletic teams (Sojka, 1983, p. 58).

Questioning the ability of institutions of higher learning to support both academic and athletic endeavors equally, in 1929 the Carnegie Corporation created the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and funded a three-year study examining sport in higher education (Knight Commission, 1989; Sojka, 1983; Watt & Moore, 2001). From that early report Walter Savage posed a question still asked today, "Can [the university] concentrate its attention on securing teams that win, without impairing the sincerity and vigor of its intellectual purpose?" (as cited in Watt & Moore, 2001, p. 8). For over a century critics have condemned the substantial athletic budgets compared to meager academic departments' resources, the scandals associated with grade manipulation or outright cheating, the exploitation of the athletes, and the big business mentality leading to a win-at-all-cost attitude (Beyer & Hannah, 2000). The debate over the role athletics plays in higher education began in the late 1800s and continues today.

NCAA athletic reform

From its inception in 1905, the NCAA has adopted thousands of rules and regulations to protect the student-athlete and prevent unethical advantages (Covell & Barr, 2001). Many of the initial rules focused on consistency in eligibility across institutions. For example, prior to World War II and the Korean War, most schools deemed freshman athletes as ineligible for varsity level competition. By delaying varsity competition and travel, these athletically funded students had time to adjust to college and to mature physically. Not until much later, in 1972, did the NCAA officially permit academically eligible freshmen to compete during their first year in college (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

Other eligibility rules were implemented as well. The Sanity Code, passed in 1946, served as the NCAA's first attempt to tie academic criteria to athletic aid (Covell & Barr, 2001). With the establishment of formal athletic scholarships in the 1950s, the NCAA was forced to add an academic component to eligibility to react to widespread criticism that college athletes were nothing short of paid professionals (Staurowsky & Sack, 2005). To maintain and perpetuate the amateur image of college athletes as opposed to paid professionals, the NCAA started using the term *student-athlete* to describe members of their athletic teams. Regardless of what athletes were called, the new academic regulations did not have much backing. Without any real ramifications for breaking the existing code of conduct, the NCAA membership soon revoked the Sanity Code leaving individual institutions to police the academic qualifications of athletes. Many proposals followed in the 1950s. Some ideas included requiring athletes to "make normal progress towards a degree," to maintain a C average, and to be enrolled in at least 12 semester hours or the equivalent to a full-time student (Covell & Barr, 2001, p. 424). With increased pressure on university presidents to control athletic departments, the NCAA passed the 1.600 Rule in 1965. This rule stipulated that all incoming freshmen athletes had to have at least a 1.600 GPA on a 4.0 scale the last three semesters in high school and maintain a 1.600 GPA while enrolled in college to receive any athletic related financial aid. In addition, SAT and ACT test scores would be used to determine initial eligibility, providing the first national measure of academic ability. As with the Sanity Code, the acceptance and enforcement of this rule was not widespread.

With the passage of the 1.600 Rule came cries of minority discrimination. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and affirmative action placed schools under pressure to admit

minority students (Covell & Barr, 2001). Unfortunately, these students often did not receive adequate preparation to attend college. As a result, their GPA often fell below the 1.600 threshold and many did poorly on standardized tests. After considerable debate the 1.600 Rule was replaced with the 2.0 Rule in 1973. Even though this change would raise the student's GPA from the last three high school semesters to 2.0, the types of courses were not specified and it removed the need for standardized test scores, which in effect lowered the standards. For much of the 1970s, as television and media displayed the physical skills of athletes to the delight of athletics and university constituents, the demand for successful athletic teams outpaced the call for academic accountability.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a shift occurred revitalizing the call for reform to increase the academic performance of athletes (Covell & Barr, 2001). Perhaps the most publicized changes occurred after abysmal athlete graduation rates (less than 50% in football) were publicized in the early 1980s (Heck & Takahashi, 2006). Passed in 1983, Proposition 48 required incoming freshman to have a minimum SAT score of 700, or ACT score of 17, and a minimum GPA of 2.0 in at least 11 core classes to receive athletic aid (Covell & Barr, 2001). Similar to the 1.600 Rule, Proposition 48 created controversy especially from civil rights activists stating the regulation "disproportionally penalized African American students" (Heck & Takahashi, 2006, p. 589). Proposition 48 was soon amended lowering GPA standards to 1.800, SAT scores to 660, and ACT scores to 13, which would increase the eligibility of African American males by approximately 24-38% (Covell & Barr, 2001). In addition, an athlete who met only one of the requirements could be admitted as a partial qualifier and receive athletic aid, but could not compete and lost one year of eligibility.

Proposition 48 would soon be criticized for creating eligibility loopholes (Covell & Barr, 2001). In 1989, the NCAA barely passed the short-lived Proposition 42 which eliminated partial qualifiers from receiving any institutional aid. Again, minority advocates criticized this proposition for eliminating the opportunity for many minority students to attend college. NCAA members who initially voted in favor of Proposition 42 quickly changed their vote. As a result, partial qualifiers retained the ability to receive athletically based aid. Although much of what was included in Proposition 48 continued in Proposition 16, this legislation created a sliding scale combining SAT or ACT scores and high school GPA in 13 specified core classes. Proposition 16 was passed in 1995 as the last major change in initial eligibility requirements.

With the outrage surrounding athlete graduation rates, the NCAA has instituted more in-depth methods of measuring college academic success (NCAA Division I Graduation Success Rate, 2008). In 1995, the NCAA started collecting data for the Graduation Success Rate (GSR). Calculated annually by Division I member institutions, this additional measure takes into account the mobility of athletes who tend to attend more than one school. The 7-year GSR trend showed an increase from an average of 42 graduates per institution in the 1995 cohort to an average of 52 graduates in 2001 cohort. Using the GSR methodology, the Division I 1998-01 cohort graduated 71% of male and 87% of female athletes. Division II institutions followed a similar methodology, but also gave unique consideration to athletes who entered their first year without receiving athletic-based aid. The Academic Success Rate (ASR) for Division II institutions indicated that 71% of the athletes entering in 2001 graduated (Brown, 2008).

The NCAA also instituted an Academic Progress Rate (APR) to measure academic achievement by teams each term (Behind, 2009). The goal of the APR is to hold schools accountable for educating athletes throughout their athletic career. Schools receive a possible two points per athlete who meets each of two requirements. The NCAA awards one point for each athlete who maintains eligibility and one point for each athlete who stays in school. NCAA sanctions can occur if a team's APR score falls below a certain threshold. After the first four years of tracking APR, the NCAA reported most teams that originally scored poorly had improved to maintain a level above the threshold on average.

Athletic reform movement: outside the NCAA

Since the Carnegie Corporation's early investigation into collegiate athletics, several other organizations unaffiliated with the NCAA have called attention to this precarious balance between academics and athletics. In 1991, following years of rampant corruption, NCAA rule violations, and increasingly poor graduation rates for athletes, especially in revenue producing sports, the first of two reports funded by the Knight Foundation laid out a plan to reform college sports (Knight Commission, 1989). In the 1991 report entitled, *Keeping Faith with the Student Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics,* the Knight Commission recommended the following measures: (a) stronger presidential control over decisions through governance changes, (b) increased academic standards and graduation rates of student-athletes, and (c) penalties for institutions with poor athlete retention and graduation rates. The Knight Commission (1991) concluded that "sanity had to be restored to this bleak scene and the values of

higher education put above all else in the world of intercollegiate athletics" (p. 9). The NCAA would employ new regulations and policies to address many of the recommendations. Overall athletic cost reductions, new academic standards, and an athletics department accountability program were the main ideals implemented out of the Knight Commission report.

Ten years later, the Knight Commission issued a follow-up report conveying while some progress had been made, there was still much in need of reform. The second report issued in 2001 titled *A Call to Action: Reconnecting College Sports and Higher Education* laid out several areas to consider (Knights Commission, 2001). Within this report, the Knight Commission called for members of the university community to act together to bring about substantial change. The report called on presidents and trustees, individual conferences and the NCAA, and athletic directors, coaches and faculty to work in cooperation to meet the challenges facing higher education. The Knight Commission recommended assembling a "Coalition of Presidents" with the goal of continued academic reform, reduction of the "athletics arms race," and a decline in the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics (Knight Commission, 2001, p.26). The group of presidents theoretically would band together to face these challenges and return athletics to its rightful place in relation to academics. The NCAA has yet to form a Coalition as the Knight Commission demanded, but has substantially increased the involvement of member institution presidents in the reform process (Covell & Barr, 2001).

University faculty have also become more vocal in the role athletics plays in higher education. For example, The Drake Group consists of university faculty members

"committed to restoring academic integrity to institutions of higher learning" through a series of reform-oriented proposals (Staurowsky & Sack, 2005, p.109). The first proposal called for academic transparency by disclosing academic information such as major, electives, GPA, and course instructors without disclosing the names of the individual students (Drake Group, n.d.). This measure would ensure that athletes receive an equal opportunity to complete their degree, according to the Drake members. The second proposal addressed eligibility standards by requiring athletes to maintain a GPA of 2.0 each semester in order to participate. The rationale behind the minimum GPA was that if athletes fall below a 2.0, they would require extra time and attention to improve their academic performance. The last proposal stated the current practice of one-year renewable scholarships should be replaced with multi-year athletic scholarships or strictly need-based financial aid. By reducing the pressure on athletes to continuously earn their athletic scholarships on an annual basis, which may result in an over emphasis on the importance of athletic responsibilities, athletes could focus adequate energy on educational goals.

Institutional athletic reform: Academic advisors

Colleges and universities have been criticized for the apparent disconnect between their educational missions and the academic performance of their athletes (Banks, 1983). After the outbreak of scandals in the late 1970s and 1980s, Congress passed the Needs to Know Bill that mandated colleges publish the graduation rates of the student-athletes (Hollis, 2002, p. 269). In response to the negative attention many Division I schools received, the NCAA member schools passed legislation mandating all institutions

provide academic counseling services to athletes (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001). Although critics of this legislation suggested that academic advisors' only goal was to maintain eligibility (The Drake Group, n.d.), Zingg (1982) stressed the role of academic advisors was about more than just eligibility,

> If academics assume that most athletes are basically dumb jocks, they will lump the 'jocks' together with the mere goals of getting them into the school and keeping them eligible. However, if academe views student athletes as individuals, recognizes the qualities of commitment, drive, industry, discipline, and ambition that have contributed to [their] athletic achievement, and resolves to assist [them] in channeling these proven traits into academic performance, then the outcome might be substantially more rewarding. (p. 17)

Academic advisors can help athletes by being tutors and mentors, by serving as an intermediary between student and faculty, by teaching study skills and time management, and by helping develop a career plan (Broughton & Neyer, 2001; Carodine et al., 2001; Zingg, 1982). Zingg (1982) also suggested an advisor has the unique opportunity to stress the merits of a college degree, "Indeed, heightening the student athlete's awareness, if not appreciation, of the value of education may be the most important service that advising can offer" (p. 19). With the implementation of an academic advisor, athletes have a resource within the athletic department who will monitor their academic success and can provide the necessary support to help keep athletes on track for graduation (Carodine et al., 2001).

Identification of the Problem

The fallout from the debate over athletics' true role in higher education can impact the athlete. This investigation will examine the potential athletic stereotype associated with being a Division II student-athlete in higher education from the view of the athlete. How stereotypes and stigmas are developed and perpetuated will be discussed in Chapter II. Two research questions will be posed in this study. The first will examine the attitudes towards athletes at this university as follows:

Research Question 1: How do athletes believe professors perceive and treat them? After establishing a better understanding how athletes believe they are perceived and treated, the results can then be compared to the Simons, Bosworth, Fujita, and Jenson (2007) study. The second research question is as follows:

> Research Question 2: Do the perceptions and treatment of the athletes in this study differ from the perceptions and treatment of the athletes in the original study?

Research Methodology

The research methodology will closely follow the mixed method study done by Simons, et al. (2007). Participants will be selected by convenience sampling of current athletes at this university. The instrument used to collect data will closely resemble the survey used in the Simons et al. study with some modifications to more appropriately fit the current setting. The survey will provide two types of data. Closed-ended questions will produce data that will be analyzed through Chi Square tests primarily looking for statistically significant differences between various groups. Data from the open-ended

questions will be coded and then categorized into emergent themes following procedures used in inductive analysis (Creswell, 1998). By combining the data gained from the statistical calculations and the themes, an approximation of the existing perceptions of student-athletes will be developed in order to better understand the challenges facing college student athletes at NCAA Division II universities.

Significance of the Study

The majority of studies involving college athletes were conducted at Division I institutions. This study will add to the limited existing literature on a negative stereotype associated with student-athletes at NCAA Division II institutions. The long-term benefits include providing valuable information to this and other similar universities about the perceptions held by this large segment of the student population. By combining the data gained from the statistical calculations and the themes, an approximation of the existing perceptions of student-athletes will be developed in order to better understand the challenges facing college student athletes at NCAA Division II universities.

Personal Interest

As a former college athlete and current college coach and professor, I have an acute interest in the modern dilemmas college student-athletes face. I have heard disparaging generalized comments about athlete's academic ability as well as surprised academic praise. My interest in this particular project stems from my background as a Division III athlete and good student. For the most part, athletes at that level resemble

the general student population. Even though I was not a Division II athlete, I interact with these athletes in competitive and academic settings. This study will give me a better understanding of the experiences unique to this level of athlete.

Summary

The task of successfully completing a college degree can prove to be challenging for many students. Adjusting to new surroundings, developing a sense of autonomy, and ever-increasing academic rigor are just a few of the obstacles facing every college student. Collegiate athletes add another burden by balancing an athletic commitment equivalent to full-time employment (Staurowsky & Sack, 2005). The role of athletics has been questioned on college campuses for over a century. With ever-present scandals, collegiate athletic departments have been accused of exploiting the talent of young athletes without regard to their academic success. Despite NCAA and other organizations' efforts to curb corruption and set academic standards for athletes, the perception of the college athlete often is negative. Reports that athletes are forced into easy majors, have schoolwork done for them, and skip class help perpetuate this opinion. However, not all athletes fit this description. Much of the media coverage and literature focuses on Division I revenue-producing sports, leaving many good students who participate in other Division I sports and at the Division II and III level with a bad reputation.

The previous study by Simons et al. (2007) examined the perceptions of athletes at a selective, public, Division I campus. The researchers concluded that an athlete stigma existed at this institution. This study will use the Simons et al. (2007) study

protocol to investigate the existence of a similar stereotype on a Division II campus by questioning athletes about how faculty members perceive and treat them. The data will then be compared to the original study.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Much debate has occurred regarding the role of athletics at institutions of higher learning. Student-athletes carry the heavy burden of high expectations from both the academic and the athletic realms. Intertwining practices and athletic contests with classes and academic demands, student-athletes must balance these often-divergent roles. A common stereotype portrays the student-athlete as someone who only cares about athletic concerns at the cost of academic mediocrity or even failure (Zingg, 1982). This "dumb jock" assumption is often unfairly applied to all student-athletes regardless of academic ability. This literature review will address the history of the dumb jock stereotype, academic achievement and motivation of student athletes, dual-roles and identities student-athletes assume, sociological and psychological implications an athlete stigma may present, race issues in academic performance, and perceptions of student-athletes by faculty and other students on campus.

History of "Dumb Jock" Stereotype

The concept of athletes wasting time honing their athletic skills at the cost of intellectual development has existed since Greek athletes trained in 500 B.C. (Coakley, 1990). These early athletes endured the criticism of philosophers as being "useless citizens with dull minds" (Coakley, 1990, p. 46). Historically, the human mind and body were viewed separately perpetuating the misconception that one area must be more dominant and therefore a person could only excel in either athletics or academics (Burke,

1993). The role athletics should play at an institution of higher learning has been debated extensively for over 100 years (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991, 1993; Engstrom, Sedlacek & McEwen, 1995; Knapp, Rasmussen, & Barnhardt, 2001). In a study performed by the Carnegie Corporation in 1929 (as cited in Sojka, 1983), Walter Savage stated the negative influences organized intercollegiate athletics has on the university and the student:

> A paid coach, the gate receipts, the special training tables, the costly sweaters and expensive journeys in special Pullman cars, the recruiting from high school, the demoralizing publicity showered on players, and the devotion of an undue proportion of time to training, all devices for putting a desirable athlete but a weak scholar across the hurdle of examinations. (p. 58)

In modern times, the media has often rendered a negative view of college athletes. Reports exposing athletes who cannot meet minimum academic requirements to remain eligible, various institutions ignoring abysmal athlete graduation rates (Sailes, 1993), and athletes majoring in less demanding coursework (Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007; Suggs, 2003; Zingg, 1982) have garnered front-page attention. Early academic studies also helped reinforce the stereotype providing evidence of athletes earning lower grade point averages compared to other students and athletes being admitted under special circumstances (Hood, Craig, & Ferguson, 1992; Purdy, Eitzen, & Hufnagel, 1985; Shulman & Bowen, 2000). As a result, academic departments often looked upon athletics negatively creating a divide on campus. Banks (1983) stated, "Study and sport are the twin children of the campus. During the last thirty years sport has become increasingly suspect, acquiring 'stepchild' status" (p.93). In 1989, intercollegiate

athletics received so much negative attention that the Knight Commission was assembled to investigate the alleged corruption and poor academic performance of college athletes (Knight Commission, 1989).

Academic Achievement and the College Student-Athlete

The academic achievement of college student-athletes has been studied extensively. One academic measure frequently used in this type of research was cumulative grade point average. Early findings indicated significantly lower grade point averages for college athletes than other students (American Institutes for Research, 1988; Purdy et al., 1985). These studies may not depict an accurate representation of athlete achievement because they did not account for a number of confounding factors. In studies which statistically controlled for variables like academic aptitude, high-school academic achievement, and other background characteristics, the athletes' academic achievement was similar to their non-athlete peers (Hood et al., 1992; Pascarella & Smart, 1991; Smith & Dizney, 1966; Stuart, 1985). For example, Pascarella et al., (1999) examined reading comprehension and math scores along various points in the students' academic career. This study found that non-revenue male athletes' reading comprehension, critical thinking, writing, and science-reasoning skills were not statistically significantly different from non-athlete males at various stages in their second and third year. In the same study, the cognitive development of women athletes in the second and third years at college was similar to women non-athletes. Aries, McCarthey, and Salovey (2004) also examined the academic performance of athletes

from highly selective colleges and found that athletes achieved similarly when matched with non-athletic peers.

Some findings indicate academic differences do occur. Studies have produced results demonstrating discrepancies in cognitive skills between male revenue or high profile athletes and non-athletes. Pascarella et al. (1999) reported differences might increase over the course of an academic career. "Our findings suggest that male [revenue sport athletes] are not receiving the same cognitive benefit from an undergraduate education as other men" (Pascarella et al., 1999, p. 21). Shulman and Bowen (2000) supported this difference suggesting that athletes were underperforming academically especially in football, basketball, and hockey. With evidence pointing in both directions, whether athletic participation definitively influences academic achievement still remains unclear.

Academic Motivation and the Student-Athlete

Many college athletes are highly driven on the playing field, but lack that same motivational intensity in the classroom. Simons, Van Rheenen and Covington (1999) investigated the achievement motivation of student athletes and academics. The more committed athletes were to their sport and the less committed to their academics, the lower their college grade point averages. When a conflict of interest occurred between academics and athletics, athletes often decided in favor of athletics. However, this might not be true for all athletes.

