

University of Central Florida

From the Selected Works of Dr. C. Keith Harrison

2011

Purposeful Engagement of First-Year Division I Student-Athletes

Keith Harrison, *University of Central Florida*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/keith_harrison/13/

Purposeful Engagement of First-Year Division I Student-Athletes

Eddie Comeaux
Laura Speer
Maria Taustine
University of Kentucky

C. Keith Harrison
University of Central Florida

Abstract. This study examined the extent to which transitioning, first-year student-athletes engage in educationally sound activities in college. The sample included 147 revenue and nonrevenue first-year student-athletes who were surveyed at four large Division I-A universities. Findings revealed that revenue and nonrevenue first-year student athletes differed regarding their academic and athletic identities. Transitioning revenue student-athletes rated themselves as having slightly higher athletic identities, yet lower academic identities compared to their nonrevenue counterparts. The findings from this study also indicated that the kinds of effective educational practices that first-year student-athletes engage in have a positive influence on their academic self-concept. These findings have implications for head coaches and student affairs leaders, particularly academic counselors and advisors who are working with this special population of students.

Transitioning from high school to college can be refreshing for some students and a daunting task for others. Many students are able to adjust and

meet the social and intellectual challenges of their first college year, and may even excel in an entirely new environment. Some students, however, find that the transition into college is at best demanding and stressful. Whether a student-athlete or student in the general population, first-year students have to negotiate multiple contexts, both inside and outside college, all of which influence their transitions. Nonetheless, differences between college student-athletes and their nonathlete peers seem elusive (Watt & Moore, 2001). While it is true that both groups are faced with stresses and expectations of the academic and social environment, college student-athletes also encounter tremendous sport demands that create substantial challenges to student life (Eitzen, 2009; Howard-Hamilton & Watt, 2001). Toward this end, college coaches have an incredible amount of influence over the lives of Division I student-athletes both on and off the playing field. Student-athletes have to endure grueling practices, travel schedules, mid-week games, team meetings, film sessions, and rehabilitation for nagging injuries as a result of their participation in college sports. Student-athletes often devote more than 40 hours a week to sport-related activities (Wolverton, 2008). As a result, these students have considerably less time available for academic obligations and other educationally purposeful activities than other students.

Striking the proper balance between their academic and athletic lives can be difficult for transitioning student-athletes, and they must continually negotiate the dual roles of student and athlete. These two roles, each replete with demands and expectations, are both significant for the student-athlete. Consequently, many experience role conflict when the demands of one role make it difficult to meet the demands of the other (Chartrand & Lent, 1987; Goode, 1960). Adler and Adler (1991) reported that Division I, male revenue student-athletes who play basketball transition into college with feelings of optimism about their academic role; however, some student-athletes experience role conflict as early as their second semester due to sport requirements that structurally inhibit their academic engagement on campus. Under such conditions, student-athletes may experience academic and social isolation (Howard-Hamilton & Watt, 2001; Jayakumar & Comeaux, 2006; Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has intensified its efforts to improve