Gaston-Gayles (2004) investigated whether measures of academic motivation in student-athletes could predict academic performance. The results indicated, "Academic

motivation, regardless of athletic motivation, was important in determining future academic success" (Gaston-Gayles, 2004, p. 82). Despite the dumb jock stereotype, athletes have reported an interest in academic pursuits. Simons et al. (2007) discovered over 91% of athletes in that study always or often attend class with over 98% turning in assignments on time. Another study found that the majority of athletes did care about and were serious about academics (Simons et al., 1999). Umbach, Palmer, Kuh, and Hannah (2006) suggested that athletes appeared to be at least equally engaged in effective educational practices, and in some areas more engaged, when compared to their non-athlete peers. The point was echoed by Aries et al. (2004), "There was no evidence that athletes devoted less time to studying, that they were any less ambitious, grade conscious, or concerned about the future than non-athletes" (p. 598). Graduation was also a primary goal. Two studies (Pascarella & Smart, 1991; Ryan, 1989) suggested that male athletes were significantly more likely than non-athletes to complete their degree. In addition, in a national survey performed by Potuto and O'Hanlon (2007), 93% of athletes rated graduation from college as "very important" (p. 950). How much athletes were motivated to succeed in academic and athletic areas was influenced by the role and identity carried by these individuals. "The primary task facing most student athletes is figuring out how best to develop or strengthen an academic identity while simultaneously maintaining a strong athletic commitment" (Simons & Van Rheenen, 2000, p. 178).

Student-Athlete Roles and Identity

Athletes must divide their time between a consuming and complicated athletics routine and an often-rigorous academic schedule. As a result, academic and athletic

interests often appear to be in competition for the student-athlete's attention (Hollis, 2002). Factor in earning the right to keep an athletic scholarship, which many athletes rely on as their only means of affording a college education, and the pressures of performing on television in front of large crowds, it is understandable why "some student-athletes might pay more attention to play books than textbooks" (Hollis, 2002, p. 266). Athletes could experience a "role strain" because of this struggle for time and energy to meet the demands of academics and athletics (Simons & Van Rheenen, 2000). Role strain or role conflict as stated by Adler and Adler (1987) might be resolved by realigning expectations, priorities, and identity to the more dominate role. Due to the rigorous load required in sport, competitive athletes often "narrow their external activities in order to achieve optimal [athletic] performance" (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993, p.239). The shifting of attention to a seemingly more important athletic domain downplays the student role while strengthening the athletic identity.

Athletic identity as defined by Brewer et al. (1993) was "the degree to which an individual identifies with the athlete role" (p.237). Individuals with a strong athletic identity often receive a positive effect on athletic performance to the point where the demands of training and competition force the athlete to narrow their focus to athletic endeavors in order to achieve optimal athletic performance. "The individual with strong athletic identity ascribes great importance to involvement in sport/exercise and is especially attuned to self perceptions in the athletic domain" (Brewer et al., 1993, p.238). Potuto and O'Hanlon (2007) found a strong athletic identity among over 2,000 participants. Over 60% of the athletes viewed themselves more as athletes than students.

The concept of salience refers to an external stimulus that increased the perceiver's awareness of something or someone in a certain context (Pittinsky, Shih, & Ambady, 2000). Research indicates a salient athletic identity could negatively influence academic performance. In a study by Yopyk and Prentice (2005), athletes scored lower on a math test after being primed with their athletic identity than similar athletes who were primed with their student identity. This finding would suggest an academic benefit for student-athletes who possessed the ability to distinguish between their student identity and their athlete identity. By being able to separate these two roles, student-athletes appeared to focus all their cognitive abilities to meet the demands of the necessary role at the appropriate time (Settles, Sellers, & Damas, 2002). Those athletes unable to differentiate between the two roles may have a harder time excelling in both areas. This type of "student-athlete is always multitasking, thinking about homework during practice and thinking about the upcoming game during class time … thereby making it more difficult for him or her to meet [non-athletic] goals" (Settles et al., 2002, p. 580).

Academic and athletic roles do not have to be in conflict. When athletes were able to make the commitment of time and energy to both academics and athletics, they could adequately succeed in those roles (Marks, 1977). A theoretical analysis of the academic and athletics roles of student-athletes by Snyder (1985) supported the idea that athletes could also be successful students. According to Snyder, students can be divided into four ideal types: (a) the scholar athlete, (b) the pure scholar, (c) the pure athlete, and the (d) nonscholar / nonathlete. A scholar athlete possessed a high degree of commitment towards both athletics and academics, therefore meeting these two roles without the two domains being in conflict. A role strain existed only when a pure athlete, who was totally

committed to athletics alone, leaves little energy for academic concerns. In reality, Snyder stated these four ideal types existed on a continuum, but athletes who tend to focus primarily on athletic roles often leave little time and energy for academic pursuits. In addition, students consumed by the athlete role tended to participate in high-profile, revenue producing sports with their main academic concern centering around staying eligible (Simons & Van Rheenen, 2000).

Evidence does exist suggesting revenue athletes tend to identify themselves as athletes more than students. Adler and Adler (1987) suggested the identity salience of the academic role for male basketball athletes at a "big time" college diminished over their playing career. This change in identity often resulted from a role conflict between student and athlete. In addition to previously poor academic training and frequent low academic expectations from faculty, the overwhelming athletic demands coupled with a peer influence that downplayed academics restructured these athletes' identity to reflect their importance as athletes compared to the seemly insignificance of academics. Adler and Adler (1987) stated, "when people are constantly identified by one role to the near total exclusion of their others, they become increasingly committed to that role and it is likely to take precedence in influencing their self-perceptions" (p. 453).

A person's identity also is influenced by self-worth. Simons et al. (1999) state, "Self-worth is determined by an individual's own, and others', perception of one's ability; perceptions that are mainly tied to successful achievement" (p. 152). When applied to student-athletes, success on the playing field increases self-worth and conversely, lack of success in the classroom would lead to the questioning of one's ability. Many athletes enter post-secondary education with inadequate academic

preparation and skills leading to low levels of self-efficacy as students (Jolly, 2008). To avoid potential failure and maintain a sense of self-worth, athletes who typically have struggled academically hide behind an excuse of not trying (Adler & Alder, 1987; Simons, et al., 1999). This lack of effort manifested into self-handicapping activities like poor class attendance, procrastination, and inadequate test preparation. All of these behaviors when exhibited by student-athletes contribute to the dumb jock stereotype.

Stereotypes, Prejudice, Discrimination, and Stigmas

The need for society to categorize people into groups helps simplify the social environment by reducing and facilitating the comprehension of information (Allport, 1954). This categorization of people can develop into stereotypes, biased emotional reactions, and potentially negative associated behaviors (Fiske, 1998; Schneider, 2004). Stereotypes are primarily based on cognitive processes, while prejudice adds an emotional element to the categorization. Discrimination results as a behavioral reaction to the stereotype or prejudice. Stereotypes can be defined as "qualities perceived to be associated with particular groups or categories of people" (Schneider, 2004, p. 24). Although not all stereotypes may be considered negative, most project broad generalizations that may not be based on facts, which can be upsetting to the targeted group. Harding, Proshnsky, Kutner, and Chein (1969) implied a more negative tone in their definition of a stereotype, "a belief that is simple, inadequately grounded, or at least partially inaccurate, and held with considerable assurance by many people" (p. 4). Most stereotypes are considered rigid, resistant to change, or at least very slow to change despite evidence contrary to the stereotype (Schneider, 2004). Generalizing or

categorizing individuals into predetermined groups based on limited information can be offensive because the observer only sees a partial glimpse of the many traits that makes up any individual. Fiske (1998) argued how stereotypes limit the need to accumulate accurate information; "even supposing that the average member of the category were accurately described, the stereotype would not be accurate for every individual, who could be derogated or excluded on the basis of group characteristics" (p. 381).

To be judged on any characteristic leads to prejudice, which Allport (1954) defined as "a categorization of a group of people, not only based on [essential] defining attributes…, but includes various 'noisy' attributes, leading to disparagement of the group as a whole" (p. 176). Allport (1954) explained "noisy attributes" as "occasional attributes," which were not present in all members of the targeted group (p.171). For example, to be categorized as an athlete that individual must participate in some type of sport as an essential attribute. A "noisy" or occasional attribute associated with athletes pertains to their inability to succeed in the classroom.

Prejudice or prejudging, is considered a normal thought process, which guides the majority of our decisions (Schneider, 2004). Schneider (2004) stated that some prejudgments guide our everyday lives; "in countless ways, I must decide whether to approach or avoid certain people, situations, and things…I tend to watch TV programs that [I have watched] in the past, and favor books by authors whose past books I liked" (p. 27). Although prejudging can limit our experiences and reduce the information we obtain from our surroundings, prejudices against people are considered more egregious than prejudice against objects. Discrimination arises from "the unjustified use of category information to make judgments about other people" (Schneider, 2004, p.29).

Those individuals deemed as acceptable to the observer elicit favoritism while those categorized into an undesirable group often receive negative treatment (Fiske, 1998).

Strong negative stereotypes develop into stigmas, which Crocker, Major, and Steele (1998) defined as, "an attribute or characteristic that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular context" (p. 505). The stigmatized group or individual is "devalued, spoiled, or flawed in the eyes of others" (Crocker et al., 1998, p. 504). Stigmas can vary among social contexts placing accepted individuals in one situation under scrutiny in a totally different circumstance (Goffman, 1963). Members of a stigmatized group become aware that others view them negatively early on, which can lead to lower self-esteem and a self-fulfilling prophecy in regards to the expected attributes of the stigmatized group (Schneider, 2004).

Traits that elicit a stigma have various properties. Some characteristics can be concealed (e.g., learning disability), others reduced over time (e.g., treatment for depression), and some are based solely on appearance (e.g., obesity) (Pittinsky et al., 2000; Schneider, 2004). In contrast, many characteristics are permanent and obvious (e.g., physical disabilities). In educational settings, Crocker et al. (1998) stated that individuals stigmatized with low academic abilities coped through "disengagement" with school, by either leaving school or not identifying with academics both of which present barriers for scholastic achievement. Fiske (1998) argued that increased information and contact could mitigate the negative categorization of individuals, "most people, given the *right* context, can avoid stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination" (p. 375).

Stereotypes, Stigmas and College Athletics

Biernat (2003) referred to a "stereotyping effect" which occurred when individual group members "were judged in a direction consistent with their group-level expectations or stereotypes" (p. 1019). As the stereotype strengthened, fewer cues and behaviors were necessary to reconfirm the stereotypical expectation of the group. As a result, faculty members may base their academic expectations on their past negative experiences with athletes resulting in a heightened awareness of the behaviors and attributes of athletes (Simons et al., 2007). The previous poor performance of a few athletes and some otherwise subtle cues might evoke the dumb jock stereotype.

The dumb jock stereotype assumes a lack of academic ability and motivation (Simons et al., 2007) even though studies have demonstrated conflicting results regarding athletes and academic performance when compared to their student peers (Burke, 1993; Gaston-Gayles, 2004; Hood et al., 1992; Pascarella et al., 1999; Purdy et al., 1985; Simons et al. 1999; Shulman & Bowen, 2000; Smith & Dizney, 1966; Stuart, 1985). Regardless of academic ability, negative perceptions of athletes exist on college campuses (Baucon & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom & Sedlsacek, 1991, 1993; Engstrom et al., 1995; Leach & Conners, 1984; Sailes, 1993; Simons et al., 2007; Web, Molstad, & Kher, 1998; Zingg, 1982). Because of detrimental media exposure, poor past experiences with athletes, and a prevalent negative stereotype held by university members, an athlete stigma developed in higher education (Simons et al., 2007).

Stigmas consist of two main elements: a difference based on a distinguishing attribute and the resulting negative perception of that person (Dovidio, Major, & Cocker, 2000). The characteristic on which the individual is judged may be valued in one social

context while simultaneously devalued in another domain (Goffman, 1963; Simons et al., 2007). For the student-athlete, athletic identity is highly praised in the athletic domain, but often ridiculed in the academic domain (Simons et. al, 2007). Because athletic attributes can be difficult for many athletes to hide (i.e. height and weight of basketball and football players) and the belief this group is different from other students, an athlete stigma may result. Once individuals become aware they are being evaluated through the lens of a negative stereotype, they become concerned that they will be treated in the direction of that stereotype (Allport, 1954).

According to Simons et al. (2007), athletes could respond to the stigma by either accepting it or rejecting it. Athletes who accept the stigma either stop trying academically or conceal their involvement with athletics. When accepting the stigma, athletes' poor academic performance became a self-fulfilling prophecy with a minimal goal of remaining eligible (Simons et al., 2007; Steele, 1997). In terms of an athletic identity salience and negative stereotype, Yopyk and Prentice (2005) stated, "even subtle reminders of stereotyped identities were often sufficient to undermine performance" (p. 334). Simons et al. (2007) reported nearly a third of the athletes in that study did not participate in class, over 15% dropped classes, and 5% did not attend class due at least in part to the stereotype. To faculty and other students these types of behaviors fall in line with the stereotypical expectations of the dumb jock, which reinforces the stigma. Simons et al. (2007) suggested that it was likely the faculty perceptions of athletes were "based on generalizing from one or more instances of negative behavior to athletes as a whole" (p. 268).

The second way athletes accepted the stigma was to hide the fact they were athletes (Pittinsky et al., 2000; Schneider, 2004; Simons et al., 2007). Although this method would work for many individuals, a 250 pound football player or six foot ten inch basketball player would find it virtually impossible to conceal their participation in athletics. Nearly 45% of the athletes in the Simons et al. (2007) study reported always, often, or sometimes hiding their athletic identity in class. This disguise worked only when academic and athletic schedules did not conflict. When forced to ask for special accommodations for academic work, athletes must disclose their identity and risk being subjected to the stigma. Athletes might have good reason to hide their identity. In the Simons et al. study, 61.7% of the participants reported that when they asked for special accommodations, faculty refused or gave the athletes a hard time.

The final means of responding to the stereotype identified by Simons et al. (2007) was to reject the stigma. Simons et al. found this to be the most common response of the participants in their study. Although only a small percentage of athletes complained to a faculty member or administrator to confront the stigma, many athletes worked to challenge the common perception of the dumb jock by excelling in their studies.

Unlike the socially unacceptable demonstration of a stigma against different races or gender, the athlete stigma seems less offensive (Simons et al., 2007). Simons et al. argued that publically criticizing the academic ability of a minority student would not be tolerated on a college campus. However, questioning the academic abilities of an athlete seems less egregious. Simons et al. offered three possible explanations for this discrepancy. First, athletes acquire privileged status, which makes negative remarks about this group more acceptable. Secondly, the stereotypical athlete has little interest in

academics compared to other stigmatized groups. Finally, with the increase in African American players and inherent ability demonstrated particularly in revenue producing sports, observers acceptably can criticize the academic abilities of athletes while actually "questioning the academic legitimacy of African Americans which is not acceptable" (Simons et al., 2007, p. 269).

Race, Athletics, and Academics

Broad generalizations often attempt to differentiate African American from White athletes. Studies have demonstrated many people believe White athletes possess superior leadership skills and instincts, but African American athletes possess greater speed and strength (Coakley, 2007; Edwards, 1984; Kirk & Kirk, 1993; Sailes, 1993). Coakley (2007) stated that in sport, like other areas of society, African Americans have been seen as inferior in intelligence to their White counterparts. Sailes (1993) suggested there was a strong relationship between racial stereotyping and intellectual stereotyping often demonstrated in sport. Although White athletes may suffer from the dumb jock stereotype, Sailes (1993) stated that African American athletes endure two stereotypes that "have compounding effects" (p. 91).

The often-conflicting dual role a college athlete must navigate was discussed at length earlier. African American athletes have to negotiate a third role. As Kirk and Kirk (1993) suggested, "Being African American and a college student and an athlete means dealing with a variety of fears and concerns unique to that constellation of roles" (p. 104). Often the educational background of African American athletes has not prepared them adequately for college (Gaston-Gayles, 2004; Hrabowski, 2002; Kirk &

Kirk, 1993; Sellers, 1992; Spence, 2000). Spence (2000) argued that many African American secondary students underachieve academically because striving to be academically successful could be seen as "acting White" (p. 92). Athletic success for many of the participants was viewed as a way to improve their circumstances above what education alone could provide (Spence, 2000,). According to Spence (2000), the importance placed on athletic achievement in the African American community "may reduce the perceived importance of educational achievement" (p. 95). The trend of mediocre performance continues to higher education.

Collegiate African American athletes reported that the level of academic achievement necessary was what would keep them eligible (Adler & Adler, 1987; Spence, 2000) or as Leach and Conners (1984) stated these athletes may end up "majoring in eligibility" (p.33). In a national study, a greater percentage of African American athletes chose a major for athletic reasons compared to White athletes (Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007). Going through college taking classes based on conflicts with the athletic schedule, eligibility requirements, and working towards "athlete-friendly majors", these athletes tend to run out of eligibility before completing their degree (Adler & Adler, 1987; Edwards, 1984; Spence, 2000). The NCAA reported African American football and basketball players consistently graduated at lower rates than their White counterparts (Gaston-Gayles, 2004). Finally, the media also contributes to the inclination of African American youth to pursue athletics. Spence stated, "When the only university student whom Black youth know and relate to is an athlete, this is their frame of reference for processing information about [themselves]" (p. 90).

There are some benefits received by African American athletes who attend college. Edwards (1984) argued, "Sport has been a powerful source of Black spiritual sustenance, a forum where Black pride, courage, intelligence, and competitiveness have been exhibited and reaffirmed" (p. 10). Some African American athletes focus more on their studies due to their desire to play in college (Spence, 2000). These athletes also receive considerable attention on and off campus compared to their non-athlete peers (Person, Benson-Quaziena, & Rogers, 2001). In addition, with the rising cost of higher education, athletic scholarships may be the only way some athletes can afford college. When compared to White athletes, fewer African American athletes stated they would go to college if not participating or receiving aid (Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007).

Unfortunately, there appear to be more negative issues as explained by Comeaux and Harrison (2007) , "The college experiences of [African American] student athletes at predominately White institutions are often hindered as a result of feelings of social isolation, racial discrimination, limited support, and lack of integration" (p. 208). Many African American athletes attend predominately White institutions which adds to the difficultly of adjusting to college (Spence, 2000). "Culturally [African American athletes] were racially, socially, and economically different from the rest of the population" (Adler & Adler, 1987, p. 449). The university community outside of the athletics department may look differently at these athletes. Studies have demonstrated a positive connection between student success and the level of interaction between students and faculty (Comeaux & Harrison, 2007). However, faculty expectations and interaction with African American athletes tends to differ from White athletes (Comeaux & Harrison, 2007; Kirk & Kirk, 1993, Perlmutter, 2003). Comeaux and Harrison (2007)

suggested that African American athletes may spend less time with professors, especially when on predominantly White campuses approximately 89% of faculty were White. Interaction with professors can result in not only discussions about course material, but also encouragement into graduate school. Perlmutter (2003) stated all faculty members might not intentionally treat African American athletes differently, but some act in ways that inhibit interaction with these athletes. These faculty behaviors include overlooking the academic seriousness of the athlete, lowering classroom expectations, increasing scrutiny of the athletes' work, and making negative comments. "Minority student athletes enter college not only struggling as other athletes do to maintain academic performance and athletic commitment but also struggling to convince their professors that they are serious students" (Person, Benson-Quaziena, & Rogers, 2001, p.59).

Simons et al. (2007) found the athlete stigma was worse for African American athletes. A higher percentage of African American athletes than White athletes reported (a) feeling negative perceptions from faculty and teaching assistants, (b) receiving a lower grade than they deserved, (c) being accused of cheating in a class, and (d) being refused or given a hard time when asking for special accommodations. Fellow classmates also possessed negative views of African American athletes' academic ability (Sailes, 1993). Sailes (1993) findings indicated "White and male [students] felt more strongly that the African American athlete was not as academically prepared to be in college as the average student, received lower grades than White athletes, and was not as intelligent as White athletes" (p. 95). These findings would indicate however negative the perceptions of athletes by members of the campus community, those judgments are heightened for African American athletes. Simons et al. (2007) concluded, "Being an

African American plays a role in the athletes' reports of negative treatment by faculty over and above that of being an athlete alone" (p. 259).

Measuring Perceptions of Athletes: Situational Attitudinal Scale

The perceptions of athletes have been primarily studied through members of college campuses other than athletes. One method of measuring the attitudes of faculty and students towards athletes is using the Situational Attitudinal Scale (SAS). The original version of this instrument was developed to determine the racial attitudes of Whites towards Blacks on a university campus and to better assess contemporary attitudes as well as provide a valid and reliable measurement (Sedlacek, Brooks, & Glenwood, 1967, p.3). The questionnaire consisted of 10 statements describing specific personal and social situations. Following each situation, participants rated their attitude on 10 bi-polar semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). Two forms of the original SAS were developed listing the same situations, but the actors on the forms differed as either "White" or "Black." For example, the situation of a new White family moving in next door would appear on one form while a new Black family moving in next door would appear on the other form of the SAS. The participants were asked to rate on a bi-polar 5 point scale their feelings towards the situation (e.g. happy to sad). Because participants were not aware that more than one form existed, they were less likely to direct their answers to a more socially acceptable response. If a discrepancy between the responses on the forms appeared, then that might have been an indication of a different perception of the targeted subgroup.

College student perceptions using SAS.

Student perceptions of athletes were originally reported to vary broadly from avid fans to very condescending of their peers (Zingg, 1982). More recently, Engstrom and Sedlacek (1991; 1993) revised the original SAS instrument by updating the situations to fit modern scenarios and inserting student and student-athlete as the main actors. By changing the actor on the instrument, the researcher could assess the attitudes toward the targeted group. The revised form of the SAS was administered to college students to gauge their perceptions of athletes on their college campus. In assessing first year students' attitudes, Engstrom and Sedlacek (1991) found that negative perceptions regarding academic competence of athletes existed stating, "students seem to be more suspicious and less trusting of student-athletes obtaining an A in class … [they] simply do not believe student-athletes have the capabilities to obtain an A" (p.191). These same students also possessed negative attitudes surrounding the situation of announcing an expanded tutorial and academic support program for athletes. In a later study, Engstrom and Sedlacek (1993) administered a similar SAS to residence hall students. This group of students responded more negatively towards athletes than towards non-athletes in situations when professors assigned athletes as their lab partner, when athletes drove an expensive sports car, and when athletes left school (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1993). Both of these studies demonstrated that students might perceive athletes negatively at least in certain situations.

University faculty perceptions using SAS.

Leach and Conners (1984) stated that college faculty might possess the strongest negative perceptions of student-athletes. This attitude may stem from the dumb jock stereotype that athletes lack motivation and intelligence to succeed and their only interest was in staying eligible (Simons et al., 2007). The SAS was used to evaluate the attitudes and perceptions faculty members have towards athletes. Engstrom et al. (1995) modified the SAS to include three possible actors: (a) student, (b) a male revenue-producing athlete (i.e. basketball and football), and (c) a male non-revenue producing athlete (i.e. baseball, tennis, and lacrosse). By dividing the athletes into two subcategories, the researchers could examine if faculty attitudes applied to athletes in general or if revenue or non-revenue athletes were more susceptible to prejudice. Faculty members more negatively questioned the academic qualifications, admissions policies, and expectations of all athletes when compared to students in general. In situations where all athletes received media attention or extra services, the faculty also expressed concern. Whether the actor was a revenue or non-revenue athlete did not influence the faculties' attitudes significantly in most situations. However, some differences did occur. Faculty were more negative towards non-revenue athletes receiving additional academic support than either athletes in revenue producing sports or students in general. In addition, a non-revenue athlete "driving an expensive sports car" was perceived in a more positive light than in the same situation for a revenue athlete (Engstrom et al., 1995, p. 222). The only situation to which faculty responded more favorably towards athletes involved academic progress towards a degree. When given the situation of "pursuing a degree at a slower pace," faculty's attitudes were significantly more positive for the non-revenue athlete

when compared to the non-athlete group (Engstrom et al., 1995, p. 222). Overall, the faculty perceptions of athletes remained negative. Engstrom et al. (1995) stated, "faculty members may consider [revenue and non-revenue athletes] to be unqualified for or undeserving of admission to their institution" (p.224).

SAS and faculty perceptions at a NCAA division II institution.

All studies mentioned to this point examined the existence of a negative athlete stereotype at NCAA Division I institutions where the majority of athletes received financial aid based solely on athletic prowess. Athletes attending NCAA Division II institutions often are granted financial aid through both athletic and academic scholarships. Baucom and Lantz (2001) used the same SAS instrument and found similar negative perceptions at a highly selective NCAA Division II institution that does not grant full-athletic scholarships. The faculty members at the private college held prejudicial attitudes toward male athletes concerning special admissions policies, scholarships, academic support services, and media exposure. According to Baucom and Lantz (2001), this finding "may suggest that faculty prejudices toward male student-athletes may be rather robust and may not be associated with only 'big time' athletic programs" (p. 273). Further studies need to examine whether the dumb jock stereotype exists at all types and levels of academia.

SAS and female athletes.

Much of the attention to faculty perceptions of student-athletes has been directed to male athletes. Webb, Molstad, and Kher (1998) revised the SAS instrument to assess faculty attitudes towards female basketball players. Evidence of some negative perceptions in certain situations did occur. As in the previous studies, faculty reacted negatively to female athletes receiving special consideration for admission or for financial support. However, the faculty appeared more lenient toward female athletes who received additional academic support and more positive in the belief that female athletes adequately could perform the necessary academic work. Studies focusing on perceptions of female athletes and academic achievement are limited.

Studies Using Instruments Other than SAS

The prevalence of a dumb jock stereotype on college campuses has been examined using other instruments as well. Two studies investigated college students' beliefs with separate questionnaires. Sailes (1993) reported that college students felt athletes were not as smart, took easier courses, and were not as academically competitive as the typical college student. Despite these findings, only 10% of those surveyed felt these athletes were "dumb jocks." Unlike the studies using the SAS instrument, participants would have been aware of a socially acceptable response that could have altered the findings.

Knapp, Rasmussen, and Barnhardt (2001) also explored college student perceptions of athletes by surveying both athletes and non-athletes. The results supported previous findings indicating that athletes were perceived differently by non-athletes.

Despite being supportive of the athletics department in general, non-athlete students felt athletes received special treatment from faculty and did not take academics seriously. Knapp et al., (2001) concluded, "Rightly or wrongly student-athletes were not perceived in a positive light" (p.100).

A final study examined this stereotype by assessing the attitudes of both faculty and students from a different perspective. Simons et al. (2007) surveyed athletes at a public NCAA Division I school to determine how other members of the campus community perceived them. The instrument used in this study contained closed and open-ended questions. One-third of the athletes reported negative perceptions from faculty and nearly 60% reported similar negative perceptions from other students. In addition, more negative perceptions were apparent for revenue athletes than non-revenue athletes. The survey indicated that athletes felt (a) they received a lower grade (27%), (b) were refused special accommodation (42%) or given a hard time for the accommodation (57%), and (c) rarely or never received special treatment by faculty members (73%). A large percentage (62%) affirmed that faculty members have made negative comments about athletes in class. The most common types of comments heard by athletes ranged from "expecting special treatment" to "only interested in sports" to "not academically qualified" (Simons et al., 2007, p. 260). The open-ended questions also revealed a negative stigma associated with athletes at this institution. Comments were categorized under several themes including: (a) lack of intellectual ability, (b) lack of motivation, (c) special treatment, and (d) discrimination because of special treatment. Athletes provided comments from both faculty and students to support these themes. Simons et al.

concluded that an athletic stigma existed stating, “While [an athletes’] social identity is highly valued in the athletic domain, it is devalued in the academic domain” (p. 268)

Summary

Despite studies demonstrating academic achievement and motivation for many athletes, evidence suggests a dumb jock stereotype still prevails on college campuses. These individuals must successfully balance the dual role of athlete and student, despite time-constraints, external pressures, and for some, previously poor academic preparation. In the studies examining faculty and student perceptions of athletes, a negative attitude towards athletes existed with the strongest stigma directed primarily towards NCAA Division I African American male athletes in revenue producing sports.

The majority of studies assessing the athlete stigma on college campuses have been performed on large, public, NCAA Division I institutions. Further studies need to be done to determine whether the type or size of the school plays a part in the prevalence of this stigma. In addition, most previous studies examined athlete perceptions by surveying faculty and non-athletes, instead of directly asking the athletes how they believe they are perceived. The purpose of this study is to examine athletes’ perceptions of how they are viewed and treated by faculty at a small, private, comprehensive NCAA Division II university.

CHAPTER III

Research Methodology

This chapter includes the description of the research methodology used and the rationale behind the chosen methodology. The purpose of this study was twofold. First, this study examined how current athletes believe faculty members on a small, private, comprehensive NCAA Division II college campus in the mid-western United States perceived them. The survey data helped identify how participants perceived the views and attitudes towards athletes at this type of university setting and could be an indication of the existence of an athlete stigma. Secondly, the results were compared to the findings of a previous study using similar protocol preformed on a large, public, highly-selective west coast NCAA Division I institution by Simons et al. (2007). This comparison aided in determining whether the perception of the attitudes towards athletes vary between these two markedly different institutions. The results of this investigation not only added to the limited existing research on non-Division I campuses, but also helped create an awareness of any potential existing stereotype to the members of this university community.

In terms of theoretical orientation, I approached this study from the post-positivist paradigm (Hatch, 2002). The ontological perspective of this paradigm suggests reality exists within the limitations of human inquiry. The post-positivist perspective states reality can be approximated but never fully apprehended. The epistemological view involves the researcher as an objective observer in relation to the phenomenon being studied. This paradigm fit the application of inductive and statistical data analysis methodology used in this investigation.

Research Design

In attempting to replicate the Simons et al. (2007) study on athlete stigma, the research design closely followed their survey protocol. The instrument contained demographic questions and items about academic experiences. Using a cross-sectional survey research design for this study was appropriate because this type of design helped identify the current attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of the participants as well as compared these traits among various groups (Creswell, 2008). Several advantages existed for using a survey to measure the responses of the athletes. In addition to being an efficient way to collect data, the use of a survey helped maintain the anonymity of the participants. This was especially important with this investigation due to my involvement with athletics. Because the participants already were familiar with me as a coach within the department, the use of focus groups or interviews could have lead to data that the athletes thought I wanted to obtain instead of candid answers and experiences. By remaining anonymous, the participants could answer the survey questions honestly reducing the possibility of being led or influenced to respond a certain way.

Procedures

In following the research protocol used by Simons et al. (2007), participants completed the surveys during separate team meetings. Administering the paper and pencil survey at these meetings produced a high return rate. I read minimal instructions and an oral informed consent statement to the participants prior to beginning the survey. Participation in the study was voluntary and the athletes could choose to stop taking the

survey at any time. To keep responses anonymous, no names were recorded on the surveys. Coaches were asked to leave the room during the survey to limit any influence they might have on their teams and the responses. Adequate time was allowed to complete the survey. The gatekeepers for this project included the athletic director and the head coaches of the individual sport teams. In addition, approval from the university's Human Subjects Review Board was obtained prior to administering the survey. (See Appendix B)

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, some terms needed to be defined. The term professor and faculty were used interchangeably. Persons falling into this category might have varied from full-professor to adjunct instructor. However, from the athletes' and most students' perspective, the term professor represented the person teaching a course at the university. The usage of the term athlete or student-athlete was defined as any current undergraduate student who participated in university sponsored athletic events and appeared on the university's intercollegiate athletic team roster. Intramural or club sport team members were not included in this study. Division II athletes typically receive academic as well as athletic scholarships as part of a full or partial scholarship package. Therefore, the term scholarship athlete referred to athletes who self-reported receiving any amount of athletic based scholarships. Non-scholarship athletes were defined as members of the athletic teams who did not receive financial aid based on athletic ability. The term scholarship group was used in statistical calculations to determine if differences existed between athletes receiving athletic aid and those who did not. In addition, due to

the small percentage of minority athletes attending the university and participating in athletics, race and ethnic groups were collapsed into two main categories: White/Caucasian and African American and all other non-White/Caucasian participants. The term race group was used in statistical calculations to better determine if significant differences existed. Finally, within NCAA Division II institutions, specific sports rarely generate revenue, but to maintain continuity with the existing Division I literature any reference to revenue or non-revenue sports or athletes referred to those sports typically considered as revenue producing (i.e. men's basketball and football).

Participants

Participants were 252 athletes (178 males, 74 females) selected by convenience sampling as current members of athletic teams at the university. All participants were undergraduates at various stages of progress towards a degree (i.e. freshman through seniors). Due to the large sample size, the results may more accurately represent the trends of the population (Creswell, 2008). The ethnicity of the university's student population is predominately White/Caucasian. The athletic teams reflected the student population's ethnicity except for football and men's basketball, which included a larger proportion of African-American athletes.

Research Setting

The research settings used in the original study and in this investigation differed in many ways including: (a) number of students enrolled, (b) type of institution (i.e.

public vs. private), (c) location within the United States, and (d) NCAA Division. The university in this project was a small, private, comprehensive institution with an enrollment of approximately 2,400 full-time undergraduate students and 2,100 full-time graduate students (Facts, 2008). The university offered 60 undergraduate majors. More than 80% of the faculty held doctorate degrees or the highest degree in their field. The undergraduate student to teacher ratio was 16 to 1. Six year graduation rates for student cohorts from 1999 – 2002 varied from 58 to 61% with grade point averages (GPA) ranging from 3.27 to 3.32 on a 4.0 scale.

During the spring semester of the 2008-2009 academic year, over 400 athletes attended the institution constituting a large percent of the undergraduate student body. The university's 10 male and 10 female varsity athletic teams compete at the NCAA Division II level continuously ranking within the top 25 Division II institutions in the Sports Academy Director's Cup, which honors institutions achieving athletic success across many sports. Degree completion for athletes reflected rates similar to those held by the general student body with the 2000-01 freshman cohort achieving a 57% graduation rate (Freshman, 2008).

Survey Instrument

Some modifications were made to the original instrument used by Simons et al. (2007) to better fit the setting at this university. The average class sizes and prevalence of professors teaching classes as opposed to teaching assistants were the two main changes made to the original instrument. Two items addressing non-athlete student perceptions were removed from the survey to decrease the overall length. Each item was

reviewed to reduce biased wording that might have created response effects or influenced participants to answer in a pre-determined manner (Schwartz, Groves, & Schuman, 1998). The survey had been used previously as a reliable and valid instrument. Content validity was established by external reviewers.

The survey instrument was divided into three parts. Part A contained 18 closed-ended questions. The majority of the closed-ended questions required participants to signify how often a behavior or situation occurred by responding on a five point Likert scale (e.g. always, often, sometimes, rarely, never). Questions using a Likert scale gave participants the opportunity to rank various attitudes and situations (Gupta, 1999). In addition, forced choice items (yes or no) paired with questions allowing for multiple answers also were used to track the occurrence of comments or behaviors from faculty. Part B contained three open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were included to elicit more in-depth responses giving participants the opportunity to provide instances or comments made by faculty about athletes not readily obtained through the closed-ended questions. The final part of the survey contained demographic questions. Year in college, gender, ethnicity, major, sport, and GPA were among the demographic variables obtained by this portion of the survey.

Research Questions

Two research questions were posed in this study. The first examined the attitudes towards athletes at the university as follows:

Research Question 1: How do athletes believe professors perceive and treat them?

To help answer this question, the percentage of participants reporting various instances were calculated and then compared across groups within the participants. The hypotheses to determine whether the observed responses significantly differed from the expected responses included the following:

$1H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for year in school.

$2H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for gender.

$3H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for race/ethnicity.

$4H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for race group.

$5H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for sport played.

$6H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for type of scholarship.

$7H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for scholarship group.

$8H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for academic major.

$9H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being physically identifiable as an athlete.

$10H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for hiding their student athlete identity from professors.

$11H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for identifying themselves as athletes for road trips.

$12H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving preferential treatment from professors.

$13H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving a higher grade than deserved.

$14H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving a lower grade than deserved.

$15H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being suspected or accused of cheating by a professor.

$16H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for their race/ethnicity positively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$17H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for their race/ethnicity negatively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$18H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments.

$19H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for negative remarks made by professors about student athletes.

$20H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being academically qualified to be at the university.

$21H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes that should not be in their class.

$22H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports.

$23H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class.

$24H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes turning in late assignments or not at all.

$25H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes cheating and having others do their work.

$26H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes expecting special treatment that they do not deserve.

$27H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for positive remarks made by professors about student athletes in class.

$28H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes working hard.

$29H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being admired for their ability to balance academics and athletics.

$30H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being good for the school's reputation.

$31H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being encouraged to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$32H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether coaches encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$33H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether teammates encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$34H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether advisors encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

35H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether family encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

36H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether friends encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

37H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses of whether other individuals encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

38H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to work hard to show that athletes are good students.

39H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to stop participating in class.

40H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to attend class less often.

41H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to drop the class.

42H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to keep their student athlete identity hidden.

43H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to the professor.

44H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to a higher power.

45H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to focus more on sports.

46H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for going to professors' office hours.

47H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for attending classes.

48H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for turning in assignments on time.

49H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for sitting with other athletes in class.

50H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for the general perception professors have of student athletes.

The participants self-reported their GPA. Mean GPA's were compared between gender and sport to test the following hypotheses:

$1H_1$: The mean GPA for female athletes differs from male athletes.

$2H_1$: The mean GPA differs by sport.

To determine whether differences in the expected and observed frequencies existed between genders and race groups further analysis of the data was necessary. The hypotheses to determine whether the observed responses significantly differed from the expected responses with respect to gender included the following:

$1H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to year in school.

$2H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to race group.

$3H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to scholarship group.

$4H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to academic major.

$5H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to being physically identifiable as an athlete.

$6H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to hiding their student athlete identity from professors.

$7H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to identifying themselves as athletes for road trips.

$8H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to receiving preferential treatment from professors.

$9H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to receiving a higher grade than deserved.

$10H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to receiving a lower grade than deserved.

$11H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to being accused of cheating by a professor.

$12H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to their race/ethnicity positively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$13H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to their race/ethnicity negatively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$14H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments.

$15H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to negative remarks made by professors about student athletes.

$16H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being academically qualified to be at the university.

$17H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes that should not be in their class.

$18H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports.

$19H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class.

$20H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes turning in late assignments or not at all.

$21H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes cheating and having others do their work.

$22H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes expecting special treatment that they do not deserve.

$23H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to positive remarks made by professors about student athletes in class.

$24H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes working hard.

$25H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being admired for their ability to balance academics and athletics.

$26H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being good for the school's reputation.

$27H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to being encouraged to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$28H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether coaches encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$29H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether teammates encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$30H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether advisors encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$31H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether family encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$32H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether friends encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$33H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to whether other individuals encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$34H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to work hard to show that athletes are good students.

$35H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to stop participating in class.

$36H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to attend class less often.

$37H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to drop the class.

$38H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to keep their student athlete identity hidden.

$39H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to the professor.

$40H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to a higher power.

$41H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to focus more on sports.

$42H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to going to professors' office hours.

43H_1: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to attending classes.

44H_1: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to turning in assignments on time.

45H_1: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to sitting with other athletes in class.

46H_1: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to the general perception professors have of student athletes.

The hypotheses to determine whether the observed frequency of responses significantly differed from the expected frequency of responses among race/ethnic groups included the following:

1H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to year in school.

2H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to gender.

3H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to sport played.

4H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to scholarship group.

5H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to academic major.

6H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to being physically identifiable as an athlete.

$7H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to hiding their student athlete identity from professors.

$8H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to identifying themselves as athletes for road trips.

$9H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to receiving preferential treatment from professors.

$10H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to receiving a higher grade than deserved.

$11H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to receiving a lower grade than deserved.

$12H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to being suspected or accused of cheating by a professor.

$13H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to their race/ethnicity positively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$14H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to their race/ethnicity negatively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

$15H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments.

16H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to negative remarks made by professors about student athletes.

17H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being academically qualified to be at the university.

18H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes that should not be in their class.

19H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports.

20H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class.

21H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes turning in late assignments or not at all.

22H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes cheating and having others do their work.

$23H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes expecting special treatment that they do not deserve.

$24H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to positive remarks made by professors about student athletes in class.

$25H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes working hard.

$26H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being admired for their ability to balance academics and athletics.

$27H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes being good for the school's reputation.

$28H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to being encouraged to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$29H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether coaches encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

$30H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether teammates encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier “athlete friendly” classes.

$31H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether advisors encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier “athlete friendly” classes.

$32H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether family encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier “athlete friendly” classes.

$33H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether friends encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier “athlete friendly” classes.

$34H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to whether other individuals encouraged them to avoid harder classes or take easier “athlete friendly” classes.

$35H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete’s reaction was to work hard to show that athletes are good students.

$36H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete’s reaction was to stop participating in class.

37H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to attend class less often.

38H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to drop the class.

39H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to keep their student athlete identity hidden.

40H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to the professor.

41H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to a higher power.

42H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to focus more on sports.

43H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to going to professors' office hours.

$44H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to attending classes.

$45H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to turning in assignments on time.

$46H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to sitting with other athletes in class.

$47H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to the general perception professors have of student athletes.

After establishing a better understanding of how athletes at this university believe they were perceived and treated, the results were then compared to the Simons et al. study. The second research question was as follows:

> Research Question 2: Do the perceptions and treatment of the athletes at university differ from the perceptions and treatment of the athletes in the original study?

The following set of research hypotheses were used to determine whether the views of athletes differed between the two institutions. To address the second research question, hypotheses included the following:

$1H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting hiding their student athlete identity from professors differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$2H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting receiving preferential treatment from professors differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$3H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting receiving a higher grade than they deserved differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$4H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting receiving a lower grade than they deserved differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$5H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting being suspected or accused of cheating by a professor differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$6H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$7H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting negative remarks made by professors about student athletes differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$8H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes being academically qualified to be at the university differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$9H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes that should not be in their class differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$10H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$11H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$12H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes turning in late assignments or not at all differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$13H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes cheating and having others do their work differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$14H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting remarks made by professors regarding athletes expecting special treatment that they do not deserve differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$15H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to work hard to show that athletes are good students differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$16H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to stop participating in class differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$17H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to attend class less often differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$18H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to drop the class differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$19H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to the professor differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$20H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to a higher power differs from the percentage of athletes in the original study.

$21H_1$: The percentage of athletes in this study reporting the general perception professors have of student athletes differs from the percentage of athlete in the original study.

Data Analysis

The survey provided several types of data. The demographic questions resulted in nominal data and the close-ended questions produced ordinal data. I analyzed the nominal and ordinal data through Chi-square tests using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS®) software to determine whether the observed frequencies of responses are significantly different from the expected frequencies (Best & Kahn, 2006). This nonparametric test helps determine how many of the participants fall into a particular category (Shavelson, 1996). The expected N was based on the assumption that the total population will be divided evenly among the categories. Crosstabulation was also performed to determine whether differences in the expected and observed frequencies

existed between gender and race groups. To evaluate the strength of the relationship between the reported frequencies of the various survey items and demographic characteristics of the participants, Cramer's V was also used.

In addition to the closed-ended items contained within the survey, three open-ended questions allowed participants to provide more specific instances or comments made by faculty regarding student athletes. To construct a theory of how athletes believe they were perceived and treated on campus, I used inductive analysis (Hatch, 2002). I coded data from the open-ended questions as positive, negative, or neutral and then categorized into emergent themes to attempt to characterize the perceptions of athletes (Creswell, 1998). Demographic information describing the faculty and class context for each comment accompanied each open-end response. By combining the data gained from the statistical calculations and the themes, I developed an approximation of the existing views and beliefs held by student-athletes in order to understand the challenges facing this group of college-student athletes.

Limitations of the Study

Due to the timing of the administration of the survey, many senior athletes were not present at the team meetings. The results may be biased to reflect the opinions and beliefs of younger student athletes taking lower level classes due to lower number of responses from more experienced students. African Americans comprise a small percentage of students and of athletes at this university. In addition, I am a member of the athletic department and a professor in the Department of Sport Sciences. My presence may have influenced the responses of the athletes despite informing the

participants their responses would remain anonymous. Another proctor administered the survey to my team members to avoid any influence I might have had on their responses. Finally, I am a former collegiate student-athlete. Although I rarely have been subjected to any form of the dumb jock stereotype, I may have a greater awareness or sensitivity to this type of treatment or behavior on a college campus. These biases could have affected the interpretation and analysis of the data. I used careful evaluation of the data and used external reviewers to limit these biases and the potential influence on the findings.

Summary

This chapter presented the methods, research hypotheses, and procedures used to replicate a study done by Simons et al. (2007) to determine how athletes believed they were perceived by faculty on a NCAA Division II campus. The research design and protocol closely followed those used in the original study. Chosen by convenience sampling, participants included current NCAA Division II athletes. Some modifications to the original instrument were made to better fit the setting at this university. The modified survey contained 21 items as well as demographic questions. The data were analyzed using Chi-square tests and crosstabulation to determine whether the observed frequencies of responses were significantly different from the expected frequencies and whether the responses were statistically different between various groups. Qualitative data were coded and categorized into themes. Finally, the findings were compared to the results from the original study.

CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter includes the results from the data analysis which tested the research hypotheses presented in the previous chapter as well as qualitative data obtained from the three open-ended survey questions. Two research questions were posed in this study. The first examined the attitudes towards athletes at the current university as follows:

Research Question 1: How do athletes believe professors perceive and treat them? After establishing a better understanding of how athletes at this university believe they were perceived and treated, I then compared the results to the Simons et al. (2007) study. The second research question was as follows:

> Research Question 2: Do the perceptions and treatment of the athletes at this university differ from the athletes' perceptions and treatment in the original study?

I analyzed the data from the closed-ended survey questions through Chi-square tests to determine whether the observed frequencies of responses were significantly different from the expected frequencies (Best & Kahn, 2006). Crosstabulation was also performed for each hypothesis to determine whether differences in the expected and observed frequencies existed for gender and race groups. Many of the crosstabulation calculations returned results that were not statistically significant. Only the statistically significant crosstabulations will be discussed in this chapter. To analyze the data from open-ended questions, I used an inductive analysis approach (Hatch, 2002). I coded data from the open-ended questions as positive, negative, or neutral and then categorized the

data into emergent themes to attempt to characterize the perceptions of athletes (Creswell, 1998). External reviewers confirmed the qualitative and quantitative themes.

Development of Themes from Quantitative Data

To assist in analyzing the results from the closed-ended survey questions, I categorized the data into four themes. An external reviewer then validated the themes. The responses were grouped into participants' demographic information, academic success or interest shown by athletes, athletic identity-related items, and perceptions or treatment of athletes by professors.

The demographic data theme consisted of the background information of the participants. This categorization provided an examination of the characteristics possessed by the athletes taking this survey. Items such as year in school, gender, race/ethnicity, sport played, level of athletic scholarship, and major course of study fell within this theme.

The theme of academic success or interest of the athletes included the survey items that demonstrated the athletes' attention to academic achievement. Using professors' office hours, completing assignments on time, maintaining a grade point average, selecting easier classes, and reacting to negative attitudes from professors were survey items that constituted this theme.

Athletic identity-related data centered on whether the participants were recognizable as a student athlete. By examining the data within this theme, the concept of whether the participants believed they were identifiable as an athlete and whether they tried to hide their identity could be established.

The final theme within the quantitative survey items was the perceptions or treatment of athletes by professors. Several survey items fell within this category. This theme examined whether the participants believed that professors treated athletes differently than other students through accommodations, grades, remarks, and perceptions.

Demographic Data of Participants

To assess the background information of the participants, a series of demographic based research hypotheses were developed and measured by the survey. The participants self-reported all of the data within this theme. Performing Chi-square tests produced the following demographic information about the participants. Statistically significant differences from the expected and the observed values occurred within the following research hypotheses.

$1H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for year in school.

The largest class rank of the participants was freshmen (40%) followed by sophomores (25%), junior (22%), and seniors (12%). The Chi-Square frequencies for the participants' year in school are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Participants' Year in School

Year	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Freshman	101	63.0	38.0
Sophomore	64	63.0	1.0
Junior	56	63.0	-7.0
Senior	31	63.0	-32.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics

	Year
Chi-Square	39.968
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The rate of attrition from freshman to senior year partially could be due to the timing of the survey. Most seniors would have exhausted their eligibility by the end of the spring semester and therefore, not been present at the team meetings. In addition, most collegiate athletics rosters contain more freshmen than seniors. Regardless of the reason, the majority of participants held an academic standing of freshman or sophomore.

$2H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for gender.

The participants' gender was statistically significantly different. The number of male participants (n=178) outnumbered the female participants (n=74). The ratio of male to female athletes in this study was 2.4 to 1. Three male only sports were offered at the institution. The participant counts for those sports included football with 81, wrestling with 19, and baseball with 23. When compared with the three female only sports of volleyball (n=9), softball (n=15) and cheerleading (n=6), this difference between the

genders was not surprising. The complete crosstabulation table of sport by gender can be found in Appendix D as Table 1.

$4H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for race group.

Due to the large proportion of White/Caucasian participants and the small number of other ethnicities represented in this study, the responses were collapsed into two race groups, White/Caucasian and African American/other, when analyzing ethnicity in the research hypotheses. The observed race groups were statistically significantly different from the expected values. The Chi-Square frequencies for ethnicity are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' by Race Group

Race Group	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
African American and other groups	37	126.0	-89.0
White/ Caucasian	215	126.0	89.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	125.730
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The expected N is based on the assumption that the total population will be divided evenly among the categories

The ethnicity of the athletes aligned closely with that of the general student population at the institution (Demographic profile, 2009). The general student population consisted of 85% White/Caucasian, 5% African American, and 9% other groups. The majority (85%) of the participants self-identified as White/Caucasian (n=215). Only 25

athletes identified themselves as African American (10%) with the 12 remaining athletes comprising the other ethnic groups.

$5H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for sport played.

The observed number of participants by sport was statistically significantly different from the expected values. The Chi-Square frequencies are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' by Sport

Sport	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Baseball	23	25.2	-2.2
Basketball*	21	25.2	-4.2
Cheerleading	6	25.2	-19.2
Football	81	25.2	55.8
Soccer*	31	25.2	5.8
Softball	15	25.2	-10.2
Swimming*	18	25.2	-7.2
Track, Cross-country*	29	25.2	3.8
Volleyball	9	25.2	-16.2
Wrestling	19	25.2	-6.2
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	159.111
df	9
Asymp. Sig.	.000

*includes both male and female participants

The number of players necessary to compete and squad size varies by sport. Football would require more athletes than volleyball, for example. Therefore, the unequal number of participants per sport would be expected.

$7H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for scholarship group.

The number of athletic based scholarships available or allowed per NCAA rules varies among sports. In this study, the participants receiving different levels of athletic financial aid were as follows: 37 receiving a full-scholarship, 147 receiving a partial scholarship, and 66 receiving no athletic-related financial aid. For further analysis purposes, the participants designated as full and partial scholarship recipients were condensed into a scholarship group. Those athletes not receiving any athletic based financial aid were categorized as non-scholarship. The observed number of scholarship and non-scholarship athletes was statistically significantly different from the expected numbers. The Chi-Square frequencies for the scholarship groups are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Chi-Square Frequencies for Scholarship and Non-Scholarship Groups

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Scholarship	184	125.0	59.0
Non-scholarship	66	125.0	-59.0
Total	250		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	55.696
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

In NCAA Division II, the majority of athletes receive a combination of athletic-based and academic-based scholarships (Baucom & Lantz, 2001). Participants receiving some financial aid based on their athletic ability represented 74% of the athletes in this study. Football has the highest allotment of scholarship money available. Of the 81 football participants in this study, 58 reported at least a partial scholarship. The next closest sport in terms of scholarship athletes was the combined data of men's and

women's soccer (28 scholarship athletes). The complete crosstabulation table of scholarship group by sport can be found in the Appendix D as Table 2.

$8H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for academic major.

The major course of study chosen by the participants was collapsed into five categories: business, education, arts and sciences, sport sciences, and undecided. The observed majors were statistically significantly different from the expected number of majors. The Chi-Square frequencies of the majors reported by the athletes are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes' Major Course of Study

Major	Observed N	Expected N	Residual	Percent
Business	87	50.2	36.8	34.5
Education	46	50.2	-4.2	18.3
Arts and Sciences	50	50.2	-.2	19.8
Sport Sciences	65	50.2	14.8	25.8
Undecided	3	50.2	-47.2	1.2
Total	251			

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	76.072
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The expected N is based on the assumption that the total population will be divided evenly among the categories

Eighty-seven participants (34%) declared a major within the College of Business and Economics. Fifty athletes (33%) selected majors with the College of Arts and Sciences within the institution. Majors within the College of Education were reported by 111 (44%) participants. The College of Education houses the Department of Sport

Sciences at this institution. Of the 111 athletes declaring an education major, 65 (25.8%) reported Sport Science as their major. This department offered majors that relate directly to athletics or sport such as Sports Management, Athletic Training, Exercise Science, and Physical Education. The relevance to sport could account for the elevated number of athletes choosing Sport Science as a major. Only 3 participants reported as being undecided.

Academic Success or Interest

The theme of academic success or interest of the athletes included the survey items that related to the participants' academic achievement. Participants were asked to provide their current accumulative grade point average (GPA). Table 6 presents the mean GPA by sport as self-reported by the participants. The mean GPA for basketball, track and cross-country, soccer, and swimming include combined data from male and female athletes.

Table 6

Participants' Mean GPA by Sport

Sport	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Baseball	2.91	23	.42580
Basketball*	3.13	20	.45523
Cheerleading	3.27	5	.45598
Football	2.82	78	.53537
Soccer*	3.15	30	.46844
Softball	3.33	15	.26373
Swimming*	3.03	18	.45752
Track, Cross Country*	3.21	28	.43866
Volleyball	3.30	9	.49087
Wrestling	2.80	18	.58587
Total	3.01	244	.51020

*includes both male and female participants

The overall mean GPA supplied by the athletes was 3.01, which was slightly lower than the GPA (3.17) of all undergraduate students attending the institution (Demographic profile, 2009). GPA was statistically significantly different between the genders. Male athletes reported a mean GPA of 2.89, while female athletes were higher with a GPA of 3.30.

To assess the academic success or interest of the participants further, a series of research hypotheses were tested. Performing chi-square tests produced the following academic information about the participants. Statistically significant differences from the expected and the observed values occurred within the following research hypotheses.

31H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being encouraged to avoid harder classes or take easier "athlete friendly" classes.

Participants signified whether or not they were encouraged to avoid harder classes. The Chi-Square frequencies for the number of athletes who reported being told to avoid harder classes or take easier classes are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Told to Avoid Harder Classes

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Yes	79	126.0	-47.0
No	173	126.0	47.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	35.063
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Zingg (1982) emphasized the importance of academic advising for student-athletes, which goes beyond merely staying eligible for competition. Being encouraged to avoid hard classes or being advised to take "athlete friendly" classes could indicate the academic intent of the participants. Close to one-third of the participants (31%) signified they had been told to avoid harder classes or take "athlete friendly" classes. The results of the survey also indicated who encouraged athletes to make this choice in course work. A research hypothesis was tested for each person or group who suggested avoiding a harder class. The athletes most frequently cited teammates (68) and friends (48) as recommending a particular class. Only 22 participants cited coaches as encouraging certain courses. Athletes also indicated advisors (27) and family members (19) as influencing course selection. All of the categories were statistically significant between the expected and observed occurrences suggesting that fewer than expected athletes were encouraged to avoid harder classes. The corresponding Chi-Square frequency tables can be found in Appendix D as Table 3.

Previous research suggested that some professors may have a negative view of athletes (Baucom & Lantz , 2001; Engstrom et al.,1995; Leach & Conners, 1984; Simons et al., 2007). The survey included potential responses to the situation of a professor having a negative attitude towards athletes. The participants were asked to check any of the provided reactions that applied to their experiences. The athletes could select more than one response. The following research hypotheses represented these items.

$38H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards

student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to work hard to show that athletes are good students.

39H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to stop participating in class.

40H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to attend class less often.

41H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to drop the class.

43H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to the professor.

44H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to complain to a higher power.

45H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete's reaction was to focus more on sports.

The Chi-Square tests indicated that each of the research hypotheses testing the reaction to a professor's negative attitude resulted in a statistically significant difference between the observed and the expected responses of the athletes. Table 8 shows the

number of athletes who selected each selected response to the situation of a professor having a negative attitude towards athletes.

Table 8

Chi-Square Frequency of Responses to a Professor's Negative Attitude Towards Athletes

Response to Negative Attitude	Number of Athletes Who Selected Response	Expected N	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Work Hard	168	126	28.000	1	.000
Drop Class	19	126	181.730	1	.000
Complain to Higher Power	19	126	181.730	1	.000
Don't Participate	15	126	195.571	1	.000
Focus More on Sport	13	126	202.683	1	.000
Miss Class	11	126	209.921	1	.000
Complain to Professor	8	126	221.016	1	.000

Each line reflects an independent hypothesis

Two thirds of the athletes (66%) chose to work hard to show athletes were good students. When encountering a negative attitude from a professor, only 6% of the participants responded by not participating in class. Even fewer participants (4%) chose not to attend class when a professor had a negative attitude. Dropping the class was selected by 7% of the athletes, while only a small number of athletes chose to complain either to the professor (3%) or to a higher power (7%). Finally, 5% decided to respond by focusing more on their sport.

The last component making up the theme of academic success or intent came from the final part of the survey. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point scale ranging from always to never how often they went to office hours, attended class, and turned in assignments on time. The following research hypotheses reflected these items.

46H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for going to professors' office hours.

This survey question allowed participants to indicate how often they go to professors' office hours. The observed number of participants using professors' office hours differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants use of professors' office hours is shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Going to Professors' Office Hours

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	7	50.4	-43.4
Often	34	50.4	-16.4
Sometimes	121	50.4	70.6
Rarely	75	50.4	24.6
Never	15	50.4	-35.4
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	178.476
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Of the 252 participants, almost half (48%) reported using professors' office hours "sometimes." When including the categories of "always" and "often," the percentage increased to 64%. These finding could suggest that the majority of participants were willing to seek help from a professor during office hours. To determine whether a difference in using office hours existed between genders, the following research hypothesis was tested.

$42H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to going to professors' office hours.

The male and female athletes' use of office hours was statistically significantly different. Of the 121 participants reporting "sometimes" using office hours, 84 were

male and 37 were female. A larger percentage of male athletes stated they "rarely" used professors' office hours (33%) than their female counterparts (22%). In terms of going to professors' office hours "often," the female athletes' percentage (24%) was higher than the male athletes' percentage (9%). The crosstabulation for the participants' use of office hours by gender is shown in Appendix D as Table 4.

47H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for attending classes.

Determining how often athletes attend class could be an indication of the level of academic success or interest shown. Similar to the previous survey item, participants indicated on a 5-point scale how often they attend class. Zero athletes stated they attended class "rarely" or "never." The observed number of participants attending class differed significantly from the expected amount in the remaining three categories. The Chi-Square frequencies are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Attending Class

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	167	84.0	83.0
Often	78	84.0	-6.0
Sometimes	7	84.0	-77.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	153.024
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The results from this survey item suggested that athletes attend class. The majority of participants (97%) stated they "always" or "often" go to class. To analyze

this academic success related item further, the following research hypothesis tested whether there was a difference in responses between the genders.

43H_1: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to attending classes.

There was a statistically significant difference between male and female athletes' responses in terms of attending class. The majority of both male and female participants stated they "always" attend class. However, a greater percentage of the female athletes (81%) than male athletes (60%) reported they "always" attend class. The crosstabulation for the participants' class attendance by gender is shown in Appendix D as Table 5.

48H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for turning in assignments on time.

Turning in assignments on time regularly also could be an indication of the level of academic success or interest held by athletes. Although a 5-point scale was used, no participants reported "rarely" or "never" turning in an assignment on time. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants turning in assignments on time are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Turning in Assignments on Time

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	194	84.0	110.0
Often	56	84.0	-28.0
Sometimes	2	84.0	-82.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	233.429
df	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Participants in this study appeared to turn in assignments on time with over three-fourths of the athletes (77%) reporting "always" turning in assignments on time. To determine if a difference existed between the genders on this academic success related item, the following research hypothesis was tested.

$44H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to turning in assignments on time.

There was a statistically significant difference between male and female athletes' responses when examining turning in assignments on time. The percentage of female athletes "always" turning in assignments on time (86%) was higher than the percentage of male athletes (73%) within the same category. The crosstabulation for the participants' turning in assignments by gender is shown in Appendix D as Table 6.

When analyzing turning in assignments on time and race groups, the following research hypothesis produced a statistically significant difference.

$45H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to turning in assignments on time.

The percentage of White/Caucasian participants "always" turning in assignments on time (79%) was higher than the percentage of African American and other (62%) within the same category. The crosstabulation for the participants' turning in assignments by race group is shown in Appendix D as Table 7.

Athletic Identity

Athletic identity-related data centered on whether the participants were recognizable as student athletes and whether they tried to hide this identity. To assess the

student-athlete identity of the participants, a series of research hypotheses were tested. Performing chi-square tests produced the following information about the participants' identity. Statistically significant differences from the expected and the observed values occurred within the following research hypotheses.

$9H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being physically identifiable as an athlete.

For this survey item, participants were asked to signify whether they were identifiable to others as an athlete. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants who felt they were recognizable as an athlete are shown in Table 12.

Table 12

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Signifying They Were Identifiable as an Athlete

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Yes	229	122.5	106.5
No	16	122.5	-106.5
Total	245		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	185.180
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Nearly all of the participants (93%) responded that they were identifiable by others as an athlete. A follow-up question provided the opportunity for the participants to state a reason for being identifiable as an athlete. Participants stated physical characteristics, such as height and weight, and overall appearance, such as wearing team clothing and muscular build, as the main indicators to others that they were athletes.

$10H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for hiding their student athlete identity from professors.

Previous research suggested that athletes might hide their identity from professors to avoid a negative stereotype or stigma (Pittinsky et al., 2000; Schneider, 2004; Simons et al., 2007). Participants indicated on a 5-point scale how often they try to hide their identity from professors. None of athletes stated they "always" hid their identity. In the remaining four categories, the observed number of participants hiding their identity differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for athletes hiding their identity are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Chi-Square Frequencies for Athletes Hiding Their Identity from Professors

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Often	9	63.0	-54.0
Sometimes	32	63.0	-31.0
Rarely	60	63.0	-3.0
Never	151	63.0	88.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	184.603
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The participants in this study did not appear to hide their athletic identity. Only 16% of the participant responded that they "often" or "sometimes" hid being an athlete from a professor. To determine whether a difference existed between genders concerning being identifiable as an athlete, the following research hypothesis was tested.

$6H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to hiding their student athlete identity from professors.

There was a statistically significant difference between the male and female athletes' responses when hiding their identity from professors. The percentage of female

athletes "never" hiding their identity (76%) was higher than the percentage of male athletes (53%). In addition, no females reported that they "often" hid their identity. The crosstabulation for the participants' hiding their identity by gender is shown in Appendix D as Table 8.

$11H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for identifying themselves as athletes for road trips.

Road trips often required athletes to identify themselves in order to receive their missed assignments (Simons, et al., 2007). Participants indicated on a 5-point scale whether they would not identify themselves as athletes if not for road trips. The observed number of participants differed significantly from the expected amount in the five categories. The Chi-Square frequencies for athletes identifying themselves for road trips are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Would Not Identify Themselves as Athletes If Not for Road Trips

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	14	50.4	-36.4
Often	16	50.4	-34.4
Sometimes	38	50.4	-12.4
Rarely	53	50.4	2.6
Never	131	50.4	80.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	181.849
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The participants in this study indicated that revealing their identity as an athlete for road trips was "rarely" or "never" an issue 73% of the time. However, over one-fourth of the athletes still reported trying "sometimes," "often," or "always" to avoid identifying themselves in class. This finding could suggest some participants would avoid revealing their identity to professors if not for the missed class time caused by road trips.

49H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for sitting with other athletes in class.

Even if the participant was trying to keep his or her identity hidden, a professor might assume the student to be an athlete when sitting with other athletes. For this survey item, participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether they sat with other athletes in their classes. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants who sat with other athletes are shown in Table 15.

Table 15

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Sit With Other Athletes in Class

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	35	50.4	-15.4
Often	136	50.4	85.6
Sometimes	71	50.4	20.6
Rarely	8	50.4	-42.4
Never	2	50.4	-48.4
Total	252		

Test Statistics

Chi-Square	240.659
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Of the 252 participants, 96% indicated “always,” “often,” or “sometimes” sitting with other athletes in class. As was consistent with the other survey items assessing the desire to hide their athletic identity, most participants in this study appeared to openly display they were athletes by sitting together in class. To determine whether a difference existed between race groups and sitting with other athletes in class, the following research hypothesis was tested.

$46H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to sitting with other athletes in class.

A statistically significant difference between race groups occurred. The percentage of White/Caucasian athletes (57%) “often” sitting with other athletes was higher than the percentage of African American and other ethnicities (38%) within the same category. The crosstabulation for the participants’ likelihood of sitting with other athletes in class by race group is shown in Appendix D as Table 9.

$42H_1$: The athletes’ observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses in the situation that a professor had a negative attitude towards student athletes and the athlete’s reaction was to keep their athletic identity hidden.

The Chi-Square tests indicated that the research hypotheses testing the athletes’ reaction to a professor’s negative attitude by hiding their identity resulted in a statistically significant difference between the observed and the expected responses of the athletes. Table 16 displays the Chi-Square frequencies for athletes who keep their identity hidden from professors with a negative attitude.

Table 16

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Who Reacted to a Professor's Negative Attitude by Keeping Their Identity Hidden

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
No	226	126.0	100.0
Yes	26	126.0	-100.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	158.730
df	1
Asymp. Sig.	.000

This survey item assessed the possible reaction of the participants responding to a professor possessing a negative attitude towards athletes by keeping their athletic identity hidden. When presented the situation of a professor with a negative attitude, only 10% of the athletes indicated that they would keep their identity hidden.

Perception or Treatment of Athletes by Professors

The perceptions or treatment of athletes by professors comprised the final theme within the quantitative survey items. This theme examined whether the participants believed that professors treated athletes differently than other students through accommodations, grades, remarks, and perceptions. To assess the perceptions of professors as reported by the participants, a series of research hypotheses were tested. Performing Chi-Square tests produced the following information about the perceptions or treatment of athletes by professors. Statistically significant differences from the expected and the observed values occurred within the following research hypotheses.

$12H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving preferential treatment from professors.

For this survey item, participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether they received preferential treatment from a professor. The observed number of participants reporting professors who offered special treatment differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants receiving preferential treatment are shown in Table 17.

Table 17

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving Special Treatment from Professors

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	3	50.4	-47.4
Often	12	50.4	-38.4
Sometimes	48	50.4	-2.4
Rarely	83	50.4	32.6
Never	106	50.4	55.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	156.373
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Many of the scandals involving collegiate athletics involve athletes receiving academic related privileges from professors that were not afforded the general student population (Knight Commission, 1989; Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007; Sailes, 1993; Suggs, 2003). At this institution, the majority of athletes (75%) reported "rarely" or "never" receiving preferential treatment from professors. To investigate further the occurrence of unusual treatment given to athletes by professors, two survey questions assessed whether

being an athlete resulted in a higher or lower grade than they deserved. The following two research hypotheses were developed to test this possibility.

$13H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving a higher grade than deserved.

$14H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for receiving a lower grade than deserved.

Participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether they received a higher grade or lower grade than expected from a professor because of their student athlete status. For both items, the observed number of participants who reported professors giving them a different grade than what they deserved differed significantly from the expected amount. No athletes indicated "always" receiving a higher grade than expected due to their athlete status. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants receiving a higher grade than deserved from a professor are shown in Table 18. Table 19 displays the Chi-Square frequencies for athletes who reported receiving a lower grade than they deserved.

Table 18

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving a Higher Grade Than Deserved

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Often	1	63.0	-62.0
Sometimes	5	63.0	-58.0
Rarely	32	63.0	-31.0
Never	214	63.0	151.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	491.587
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Table 19

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Receiving a Lower Grade Than Deserved

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	1	50.4	-49.4
Often	4	50.4	-46.4
Sometimes	35	50.4	-15.4
Rarely	55	50.4	4.6
Never	157	50.4	106.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics

Chi-Square	321.730
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The results from the Chi-Square tests would indicate that the majority of the participants at this institution did not receive higher or lower grades than they deserved because of their student athlete status. Only 15% of the athletes reported "sometimes" or "rarely" receiving a higher grade from a professor, while 36% stated they "sometimes" or "rarely" got a lower grade than they deserved.

$15H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for being suspected or accused of cheating by a professor.

For this survey item, participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether a professor had suspected or accused them of cheating because they were a student athlete. The observed number of participants reporting professors suspecting or accusing them of cheating differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants suspected or accused of cheating because they were a student athlete are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Suspected or Accused of Cheating by a Professor

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	1	50.4	-49.4
Often	1	50.4	-49.4
Sometimes	6	50.4	-44.4
Rarely	16	50.4	-34.4
Never	228	50.4	177.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	785.262
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The results indicated that professors suspecting or accusing athletes of cheating only occurred to very few athletes. Over 96% of the participants indicated a professor "rarely" or "never" had suspected or accused them of cheating. When determining whether ethnicity or race might influence how an athlete was treated in a course, the following two research hypotheses were developed.

16H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for their race/ethnicity positively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

17H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for their race/ethnicity negatively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

Participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether their race/ethnicity positively or negatively influenced the way they were treated as a student athlete in a

course. For both items, the observed number of participants who reported positive or negative treatment differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for participants' race positively influencing how they were treated are shown in Table 21. Table 22 displays the Chi-Square frequencies for athletes who reported their race/ethnicity negatively influenced how they were treated.

Table 21

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Race/Ethnicity Positively Influencing How They Were Treated

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	2	50.4	-48.4
Often	3	50.4	-47.4
Sometimes	11	50.4	-39.4
Rarely	25	50.4	-25.4
Never	211	50.4	160.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	646.413
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Table 22

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Race/Ethnicity Negatively Influencing How They Were Treated

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	1	50.4	-49.4
Often	2	50.4	-48.4
Sometimes	5	50.4	-45.4
Rarely	19	50.4	-31.4
Never	225	50.4	174.6
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	760.222
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

In this study, the participants' race/ethnicity appeared to have little influence on the treatment they received as a student athlete in a course. Eighty-four percent of the athletes indicated that race/ethnicity "never" positively influenced their treatment, while a similar percentage (89%) reported that their race/ethnicity "never" negatively influenced their treatment as a student athlete. To determine whether a difference existed between race groups and the influence on how athletes were treated in a course, both the positive and negative influence research hypothesis was tested. However, only the negative influence hypothesis was statistically significant. The research hypothesis is listed below.

$14H_1$: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to their race/ethnicity negatively influencing the way they were treated as a student athlete in a course.

Although a large percentage of African American and other race/ethnicities (70%) reported that race "never" negatively influenced the way they were treated as a student athlete, race/ethnicity "never" negatively influenced how 93% of the White/Caucasian athletes were treated. Of the remaining African American and other race/ethnicity group members, 22% reported that their race/ethnicity "rarely" negatively influenced their treatment as a student athlete. The crosstabulation for the participants' likelihood of race/ethnicity negatively influence their treatment as a student athlete by race group is shown in Appendix D as Table 10.

$18H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments.

For this survey item, participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale whether a professor had given them a hard time or refused to accommodate them due to athletic related commitments. The observed number of participants reporting professors giving them a hard time or refusing accommodations differed significantly from the expected amount. The Chi-Square frequencies for this research hypothesis are shown in Table 23.

Table 23

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Given a Hard Time or Refused Accommodation by a Professor

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	4	50.2	-46.2
Often	16	50.2	-34.2
Sometimes	63	50.2	12.8
Rarely	61	50.2	10.8
Never	107	50.2	56.8
Total	251		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	135.673
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The Chi-Square results indicated that 67% of the athletes stated their professors "rarely" or "never" gave the participants in this study a hard time or refused to accommodate them due to athletic commitments. When determining whether a difference existed between race groups and being given a hard time or refused accommodation, the following research hypothesis was tested.

15H_1: The responses of the White/Caucasian group and African American and other group differed with respect to professors giving them a hard time or refusing to accommodate them due to athletic commitments.

The research hypothesis testing whether a difference occurred with this survey by race group proved to be statistically significant. The crosstabulation revealed that 69% of the African American and other race group participants "never" reported being given a hard time or refused accommodations for athletic related commitments. By comparison within the White/Caucasian group, only 38% stated "never" being given a hard time and

25% "rarely" being given a hard time. The crosstabulation table for the participants' receiving a hard time or being refused accommodations by race group is shown in Appendix D as Table 11.

$19H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for negative remarks made by professors about student athletes.

Participants signified whether or not they had heard a negative remark made about athletes in class. The Chi-Square frequencies for the number of athletes who reported a negative remark are shown in Table 24.

Table 24

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Indicating a Professor Made a Negative Remark in Class

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	3	50.2	-47.2
Often	21	50.2	-29.2
Sometimes	58	50.2	7.8
Rarely	65	50.2	14.8
Never	104	50.2	53.8
Total	251		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	124.598
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Two-thirds of the participants (67%) indicated that they "rarely" or "never" heard a professor make a negative remark about student athletes in class. To assess the perception and treatment of the participants further, the following series of research hypotheses that provided potential negative remarks made by professors were tested.

$20H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being academically qualified to be at the university.

$21H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes that should not be in their class.

$22H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports.

$23H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class.

$24H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes turning in late assignments or not at all.

$25H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes cheating and having others do their work.

$26H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes expecting special treatment that they do not deserve.

Participants indicated on the survey any remarks a professor had made in class. Table 25 displays the number of participants who selected each of the provided negative remarks.

Table 25

Frequency of Professor's Negative Remarks Towards Athletes in Class Heard by Participants

Negative Remark	Number of Athletes Who Selected Remark	Expected N	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Athletes Expect Special Treatment They Don't Deserve	97	126	13.349	1	.000
Athletes Only Interested in Sports	95	126	15.254	1	.000
Athletes Don't Participate in Class	43	126	109.349	1	.000
Athletes Turn in Assignments Late or Not at All	41	126	114.683	1	.000
Athletes Not Qualified to be at University	20	126	178.349	1	.000
Athletes Cheat and Have Others Do Their Work	14	126	199.111	1	.000
Athletes Shouldn't be in the Class	12	126	206.286	1	.000

Each line reflects an independent hypothesis

Of the 252 participants responding to this survey, only a small percentage selected many of the provided negative remarks that might be made by professors. The athletes chose two negative remarks more frequently. In both instances, 38% of the participants marked "athletes are only interested in sports" and "athletes expect special treatment they don't deserve." The next two highest negative remarks, "athletes don't participate in class" and "athletes turn in assignments late or not at all" rated in lower percentages of

less than 20%. Two of the professor's negative remarks made in class were statistically significantly different between genders. The research hypotheses for these items are listed below.

$18H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes only being interested in sports.

$19H_1$: The responses of the male and female athletes' differed with respect to remarks made by professors regarding athletes not participating in class.

A larger percentage of male athletes (42%) reported the negative comment of athletes only being interested in sport than the female athletes (28%). Similarly, more male participants (21%) indicated hearing the negative comment about not participating in class than their female counterparts (7%).

The opportunity also existed for professors to make positive remarks about student athletes in class. The following research hypothesis was tested to asses this survey item.

$27H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for positive remarks made by professors about student athletes in class.

Participants signified whether or not they had heard a positive remark made about athletes in class. The Chi-Square frequencies for the number of athletes who reported a positive remark are shown in Table 26.

Table 26

Chi-Square Frequencies for Participants Indicating a Professor Made a Positive Remark in Class

Response	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Always	4	50.4	-46.4
Often	60	50.4	9.6
Sometimes	131	50.4	80.6
Rarely	42	50.4	-8.4
Never	15	50.4	-35.4
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	199.706
df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Three-fourths of the participants (76%) indicated that they "often" or "sometimes" heard a professor make a positive remark about student athletes in class. To assess the perception and treatment of the participants further, the following series of research hypotheses that provided potential positive remarks made by professors were tested.

28H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes working hard.

29H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being admired for their ability to balance academics and athletics.

30H_1: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for remarks made by professors regarding athletes being good for the school's reputation.

Participants indicated on the survey any positive remarks a professor had made in class. Table 27 displays the number of participants who selected each of the provided positive remarks.

Table 27

Frequency of Professor's Positive Remarks Towards Athletes in Class Heard by Participants

Positive Remark	Number of Athletes Who Selected Remark	Expected N	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Athletes Work Hard	139	126	2.683	1	.101*
Athletes Are to be Admired for Their Ability to Balance Academics and Athletics	148	126	7.683	1	.006
Athletes Are Good for the School's Reputation	92	126	18.349	1	.000

* not statistically significant p>.05
Each line reflects an independent hypothesis

A higher percentage of the participants signified they had heard positive comments from professors than the previously explained negative comments. Over half (55%) of the athletes remembered the positive comment about athletes working hard. Close to 60% of the participants selected the positive comment regarding an athlete's ability to balance academics and athletics. Finally, 37% of the athletes chose the positive professor's comment about athletes being good for the school's reputation.

The final quantitative survey item asked the participants how they felt professors perceive student athletes in general. The following research hypothesis reflected this item.

$50H_1$: The athletes' observed frequency of responses differed from the expected frequency of responses for the general perception professors have of student athletes.

Participants were asked to signify on a 5-point scale how they felt professors perceive student athletes. The observed number of participants reporting perceptions of athletes differed significantly from the expected amount. None of the participants indicated the professors' perception of student athletes as "very negative." The Chi-Square frequencies of the remaining four categories of professors' general perceptions of student athletes are shown in Table 28.

Table 28

Chi-Square Frequencies for Professors' General Perceptions of Athletes as Indicated by the Participants

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
Negatively	29	63.0	-34.0
Neutral	115	63.0	52.0
Positively	102	63.0	39.0
Very Positively	6	63.0	-57.0
Total	252		

Test Statistics	
Chi-Square	136.984
df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

The majority of the participants (86%) indicated that they felt professors perceived athletes either "neutral" or "positively." Differences in professors' perceptions between race groups and genders were tested, however neither proved to be statistically significant.

Qualitative Data Results

The main purpose of this study was to assess how student-athletes at this NCAA Division II University believe faculty perceived them. Although the closed-ended questions provided a large amount of data, the three open-ended survey questions gave participants the opportunity to express their experiences in their own words. The first two survey items allowed the athletes to describe an in-class incident in which a professor made a remark about or singled out student-athletes. The third open-ended survey item asked for instances when the race or ethnicity of the student-athlete played a role in how he or she was treated. Only nine participants responded that race had influenced the way they were treated in a course. The low response rate to this item made theme development impossible for this question. Following a thorough analysis of data from the items assessing professors' remarks and the singling out of athletes, responses to the first two questions revealed neutral, positive, and negative experiences.

Question 1: Professor Makes a Remark about Athletes in Class

Neutral responses

Many of the professors' remarks (29%) relayed by the participants were neutral. Some neutral comments made in class tended to center around a team's or athlete's performance. One participant stated, "My professor would always point out how the athletes did that weekend, whether they won or lost, would always bring articles from the city paper or school paper and talk about them." Another athlete wrote, "One of my professors always asked how the soccer team was doing and I'd say so-so… she'd make comments like 'at least you're doing better in the classroom than on the soccer field.'"

While these comments might have demonstrated an interest in the success of the athletes' teams, these comments did not directly relate to the research question of perceptions of student athletes.

Some of the neutral comments were ambiguous. The statements provided by the participants could be viewed as positive or negative depending on the circumstances in which the event occurred. A participant stated, "One professor said that athletes represent the school." Several participants supplied experiences of being used as examples in class. "My [subject] professor always used analogies through sports and always used me as an example," stated one athlete. Because the participants did not specify whether the examples were positive or negative, I chose to categorize them as neutral.

Other neutral remarks made by professors addressed the time commitments student athletes must make to class and sports. One athlete responded, "A professor commented on how much more work it will take being an athlete and student and balancing everything." Another participant wrote, "In my [subject] class, we talked about student athletes and the difficulty of balancing school and sport." These comments did not question the capability of athletes in handling academics and athletics. Therefore, they fell under the neutral category.

Negative remarks made by professors in class

Of the 166 total responses to this question, 75 (45%) were categorized as negative. The negative responses for the questions assessing remarks made by professors in class could be captured under the following themes: (a) missed class and

accommodating athletes, (b) athletes are poor students and (c) athletes care more about sports than school. Each theme will be discussed in the following section.

Theme 1: Missed class and accommodating athletes

The competition schedule for any collegiate sport requires athletes to miss class in order to travel to an opponent's school. Special accommodations for missed class time often resulted in negative remarks directed at athletes. Several of the participants provided comments demonstrating the issue of missed class. One participant stated, "A professor told us if we are a student athlete then we will not be able to take his class. He said he didn't have time for people missing class." Another athlete responded that a professor commented, "Oh so you're an athlete, this means you can just miss class." Accommodations associated with missed class also appeared in the participants' comments. One athlete stated, "My professor told the athletes the first day of class, there will be no extensions for athletes, even if you go on a trip." In addition, a participant wrote this comment, "Student athletes miss too many classes and then come to my office looking for help." Several negative comments provided by the athletes supported the theme of missed class and accommodating athletes.

Theme 2: Athletes are poor students

The dumb jock stereotype implies that athletes are not capable of doing the same schoolwork as their non-athlete peers (Simons et. al., 2007). The second negative theme would suggest that some professors believed athletes generally were poor students. A

participant stated, “One professor plainly stated that she despised [sport] players because we missed class for games and weren’t committed to class and therefore we were of lower quality than normal students.” Another athlete wrote, “A professor made a remark saying that most athletes get worse grades than normal students.” One professor addressed the academic integrity of athletes as stated in this comment by a participant, “My [subject] professor does not sign progress reports because she will automatically give a bad grade and states that we don’t work hard enough and always cheat.” A final comment demonstrating the theme of athletes as poor students a participant wrote, “Why do we even need to build a stadium if our athletes aren’t even smart enough to be at this school?” These remarks supplied by the participants suggested that a negative stereotype of athletes might have existed at least for some professors on this campus.

Theme 3: Athletes care more about sports than school

Student athletes must develop competencies in two domains: academics and athletics (Hollis, 2002). Athletes must divide their time between a rigorous athletics schedule and a demanding academic program. As a result, academic and athletic interests often appear to be in competition for the student athlete’s attention. The participants suggested some professors believed athletes were only at the institution for athletic reasons by providing several negative comments. One athlete stated, “A professor made a remark to me that all athletes care about is the sport they play and not at all about their education.” Another athlete responded, “A professor commented on the stupidity and pointlessness of sports and that it takes away from time to learn.” After being given a hard time for missing class for an athletic event, a professor asked a

participant, “Are you here for school or for ball?” Finally in a comment made by a professor to an athlete, the participant stated, “A professor told me I was wasting my time with sport and that I should focus on [class] and that I need to make a decision.” These remarks suggested a negative perception of athletes caring more about sport than school.

Positive remarks made by professors in class

Several of the responses to this question (26%) were categorized as positive. The participants’ positive written comments fell under two themes: athletes possessed the ability to balance school and sports and athletes build life skills through sports. Each theme will be discussed in the following section, supported by specific quotes from the participants.

Theme 1: Athletes possessed the ability to balance school and sports

Even though some participants reported professors’ negative perceptions of athletes not being able to handle the academic and athletic demands, not all professors held this view. Some participants reported their professors praised them for being able to handle both responsibilities successfully. One athlete responded, “I have always received positive feedback from professors…of how I can juggle between practices, team meetings, road trips, and school work.” Another athlete stated, “Our teacher talked about the dedication of athletes to not only their sport, but to their schoolwork and it’s something to be proud of.” Finally, one participant recorded the remark made by a professor in class by stating, “Student athletes are hard workers. They are to be commended for all their hard work inside and outside of the classroom.” Work ethic,

dedication, and time management skills appeared in many of the comments that fell under this theme.

Theme 2: Athletes build life skills through sports

Much debate continues on whether sports build life skills in athletes (Potuto & Hanlon, 2007). Some professors at this institution made comments that suggest athletics offer benefits to participants. One remark made by a professor in class suggested athletes learn to work hard in sports. One athlete wrote, "[My professor] stated she admires and acknowledges that fact that student athletes are required to work harder." Often professors mentioned how athletics can be a benefit as a resume builder. A participant stated about a professor "talking about what companies want from students…athletics looks good, shows leadership, time management." Finally, an athlete remembered a remark stating, "[athletes] lead by example and are hard workers." The participants' responses under this theme repeatedly suggested the concept of athletics developing skills that employers sought.

Question 2: Professor Singles You Out in Class for Being an Athlete

The response rate of the second question was lower than the first question. In addition, many of the comments included answers referring back to what was written to the previous question. From the available data regarding being singled out in class, many of the responses echoed the themes of the first question. Neutral, negative, and positive comments emerged.

Neutral responses

Fifty-one percent of the total responses to this question were categorized as neutral. These comments related to remarks involving success of the player or team and using the athlete as an example for class discussion. One participant stated, "I have had a teacher say good game last night or ask how the team did." Another athlete recalled a professor "specifically asking me how the team was and how I was playing." Participants frequently responded that professors included them as part of the class discussion. As one athlete stated about a comment made by a professor, "It was just an example of what he was talking about." A professor singled out another participant "to give an athlete's perspective on a topic." Finally, an athlete stated, "A professor used me as an example to encourage communication." I categorized these remarks as neutral because they do not reflect a positive or negative connotation.

Negatively singling out an athlete in class

Theme 1: Athletes miss class and seek accommodations

After reviewing the written comments of the participants, theme development revealed a similar negative theme to the first question. Many participants (28%) reported negative comments relating to missed class time and assignments and being hassled when trying to make up the work. One participant stated, "I was singled out in a class after missing a homework assignment. She said, 'Since you are an athlete you probably expect me to extend the deadline?'" Another athlete added how one professor "made a big deal out loud about me having to re-schedule a quiz." Finally, one participant stated, "A professor just made a comment about quizzes that we took and wouldn't let me take it because of a road trip. I was mad and thought it was unfair." The participant responses

to this question reinforce the theme of professors' displeasure in athletes missing class and seeking accommodations.

Positively singling out an athlete out in class

Theme 1: Athletics builds life skills

Many of the athletes (20%) also reported positive comments heard from professors. The positive theme of athletics developing life skills emerged similarly to the first question. Participants reported professors stating how the demands of being an athlete will translate to real life. One participant wrote, "My professor always talks about me and my role on the team and how it will relate to the real world." Another athlete suggested how sport helped with time management by stating, "We began talking about time management in class one day and she asked me in front of the whole class, how I manage my time due to my commitments as a [sport] player." Another participant stated, "The professor talked about student athletes being successful in the field because of our work ethic and our ability to adapt." Finally, an athlete provided a general comment about a professor "talking about teamwork and commitment." These positive comments supported the theme from the first question suggesting athletics might play a part in building skills such as time management, work ethic, teamwork, and commitment.

Current Results Compared to the Original Study

After reviewing the data collected from this study, I compared the findings of the existing study performed by Simons et al. (2007). The second research question was as follows:

Research Question 2: Do the perceptions and treatment of the athletes at this university differ from the athletes' perceptions and treatment in the original study?

Although I did not have access to the raw data or complete statistical analysis from the original study, some comparison between the two studies could be done.

The theme of academic success and interest showed some differences. When participants responded to a negative attitude of a professor, 35% athletes in the original study chose to work hard to show athletes are good students compared to 66% of the athletes at this institution. In the current study, 15% of the athletes dropped the class when a professor had a negative attitude in the original study, while only 7% of the participants dropped the class in the current study.

Athletic identity-related data also showed differences between the two projects. Simons et al. (2007) reported 55.4% of the participants "rarely" or "never" hide their athletic identity. The current study reported 84% of athletes within the same two categories not hiding their identity.

Within the theme of professors' perceptions and treatment, the data from the closed ended questions showed some differences between the participants in this study and the Simons et al. (2007) study. The differences between the two studies are shown in Table 29.

Table 29

Differences Between the Two Studies Depicting Professors' Perceptions of Athletes as Reported by Participants

Survey Item	Current Study	Simons et al. (2007) study
Participants Reporting Professors' Negative Perception of Student Athletes in General	12%	33%
Participants Reporting "Never" Receiving a Lower Grade Than Deserved Because of Student Athlete Status	62%	73%
Participants Reporting a Professor Making a Negative Remark in Class that Athletes Are Only Interested In Sports	38%	28%
Participants Reporting a Professor Making a Negative Remark in Class that Athletes Are Not Qualified to be at This University	8%	25%
Participants Reporting a Professor Making a Negative Remark in Class that Athletes Cheat and Have Others Do Their Work	6%	15.5%
Participants Reporting a Professor Making a Negative Remark in Class that Athletes Shouldn't be in the Class	5%	15.7%

The two studies did have some similar results within the perception theme. In terms of getting a hard time or being refused accommodations for missing class, both studies had comparable results. The Simons et al. (2007) study noted 38% of the participants never had a hard time being accommodated, while this study revealed 43%. The participants in both projects reported a low percentage for being accused of cheating of less than 10%. Similar results indicated that near 75% of athletes at both institutions "rarely" or "never" received special treatment from professors. When asked if the participants had ever received a higher grade than they deserved, 85% in the current study indicated that they "never" had this happen with only a slightly higher percentage (89%) stating the same in the original study. In both studies, participants indicated that professors felt some athletes expect special treatment they do not deserve with the results

only differing by 3%. Other comparable results indicated that the negative comments heard in class, athletes don't participate and athletes turn in late assignments, only were separated by a few percentage points.

The qualitative comments supplied by the participants produced similar themes. Simons et al. (2007) suggested lack of intellectual ability and special or unequal treatment as two negative themes. These areas closely align with athletes are poor students and missed class and special accommodations, two of the themes presented in this study. Positive themes also appeared to relate between the two studies. The original study suggested that some participants reported faculty who understood and supported the athletes and used athletics as an example for class discussion. These positive comments also were demonstrated in this study.

Summary

This project examined faculty perceptions of athletes at a NCAA Division II institution from the athletes' perspective by using a similar protocol to the Simons et al. (2007) study. This chapter included the results from the quantitative data analysis and the themes that emerged from the qualitative data obtained from survey questions. A total of 252 athletes participated in the study.

The responses to the closed-end survey question were grouped into four themes: (a) participants' demographic information, (b) academic success or interest shown by athletes, (c) athletic identity-related items, and (d) perceptions or treatment of athletes by professors. The overall results suggested the following general findings. White/Caucasian males represent the largest demographic group. The athletes' GPA was

almost identical to the general student population, which along with the other academic related information suggested that the majority of participants showed considerable interest in academic success. Nearly all of the participants could be identified as athletes, but only a few attempted to hide their athletic identity. Although participants signified some professors made negative remarks about athletes, a larger percentage reported positive comments made by professors. Finally, the participants indicated the general perception of professors as either neutral or positive towards athletes.

The qualitative portion of the survey allowed participants to respond to the situations of a professor making a remark in class and a professor singling out an athlete in class. The written responses to the open-ended questions produced three negative and two positive themes. The negative themes included (a) professors giving athletes a hard time for missed class due to athletic events, (b) professors stating athletes were poor students, (c) professors belief that athletes care more about sport than school. The first positive theme that emerged from the qualitative data was professors commending athletes' ability to balance academics and athletics. Participants also reported that professors expressed how athletics would help build life skills.

In general, the results from this study were comparable to the original study. In the Simons et al. (2007) study a lower percentage of participants choose to work hard to show that athletes could be successful in class and never or rarely hid their athletic identity. A larger percentage of athletes in the original study reported never receiving a lower grade than they deserved. Finally, the participants in the previous study generally had a more negative perception of professors from the closed ended items.

CHAPTER V

Summary and Discussion

This final chapter includes an overview of the research findings, implications of the results, and future areas for research. The purpose of this study was twofold. First, this study examined how current athletes believed faculty members on a small, private, comprehensive NCAA Division II college campus in the mid-western United States perceived them. Secondly, the results were compared to the findings of a previous study using similar protocol preformed on a large, public, highly-selective west coast NCAA Division I institution by Simons et al. (2007). Two research questions were posed in this study as follows:

Research Question 1: How do athletes believe professors perceive and treat them?

Research Question 2: Do the perceptions and treatment of the athletes at this university differ from the athletes' perceptions and treatment in the Simons et al. (2007) study?

Review of Methodology

This investigation attempted to gauge the current perceptions and attitudes of faculty members towards NCAA Division II athletes as reported by athletes. Establishing an approximation of the existing perceptions of student-athletes at this university might lead to a better understanding of the challenges facing athletes at NCAA Division II universities.

The original study by Simons et al. (2007) examined the perceptions of athletes at a selective, public, Division I campus. In the previous study, the researchers concluded that an athlete stigma existed. Following the original study's protocol, this study investigated the existence of a similar stereotype on a Division II campus. The instrument contained demographic questions and items about academic experiences. Both closed and open-ended questions were used to assess the perceptions and treatment of the participants. I analyzed the data from the closed-ended survey questions through Chi-square tests to determine whether the observed frequencies of responses were significantly different from the expected frequencies (Best & Kahn, 2006). Crosstabulation was also performed for each item to determine whether differences in the expected and observed frequencies existed for gender and race groups. I used an inductive analysis approach to develop themes from the qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions (Hatch, 2002). By combining the data gained from the statistical calculations and the themes, I was able to develop an approximation of the existing perceptions of student-athletes at this university.

Summary of Results

Previous research indicated that a dumb jock stereotype does exist on college campuses (Baucon & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom et al., 1995; Engstrom & Sedlsacek, 1991, 1993; Leach & Conners, 1984; Sailes, 1993; Web et al., 1998; Zingg, 1982). This stereotype depicts someone who only cares about athletic performance to the detriment of academic concerns (Zingg, 1982). Simons et al. (2007) suggested the presence of an athlete stigma held by professors and teaching assistants in that study. The existence of a

stigma, which Crocker et al. (1998) defined as "an attribute or characteristic that conveys a social identity that is devalued in a particular context" (p. 505), did not appear to be as strong at this institution. Participants reported high levels of academic interest, nearly full disclosure of their athletic identity, and generally favorable faculty perceptions and treatment.

Many of the findings indicated that the participants cared about success in the academic realm, which was similar to the results found by Simons et al. (2007). The athletes' self-reported GPA was comparable to that of the general student population. A large majority of athletes stated they regularly attended class, turned in assignments on time, and worked hard to show athletes were good students. When taking a class with a professor who possessed a negative attitude towards athletes, very few participants reacted by dropping the class, by not attending, by not participating, or by focusing more on sport. In fact, two-thirds of the participants in this situation chose to work hard to show athletes are good students. Previous research has suggested that athletes often take less rigorous coursework in order to remain eligible for competition (Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007; Suggs, 2003; Zingg, 1982). Of the athletes in this study, less than one-third signified that they had been told to avoid harder classes or to take "athlete-friendly" classes. In addition, friends and teammates, not coaches, were the most frequently cited as recommending avoiding a particular class. All of these findings indicated that the participants cared about their academic success, which directly contradicts a dumb jock stereotype.

Simons et al. (2007) also suggested that athletes try to hide their athletic identity to avoid the negative stereotype. In this study, nearly all of participants indicated they

were identifiable to others as athletes, but only 16% attempted to hide this identity. Athletes are often forced to reveal their identity when asking for accommodations due to missed class caused when traveling on road trips (Simons et al., 2007). In this investigation, 73% of the participants reported revealing their identity for road trips was rarely or never an issue. The athletes' openness with their athletic identity may suggest the negative repercussions often associated with the negative stereotype did not exist to the same degree on this campus.

The most intriguing element of this study may be the perceptions held by faculty as signified by the athletes. The results from the Simons et al. (2007) study indicated one third of the athletes reported a negative attitude towards athletes held by faculty existed on that campus. Only 12% of the athletes reported a negative perception held by professors in the current study. The comments within the negative themes in the open-ended survey items provide the strongest evidence that some professors on this campus view athletes negatively. Regarding the open-ended item of a professor making a remark about student-athletes in class, 75 of the 166 responses were categorized as negative. When asked to provide examples of incidents when a professor singled an athlete out in class, 31 of the 109 responses were negative. These negative remarks characterized athletes as poor students, suggested athletes were only interested in sport, and asserted athletes expect special accommodations for missed class.

The students' views of their own attitudes suggested that they cared about academics. As stated earlier, the data suggested athletes cared about academics. In terms of special treatment, the participants indicated they rarely received preferential treatment or grades that were higher or lower than they deserved due to their athlete status. The

final negative area of missed classes seemed to provide the greatest incidence of criticism towards athletes. Participants' responses on both closed and open-ended survey items indicated this area created at least an occasional "hard time" for athletes. It is important to note how many different faculty members held these views could not be determined from the survey data. Therefore, only a few professors or several members of the faculty could hold this view, which makes judging how widespread this attitude was on campus hard to gauge. What this study did measure was the number of athletes who reported receiving a hard time from a professor when asking for accommodations. The closed ended results indicated that 33% of the athletes had been given a hard time or were refused accommodations. From the open-ended questions, 20% of the total responses related to the negative issue of missed class for athletic events. Regardless, there were professors who made disparaging remarks about athletes or singled out athletes in class.

Conversely, participants also indicated professors made positive remarks about athletes in class. From the closed ended items, the positive comments designated by the participants included that athletes work hard (55%) and possess the ability to balance academics and athletics (41%). When given the opportunity to provide positive remarks made by professors, 35 out of 166 participants included observations about athletes' time management skills, work ethic, and ability to balance athletics and academics. Participants stated professors often used athletes as examples for class discussion in a positive way. Considering the majority of participants categorized the general perception held by faculty members as neutral or positive and the presence of positive remarks made in class, arguing an extensive occurrence of an athletic stigma on this campus would be difficult to support.

In a few of the survey items, crosstabulation did reveal differences between race groups and gender. Any conclusions drawn from the data involving race groups should come with the caveat that this study had little ethnic diversity, which accurately mirrored the predominately White/Caucasian student body on the university's campus. Simons et al. (2007) suggested the athlete stigma was worse for African American athletes. The majority of athletes indicated that race/ethnicity never positively or negatively influenced their treatment as a student athlete in the current investigation. There were statistically significant differences within the survey items in relation to race/ethnicity that might suggest a slightly worse stigma for African American and other race/ethnicity groups. The percentage of African American and other race/ethnicities reporting race as rarely a negative influence in their treatment as a student athlete was higher than the White/Caucasian group. Other statistically significantly differences included a lower percentage of African American and other race/ethnicity participants than White/Caucasian participants reporting always turning in assignments on time. Alone these two findings might imply the athlete stigma affected African American and other race/ethnicity groups to a greater degree. But some evidence also suggested the opposite to be true. A higher percentage of African American athletes than White/Caucasian athletes indicated never being given a hard time or being refused accommodation for athletic related commitments. The results from this study regarding race/ethnicity did not appear to increase the athlete stigma to the same level as was suggested in previous studies.

Within the results, some statistically significant differences also occurred between genders. In a study performed by Webb et al. (1998), faculty attitudes towards female

athletes were examined suggesting some negative perceptions could occur. The results from the current investigation indicated that a lower percentage of female athletes heard negative remarks from professors about not participating in class and only being interested in sports. In addition, more female participants reported using professor's office hours and always attending class. Finally, the percentage of female athletes reporting never hiding their identity was higher than their male counterpart's percentage. All of these findings provide little support for a negative perception of female athletes in this study.

Implications

The media often suggest that the term student-athlete is an oxymoron, an improbable combination, or polar opposites in the worst-case scenarios of well-publicized cases when athletes are exploited for their athletic talents then cast aside receiving little actual education. Tragically, this may be reality at a few institutions, or for a few athletes, but before labeling all athletes as proverbial "dumb jocks," they deserve a second look. Stereotypes, as suggested by Allport (1954), facilitate the comprehension of information by categorizing people into groups. However, inferences based on limited information or any single characteristic can lead to prejudice and discrimination (Schneider, 2004). The dumb jock stereotype assumes a lack of academic ability and motivation (Simons et al., 2007) that may not the justified.

In this study, the participants reported positive academic habits like attending class regularly, turning assignments in on time, and respectable grade point averages. Several athletes reported positive statements made by professors about how hard athletes

work and their ability to balance academic and athletic commitments. In addition, very few participants were accused of cheating or reported receiving a different grade than they deserved. Considering these positive habits and remarks, the fact that most of the athletes did not hide their athletic identity even when confronted with asking for accommodations from professors for missing class may not be surprising. The participants in this study appeared to refute the prejudicial view of the athlete being only interested in sports.

Despite the evidence of many positive academic habits and success, some data revealed the presence of a dumb jock stereotype on this campus as well. Participants reported some negative and even borderline hurtful comments made by professors regarding the "pointlessness" of sport or poor academic ability of athletes. The greatest area of frustration appeared to be connected to accommodating athletes for missed class due to athletic events. Adjusting class assignments or making special accommodations could be considered an added hassle by professors, especially when the athlete asserts he or she has a "right" to make up assignments or gives late notice for missing class. As Biernat (2003) suggested, a "stereotyping effect" occurs when individual members are judged based on the expectations of the group. Some of these negative comments may have been based on previous detrimental experiences with non-academically minded athletes who displayed the characteristics of the stereotypical dumb jock. This experience could heighten the level of awareness faculty possesses for athletes and non-academic behaviors (Simons et al., 2007). Missing class may be construed as a lack of interest in academics on behalf of the athlete when in fact, traveling for away contests is a

necessary part of collegiate athletics. Asking for accommodations might be viewed better as a true concern for what will be missed than an excuse to "slack off" in class.

Simons et al. (2007) asked the question, "Why is it acceptable to openly disparage athletes while it is not acceptable to do the same for other stigmatized groups?" (p.268). Although it may be beyond the scope of this study to answer this question, the fair treatment of all students should be a goal for individuals in higher education. Athletes might be viewed as privileged and therefore garner more attention than "regular" students. Athletes may have to miss class for away contests and require extra accommodations. Nevertheless, athletes do not necessarily view athletic success as more important than academic achievement. The findings from this study could be used as a reminder to faculty that all athletes should be evaluated on their individual merits instead of broad generalizations. While the results of this study suggest this NCAA Division II institution treats and perceives athletes in a more positive light than the original study, there is still room for improvement.

Recommendations for Future Research

Several potential areas for further research exist. NCAA Division II members are a diverse collection of schools. This investigation was conducted at a small, private, comprehensive institution, which represents only a small sector of this division. The inability to generalize these results to all Division II schools would be a limitation of this study. By performing this test on a variety of Division II campuses across the United States, a more accurate representation of an athlete stigma or stereotype might be established. In addition to Division II institutions, this research project could be

performed on a NCAA Division III campus. Division III prohibits the awarding of athletic-based scholarships, which could potentially influence the faculty's perceptions of athletes on those campuses.

Another area for further study could attempt to determine what factors within a college setting influence the presence of this stereotype. Attributes such as admission standards, number of athletic scholarships awarded, success of the team or individual athlete, the number of students enrolled, the level of alumni support, and race/ethnic composition of faculty and students could all affect the prevalence of a dumb jock stereotype. A study attempting to decipher these factors could be valuable.

Why some gender differences occurred would also be a potential area for further investigation. Previous studies focusing on perceptions of female athletes and academic achievement were limited. Lack of revenue production, lower publicity and media coverage, and level of play may all contribute to the lack of research. Whether female athletes are considered more academic than the male counterparts, could also be studied.

Finally, since this stereotype existed, although to a lesser degree on this campus, a research project investigating ways to reduce the stereotype may also be warranted. By studying measures to reduce stereotypes taken by other groups, a plan to decrease the dumb jock stereotype might be created. This type of study could potentially benefit future generations of athletes.

Summary

The purpose of this project was to examine faculty perceptions of athletes at a NCAA Division II institution from the athletes' perspective using similar protocol to the

Simons et al. (2007) study. Despite studies demonstrating academic achievement and motivation for many athletes, evidence suggests a dumb jock stereotype still exists on college campuses (Baucon & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom & Sedlsacek, 1991, 1993; Engstrom et al., 1995; Zingg, 1982). Athletes must successfully balance the dual role of athlete and student despite time-constraints and competing external pressures from both athletic and academic entities. The participants in this study reported positive academic habits like attending class regularly, turning assignments in on time, and respectable grade point averages. Even with the evidence of the positive academic habits and success, some data revealed the presence of a dumb jock stereotype on this campus. However, the prevalence of an athlete stigma appeared to be less than in the original study.

REFERENCES

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). Role conflict and identity salience: College athletics and the academic role. *Social Science Journal*, *24*, 443-455.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

American Institute for Research. (1988). *Summary results for the 1987-88 national study of intercollegiate athletes* (Report No. 1). Palo Alto, CA: Center for the Study of Athletics.

Aries, E., McCarthy, D., & Salovey, P. (2004). A comparison of athletes and non-athletes at highly selective colleges: Academic performance and personal development. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(6), 577-602.

Armstrong, S., & Oomen-Early, J. (2009). Social connectedness, self-esteem, and depression symptomatology among collegiate athletes versus nonathletes. *Journal of American College Health*, *57*(5), 521-526.

Banks, S.A. (1983). Sport: Academic stepchild. *Journal of Popular Culture, 16*(4), 90-100.

Baucom, C., & Lantz, C. (2001). Faculty attitudes toward male division II student – athletes. *Journal of Sport and Behavior*; 24(3), 265-276.

Behind the blue disk: Division I academic progress rate (APR). (2009). Retrieved from the National Collegiate Athletic Association website: http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?ContentID=45983&gclid=CKDCwd2P7JkCFSAhDQodMlKhRg

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Beyer, J., & Hannah, D. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, *14*(2), 105-132.

Biernat, M. (2003). Toward a broader view of social stereotyping. *The American Psychologist*, *58*(12), 1019-1027.

Boone, T. (2004). Sports, its purpose, and dietary supplements. *Journal of Professional Exercise Physiology*, *2*(6), 1-1.

Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (1993). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or Achilles heel? *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *24*, 237-254.

Broughton, E., & Neyer, M. (2001). Advising and counseling student athletes. *New Directions For Student Services, 93,* 47-53.

Brown, G. (2008). Academic success up in Div. II. *The NCAA News, 45(22), 11.*

Burke, K. L. (1993). The negative stereotyping of student athletes. In W.D. Kirk & S.V. Kirk (Eds.), *Student athletes: Shattering the myths and sharing the realities* (pp. 93-98). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Carodine, K., Almond, K., & Gratto, K. (2001). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services, 93,* 19-33.

Chu, D. (1985). The American conception of higher education and the formal incorporation of intercollegiate sport. In D. Chu, J.O. Segrave, & B. J. Becker, (Eds.) *Sport and higher education* (pp.35-55). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Coakley, J. J. (1990). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Times Mirror/Mosby.

Coakley, J. J. (2007). *Sports in society: issues and controversies*(4th ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Comeaux, E., & Harrison, K. (2007). Faculty and male student athletes: Racial differences in the environmental predictors of academic achievement. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(2), 199-214.

Covell, D., & Barr, C. A. (2001). The ties that bind: Presidential involvement with the development of NCAA division I initial eligibility legislation. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(4), 414-452.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. M. (1998). Social Stigma. In S.T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.). (pp.504-553). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Demographic profile. (2009). Ashland University Office of Institutional Research. Ashland, OH: Ashland University.

Dovidio, J. F., Major, B., & Crocker, J. (2000). Stigma: Introduction and overviews. In T. F. Heatherton (ed.), *The social psychology of stigma.* (pp. 1-28). New York, NY: Guilford.

Drake Group Proposals. (n.d.). Retrieved from The Drake Group website: http://www.thedrakegroup.org/proposals.html

Edwards, H. (1984). The Black "dumb jock": An American sports tragedy. *College Board Review*, *131*, 8-13.

Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of the prejudice toward university student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*(1), 189-193.

Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1993). Attitudes of residence hall students toward student athletes: Implications for advising, training, and programming. *Journal of College and University Student Housing, 23*, 28-33.

Engstrom, C. M., Sedlacek, W. E., & McEwen, M. (1995). Faculty attitudes towards male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(3), 217-227.

Facts about Ashland University. (2008). Retrieved March 23, 2009 from Ashland University Web site: http://www.ashland.edu/about/aufacts.html

Fiske, S.T. (1998). Stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination. In S.T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.). (pp. 357-414). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Freshman-cohort graduation rates:2000-01. (2008). Ashland, Ohio: Ashland University, Department of Athletics.

Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2004). Examining academic and athletic motivation among student athletes at a division I university. *Journal of College Student Development*, *45*(1), 75-83.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigmas: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gupta, K. (1999). *A practical guide to needs assessment.* San Francisco, CA: Pfieffer.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Harding, J., Proshnsky, H., Kutner, B., & Chein, I. (1969). Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social* psychology (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 1-76). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Heck, R. H., & Takahashi, R. (2006). Examining the impact of proposition 48 on graduation rates in division IA football and program recruiting behavior: Testing a policy change model. *Educational Policy, 20*(4), 587-614.

Hollis, L. (2002). Service ace? Which academic services and resources truly benefit student athletes. *Journal of College Student Retention, 3*(3), 265-284.

Hood, A. B., Craig, A. F., & Ferguson, B. W. (1992). The impact of athletics, part-time employment, and other activities on academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Development, 33,* 447-453.

Hrabowski, F. A. (2002). Postsecondary minority student achievement: How to raise performance and close the achievement gap. *The College Board Press, 195*, 40-48.

Jolly, J. (2008). Raising the question # 9: Is the student-athlete population unique? and why should we care? *Communication Education*, *57*(1), 145-151.

Kirk, W. D., & Kirk, S. V. (1993). The African American student athlete. In W.D. Kirk & S.V. Kirk (Eds.), *Student athletes: Shattering the myths and sharing the realities* (pp. 99-109). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Knapp, T., Rasmussen, C., & Barnhart, R. (2001). What college students say about intercollegiate athletics: A survey of attitudes and beliefs. *College Student Journal, 35*(1), 96-100.

Knight Commission. (1989). *Knight Commission.* Retrieved from the Knight Commission website: http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=64&Itemid=9

Knight Commission. (1991). *Keeping the faith with the student-athlete: A new model for intercollegiate athletics*. Charlotte, NC: Knight Commission.

Knight Commission. (2001). *A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Charlotte, NC: Knight Commission.

Leach, B., & Conners, B. (1984). Pygmalion on the gridiron: The Black student-athlete in a White university. In A. Shriberg & F. R. Brodziniki (Eds.) *Rethinking services for college athletes. New directions for student services*, no. 28. (pp. 31-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marks, S. R. (1977). Multiple role strain: Some notes on human energy, time, and commitment. *American Sociological Review, 42*(6), 921-936.

Matheson, G. (2005). Sports gone wild. *Physician and Sportsmedicine, 33*(3), 2.

NCAA Division I Graduation Success Rate / Division II Academic Success Rate. (2008). Retrieved from the National Collegiate Athletic Association website: http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?ContentID=5652

NCAAStudent.org. (2007). Retrieved from the National Collegiate Athletic Association website: http://www.NCAAStudent.org

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Pascarella, E.T., & Smart, J. C. (1991). Impact of intercollegiate athletic participation for african american and caucasian men: Some further evidence. *Journal of College Student Development, 32,* 123-130.

Pascarella, E.T., Truckenmiller, R., Nora, A., Terenzini, P.T., Edison, M., & Hagedorn, L. S. (1999). Cognitive impacts of intercollegiate athletic participation: some further evidence. *Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1)*,* 1-26.

Perlmutter, D. (October, 2003). Black athletes and white professors: A twilight zone of uncertainty. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(7), B7.

Person, D. R., Benson-Quaziena, M., & Rogers, A. M. (2001). Female student athletes and student athletes of color. *New Directions For Student Services, 93,* 55-64.

Pittinsky, T., Shih, M., & Ambady, N. (2000). Will a category cue affect you? category cues, positive stereotypes and reviewer recall for applicants. *Social Psychology of Education*, *4*(1), 53-65.

Potuto, J., & O'Hanlon, J. (2007). National study of student athletes regarding their experiences as college students. *College Student Journal*, *41*(4), 947-966.

Purdy, D., Eitzen, D. S., & Hufnagel, R. (1985). Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of college athletes. In D. Chu, J. O. Segrave, & B. J. Becker (Eds.), *Sport and Higher Education.* (pp.221-234). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Ryan, T. (1989). Participation in intercollegiate athletics: Affective outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development,* 39, 122-128.

Sack. A. L., & Staurowsky, E. J. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

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

Schneider, D. J. (2004). *The psychology of stereotyping.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Schwarz, H., Groves, R. M., & Schuman, H. (1998). Social stigma. In S.T. Fiske, D. T. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed.). (pp. 143-179). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Sedlacek, W. E., Brooks, G. C., & Glenwood, C. Jr. (1967). The development of a measure of racial attitudes. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED037497)

Sellers, R. M. (1992). Racial differences in the predictors of academic achievement of student athletes of division I revenue-producing sports. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 1,*46-51.

Settles, I. H., Sellers, R. M., & Damas, A. (2002). One role or two? The function of psychological separation in role conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 574-582.

Shavelson, R. J. (1996). *Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2000). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Simons, H., Bosworth, C., Fujita, S., & Jensen, M. (2007). The athlete stigma in higher education. *College Student Journal*, *41*(2), 251-273. Retrieved June 28, 2008, from Education Research Complete database.

Simons, H., & Van Rheenen, D. (2000). Noncognitive predictors of student athletes' academic performance. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 30*(2), 167-181.

Simons, H., Van Rheenen, D., & Covington, M. (1999). Academic motivation and the student-athlete. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(2), 151-162.

Smith, E. B., & Dizney, H. F. (1966). Academic achievement and progress of participants in intercollegiate football. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 7,* 349-350.

Snyder, E. E. (1985). A theoretical analysis of academic and athletic roles. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 2,* 210-217.

Sojka, G. S. (1983). Evolution of the student athlete in America. *Journal of Popular Culture, 16*(4), 54-67.

Spence, C. M. (2000). *The skin I'm in: Racism, sports and education.* Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publications.

Staurowsky, E. J., & Sack, A. L. (2005). Reconsidering the use of the term student-athlete in academic research. *Journal of Sports Management*, 19,103-116.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist, 52*, 613-629.

Stuart, D. (1985). Academic preparation and subsequent performance of intercollegiate football players. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26,* 124-129.

Suggs, W. (January, 2003). Jock majors. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(19), A33.

Umbach, P. D., Palmer, M. M., Kuh, G. D., & Hannah, S. J. (2006). Intercollegiate athletes and effective educational practices: Winning combination or losing effort? *Research in Higher Education*, *47*(6), 709 - 733.

Watt, S. K., & Moore, J. L. (2001). Who are student-athletes? *New Directions for Student Services, 93*, 7-18.

Webb, S. J., Molstad, S. M., & Kher, N. (1998). Faculty attitudes toward female college student-athletes. *International Sports Journal, 2*(2), 86-95.

Wright, A., & Côté, J. (2003). A retrospective analysis of leadership development through sport. *Sport Psychologist*, *17*(3), 268-291.

Yopyk, D., & Prentice, D. (2005). Am I an athlete or a student? Identity salience and stereotype threat in student-athletes. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 27*(4), 329-336.

Zingg, P. J. (1982). Advising the student athlete. *Educational Record, 63,* 16-19.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES OF STUDENT ATHLETES

Year in School: ☐ Freshman ☐ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐ Senior
Gender: ☐ Male ☐Female

Race/Ethnicity: please check one:

☐ African-American/Black
☐ White / Caucasian
☐ American Indian/Alaskan Native/Pacific Islander
☐ Hispanic
☐ Asian-American
☐ Other _____

What sport do you participate in? _____

Are you on an athletic scholarship? ☐ Full ☐ Partial ☐ No scholarship

Cumulative GPA _____

Major or intended major _____

Are you physically identifiable by others as an athlete? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, briefly state why? (optional) _____

Part A: General Academic Experiences

• I try to hide my student athlete identity from my professors

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• If wasn't for road trips I wouldn't identify myself as an athlete (in my classes)

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I receive preferential treatment from professors (extended deadlines, credit for a missed assignment, etc.) due to my student athlete status.

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I received a higher grade than I deserved from a professor because I am a student athlete.

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I received a lower grade than I deserved from a professor because I am a student athlete.

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I have been suspected or accused of cheating by a professor in a class because I am a student athlete.

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

• My race/ethnicity positively influenced the way I was treated as a student athlete in a course.

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

• My race/ethnicity negatively influenced the way I was treated as a student athlete in a course.

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

• A professor gave me a hard time or refused to make an accommodation for me when I went on a road trip or had some other athletic commitment.

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

• A professor made a negative remark about student athletes in class.

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

Please check all remarks that a professor made.

☐ Athletes aren't academically qualified to be at this university
☐ Athletes shouldn't be in the class.
☐ Athletes are only interested in sports.
☐ Athletes don't participate in class.
☐ Athletes turn in assignments late or not at all
☐ Athletes cheat and have others do their work.
☐ Athletes expect special treatment that they don't deserve.

• A professor made a positive remark about student athletes in class

□ Always □ Often □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

Please check all remarks that a professor made.

☐ Athletes work hard

☐ Athletes are to be admired for their ability to balance academics and athletics.

☐ Athletes are good for the school's reputation

• I have been encouraged to avoid “harder” or take easier "athlete friendly classes:"

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, by whom? (check all that apply)

☐ Coaches ☐ Family

☐ Teammates ☐ Friends

☐ Advisers ☐ Other

• If I feel a professor has a negative attitude toward me because I am a student athlete, I usually: (check all that apply)

☐ Work hard to show that athletes are good students ☐ Complain to the professor

☐ Don't participate ☐ Complain to a higher power (adviser, department chair, dean)

☐ Attending class less often

☐ Drop the class ☐ Focus more on sports

☐ Keep identity hidden ☐ Other _____

• I go to professors’ office hours

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I attend my classes

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I turn in my assignments on time

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I sit with other athletes in my classes

☐ Always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never

• I feel that <u>in general</u> professors perceive student athletes

☐ Very Negatively ☐ Negatively ☐ Neutral ☐ Positively ☐ Very positively

Part B: Descriptions of Specific Experiences
The following items ask about specific experiences. If you have had more than one experience, please choose one that stands out most clearly in your mind.

• A professor makes a remark about student-athletes in class.
Please describe one incident that stands out in your mind.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Faculty/Cass description

Professor:
☐ Female ☐ Male

☐ Lower level (100/200)
☐ Upper level (300/400)

Class taken as requirement for:
☐ Core
☐ Major
☐ Elective

Were there other student athletes in the class? _____ If yes, how many?_____

• A professor singles you out in class for being a student-athlete.
Please describe one incident that stands out in your mind.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Faculty/Class description

Professor:
☐ Female ☐ Male

☐ Lower level (100/200)
☐ Upper level (300/400)

Class taken as requirement for:
☐ Core
☐ Major
☐ Elective

Were there other student athletes in the class? _____ If yes, how many?_____

• My race/ethnicity influenced the way I was treated as a student athlete in a course. Please describe one incident that stands out in your mind.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Faculty/Class description

Professor:

☐ Female ☐ Male

☐ Lower level (100/200) ☐ Upper level (300/400)

Class taken as requirement for:

☐ Core ☐ Major ☐ Elective

Were there other student athletes in the class? _____ If yes, how many?_____

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PERMISSION FORMS

The Graduate School

TO: Jennifer Parsons

FROM: Randy Gearhart, Chair

DATE: April 20, 2009

RE: Human Subjects Review Board Approval

The Human Subjects Review Board has approved the research proposal you submitted. You may proceed with the project.

The primary function of the HSRB is to ensure protection of human research subjects. As a result of this mandate, we ask that you pay close attention to the fundamental ethical principles of autonomy, justice, and beneficence when establishing your research proposal. These ethical principles pertain specifically to the issues of informed consent, fair selection of subjects, and risk/benefit considerations.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Randy Gearhart
Phone: 419-207-6198
Fax: 419-289-5460
E-mail: rgearhar@ashland.edu

Ashland University
Department of Athletics

401 College Avenue • Ashland, Ohio 44805
Phone: (419) 289-5441 • Website: www.ashland.edu/athletics
NCAA Division II • Member of Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference

To whom it may concern,

Jennifer Parsons has my permission to use student-athletes at Ashland University as participants in her study regarding the perception of athletes on our campus for her dissertation research. I understand that the athletes' responses to the survey will remain anonymous.

Bill Goldring, Athletic Director
Ashland University

3/30/09
Date

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO PARTICIPANTS

INSTRUCTIONS AND ORAL STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

FOR SURVEY

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. Your decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on your present or future status as an athlete at Ashland University. If in the future after completing the survey you decide you want to withdraw from this study or have any questions regarding the study, you can contact the researcher, Jennifer Parsons, at the Ashland University Athletics Department.

Pursuant with the Human Subjects policies at the university, your name will not be recorded and all responses will remain anonymous.

The results of this study will not be used for commercial purposes. The researcher may submit the finished study for a presentation or publication at an educational conference or in an educational journal.

By completing the survey, you are agreeing to participate in this study and granting the researcher permission to collect data for dissertation research at Ashland University.

APPENDIX D

STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT CROSSTABULATION TABLES

Table 1

Crosstabulation for Gender by Sport

		Male	Female	Total
Basketball	Count	11	10	21
	Expected Count	14.8	6.2	21.0
	% within Sport	52.4%	47.6%	100.0%
	% within Gender	6.2%	13.5%	8.3%
	% of Total	4.4%	4.0%	8.3%
Track and Field and Cross Country	Count	18	11	29
	Expected Count	20.5	8.5	29.0
	% within Sport	62.1%	37.9%	100.0%
	% within Gender	10.1%	14.9%	11.5%
	% of Total	7.1%	4.4%	11.5%
Volleyball	Count		9	9
	Expected Count	6.4	2.6	9.0
	% within Sport	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	.0%	12.2%	3.6%
	% of Total	.0%	3.6%	3.6%
Cheerleading	Count		6	6
	Expected Count	4.2	1.8	6.0
	% within Sport	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	.0%	8.1%	2.4%
	% of Total	.0%	2.4%	2.4%
Swimming	Count	10	8	18
	Expected Count	12.7	5.3	18.0
	% within Sport	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
	% within Gender	5.6%	10.8%	7.1%
	% of Total	4.0%	3.2%	7.1%
Baseball	Count	23		23
	Expected Count	16.2	6.8	23.0
	% within Sport	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	12.9%	.0%	9.1%
	% of Total	9.1%	.0%	9.1%
Football	Count	81		81
	Expected Count	57.2	23.8	81.0
	% within Sport	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	45.5%	.0%	32.1%
	% of Total	32.1%	.0%	32.1%
Soccer	Count	16	15	31
	Expected Count	21.9	9.1	31.0
	% within sport	51.6%	48.4%	100.0%
	% within Gender	9.0%	20.3%	12.3%
	% of Total	6.3%	6.0%	12.3%

Wrestling	Count	19		19
	Expected Count	13.4	5.6	19.0
	% within Sport	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	10.7%	.0%	7.5%
	% of Total	7.5%	.0%	7.5%
Softball	Count		15	15
	Expected Count	10.6	4.4	15.0
	% within Sport	.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% within Gender	.0%	20.3%	6.0%
	% of Total	.0%	6.0%	6.0%
Total	Count	178	74	252
	Expected Count	178.0	74.0	252.0
	% within sport	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
	% within Gender	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	135.078	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	169.882	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.905	1	.015
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.732	.000
	Cramer's V	.732	.000

Table 2

Crosstabulation for Scholarship Group by Sport

		Full/Partial Scholarship	Non-Scholarship	Total
Basketball	Count	17	3	20
	Expected Count	14.7	5.3	20.0
	% within sport	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	9.2%	4.5%	8.0%
	% of Total	6.8%	1.2%	8.0%
Track and Field and Cross Country	Count	16	13	29
	Expected Count	21.3	7.7	29.0
	% within sport	55.2%	44.8%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	8.7%	19.7%	11.6%
	% of Total	6.4%	5.2%	11.6%
Volleyball	Count	9		9
	Expected Count	6.6	2.4	9.0
	% within sport	100.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	4.9%	.0%	3.6%
	% of Total	3.6%	.0%	3.6%
Cheerleading	Count	2	4	6
	Expected Count	4.4	1.6	6.0
	% within sport	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	1.1%	6.1%	2.4%
	% of Total	.8%	1.6%	2.4%
Swimming	Count	12	6	18
	Expected Count	13.2	4.8	18.0
	% within sport	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	6.5%	9.1%	7.2%
	% of Total	4.8%	2.4%	7.2%
Baseball	Count	16	7	23
	Expected Count	16.9	6.1	23.0
	% within sport	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	8.7%	10.6%	9.2%
	% of Total	6.4%	2.8%	9.2%
Football	Count	58	23	81
	Expected Count	59.6	21.4	81.0
	% within sport	71.6%	28.4%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	31.5%	34.8%	32.4%
	% of Total	23.2%	9.2%	32.4%
Soccer	Count	28	3	31
	Expected Count	22.8	8.2	31.0
	% within sport	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	15.2%	4.5%	12.4%
	% of Total	11.2%	1.2%	12.4%

Wrestling	Count	12	6	18
	Expected Count	13.2	4.8	18.0
	% within sport	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	6.5%	9.1%	7.2%
	% of Total	4.8%	2.4%	7.2%
Softball	Count	14	1	15
	Expected Count	11.0	4.0	15.0
	% within sport	93.3%	6.7%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	7.6%	1.5%	6.0%
	% of Total	5.6%	.4%	6.0%
Total	Count	184	66	250
	Expected Count	184.0	66.0	250.0
	% within sport	73.6%	26.4%	100.0%
	% within Scholarship Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	73.6%	26.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	23.358	9	.005
Likelihood Ratio	26.349	9	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.976	1	.160
N of Valid Cases	250		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.306	.005
	Cramer's V	.306	.005

Table 3

Chi-Square Frequencies for Groups Recommending Participants Avoid a Harder Class

Group Suggesting to Avoid Harder Class	Number of Athletes Who Selected Remark	Expected N	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.
Coach	22	126	171.683	1	.000
Teammate	68	126	53.397	1	.000
Advisor	27	126	155.571	1	.000
Family Member	19	126	181.730	1	.000
Friends	48	126	96.571	1	.000

Table 4

Crosstabulation for Participants Who Go to Professors' Office Hours by Gender

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Male	Count	5	16	84	59	14	178
	Expected Count	4.9	24.0	85.5	53.0	10.6	178.0
	% within Gender	2.8%	9.0%	47.2%	33.1%	7.9%	100.0%
	% within Office Hours	71.4%	47.1%	69.4%	78.7%	93.3%	70.6%
	% of Total	2.0%	6.3%	33.3%	23.4%	5.6%	70.6%
Female	Count	2	18	37	16	1	74
	Expected Count	2.1	10.0	35.5	22.0	4.4	74.0
	% within Gender	2.7%	24.3%	50.0%	21.6%	1.4%	100.0%
	% within Office Hours	28.6%	52.9%	30.6%	21.3%	6.7%	29.4%
	% of Total	.8%	7.1%	14.7%	6.3%	.4%	29.4%
Total	Count	7	34	121	75	15	252
	Expected Count	7.0	34.0	121.0	75.0	15.0	252.0
	% within Gender	2.8%	13.5%	48.0%	29.8%	6.0%	100.0%
	% within Office Hours	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	2.8%	13.5%	48.0%	29.8%	6.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.258	4	.004
Likelihood Ratio	15.629	4	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.217	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.246	.004
	Cramer's V	.246	.004

Table 5

Crosstabulation for Participants Who Attend Class by Gender

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Total
Male	Count	107	65	6	178
	Expected Count	118.0	55.1	4.9	178.0
	% within Gender	60.1%	36.5%	3.4%	100.0%
	% within Attend Class	64.1%	83.3%	85.7%	70.6%
	% of Total	42.5%	25.8%	2.4%	70.6%
Female	Count	60	13	1	74
	Expected Count	49.0	22.9	2.1	74.0
	% within Gender	81.1%	17.6%	1.4%	100.0%
	% within Attend Class	35.9%	16.7%	14.3%	29.4%
	% of Total	23.8%	5.2%	.4%	29.4%
Total	Count	167	78	7	252
	Expected Count	167.0	78.0	7.0	252.0
	% within Gender	66.3%	31.0%	2.8%	100.0%
	% within Attend Class	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	66.3%	31.0%	2.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.299	2	.006
Likelihood Ratio	10.983	2	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.575	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.202	.006
	Cramer's V	.202	.006

Table 6

Crosstabulation for Participants Turn In Assignments On Time by Gender

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Total
Male	Count	130	47	1	178
	Expected Count	137.0	39.6	1.4	178.0
	% within Gender	73.0%	26.4%	.6%	100.0%
	% within Assignments On Time	67.0%	83.9%	50.0%	70.6%
	% of Total	51.6%	18.7%	.4%	70.6%
Female	Count	64	9	1	74
	Expected Count	57.0	16.4	.6	74.0
	% within Gender	86.5%	12.2%	1.4%	100.0%
	% within Assignments On Time	33.0%	16.1%	50.0%	29.4%
	% of Total	25.4%	3.6%	.4%	29.4%
Total	Count	194	56	2	252
	Expected Count	194.0	56.0	2.0	252.0
	% within Gender	77.0%	22.2%	.8%	100.0%
	% within Assignments On Time	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	77.0%	22.2%	.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.411	2	.041
Likelihood Ratio	6.935	2	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.232	1	.040
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	.041
	Cramer's V	.159	.041

Table 7

Crosstabulation for Participants Turn In Assignments On Time by Race Group

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Total
African America and Other Race Groups	Count	23	14		37
	Expected Count	28.5	8.2	.3	37.0
	% within Race Group	62.2%	37.8%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Assignment On Time	11.9%	25.0%	.0%	14.7%
	% of Total	9.1%	5.6%	.0%	14.7%
White/ Caucasian Group	Count	171	42	2	215
	Expected Count	165.5	47.8	1.7	215.0
	% within Race Group	79.5%	19.5%	.9%	100.0%
	% within Assignment On Time	88.1%	75.0%	100.0%	85.3%
	% of Total	67.9%	16.7%	.8%	85.3%
Total	Count	194	56	2	252
	Expected Count	194.0	56.0	2.0	252.0
	% within Race Group	77.0%	22.2%	.8%	100.0%
	% within Assignment On Time	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	77.0%	22.2%	.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.341	2	.042
Likelihood Ratio	6.021	2	.049
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.309	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.159	.042
	Cramer's V	.159	.042

Table 8

Crosstabulation for Participants Hiding Their Identity by Gender

		Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
Male	Count	9	29	45	95	178
	Expected Count	6.4	22.6	42.4	106.7	178.0
	% within Gender	5.1%	16.3%	25.3%	53.4%	100.0%
	% within Hide Identity	100.0%	90.6%	75.0%	62.9%	70.6%
	% of Total	3.6%	11.5%	17.9%	37.7%	70.6%
Female	Count		3	15	56	74
	Expected Count	2.6	9.4	17.6	44.3	74.0
	% within Gender	.0%	4.1%	20.3%	75.7%	100.0%
	% within Hide Identity	.0%	9.4%	25.0%	37.1%	29.4%
	% of Total	.0%	1.2%	6.0%	22.2%	29.4%
Total	Count	9	32	60	151	252
	Expected Count	9.0	32.0	60.0	151.0	252.0
	% within Gender	3.6%	12.7%	23.8%	59.9%	100.0%
	% within Hide Identity	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	3.6%	12.7%	23.8%	59.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.798	3	.002
Likelihood Ratio	18.581	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.655	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.242	.002
	Cramer's V	.242	.002

Table 9

Crosstabulation for Participants Who Sit With Other Athletes in Class by Race Group

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
African American / other	Count	5	14	13	4	1	37
	Expected Count	5.1	20.0	10.4	1.2	.3	37.0
	% within Race Group	13.5%	37.8%	35.1%	10.8%	2.7%	100.0%
	% within sit with athletes	14.3%	10.3%	18.3%	50.0%	50.0%	14.7%
	% of Total	2.0%	5.6%	5.2%	1.6%	.4%	14.7%
White/ Caucasian	Count	30	122	58	4	1	215
	Expected Count	29.9	116.0	60.6	6.8	1.7	215.0
	% within Race Group	14.0%	56.7%	27.0%	1.9%	.5%	100.0%
	% within sit with athletes	85.7%	89.7%	81.7%	50.0%	50.0%	85.3%
	% of Total	11.9%	48.4%	23.0%	1.6%	.4%	85.3%
Total	Count	35	136	71	8	2	252
	Expected Count	35.0	136.0	71.0	8.0	2.0	252.0
	% within Race Group	13.9%	54.0%	28.2%	3.2%	.8%	100.0%
	% within sit with athletes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	13.9%	54.0%	28.2%	3.2%	.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.798	4	.012
Likelihood Ratio	9.911	4	.042
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.127	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Phi	.225	.012
Cramer's V	.225	.012
N of Valid Cases	252	

Table 10

Crosstabulation for Participants' Race/Ethnicity Negatively Influence Treatment as Student by Race Group

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
African American and Other Race Groups	Count			3	8	26	37
	Expected Count	.1	.3	.7	2.8	33.0	37.0
	% within Race Group	.0%	.0%	8.1%	21.6%	70.3%	100.0%
	% within Negative Influence	.0%	.0%	60.0%	42.1%	11.6%	14.7%
	% of Total	.0%	.0%	1.2%	3.2%	10.3%	14.7%
White/ Caucasian	Count	1	2	2	11	199	215
	Expected Count	.9	1.7	4.3	16.2	192.0	215.0
	% within Race Group	.5%	.9%	.9%	5.1%	92.6%	100.0%
	% within Negative Influence	100.0%	100.0%	40.0%	57.9%	88.4%	85.3%
	% of Total	.4%	.8%	.8%	4.4%	79.0%	85.3%
Total	Count	1	2	5	19	225	252
	Expected Count	1.0	2.0	5.0	19.0	225.0	252.0
	% within Race Group	.4%	.8%	2.0%	7.5%	89.3%	100.0%
	% within Negative Influence	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	.4%	.8%	2.0%	7.5%	89.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.876	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	16.567	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.128	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	252		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.295	.000
	Cramer's V	.295	.000

Table 11

Crosstabulation for Participants Given a Hard Time or Refused Accommodation by Race Group

		Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Total
African American and Other Race Groups	Count			4	7	25	36
	Expected Count	.6	2.3	9.0	8.7	15.3	36.0
	% within Race Group	.0%	.0%	11.1%	19.4%	69.4%	100.0%
	% within hard time	.0%	.0%	6.3%	11.5%	23.4%	14.3%
	% of Total	.0%	.0%	1.6%	2.8%	10.0%	14.3%
White/ Caucasian	Count	4	16	59	54	82	215
	Expected Count	3.4	13.7	54.0	52.3	91.7	215.0
	% within Race Group	1.9%	7.4%	27.4%	25.1%	38.1%	100.0%
	% within hard time	100.0%	100.0%	93.7%	88.5%	76.6%	85.7%
	% of Total	1.6%	6.4%	23.5%	21.5%	32.7%	85.7%
Total	Count	4	16	63	61	107	251
	Expected Count	4.0	16.0	63.0	61.0	107.0	251.0
	% within Race Group	1.6%	6.4%	25.1%	24.3%	42.6%	100.0%
	% within hard time	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0 %	100.0%
	% of Total	1.6%	6.4%	25.1%	24.3%	42.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.122	4	.007
Likelihood Ratio	16.781	4	.002
Linear-by-Linear Association	13.242	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	251		

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.237	.007
	Cramer's V	.237	.007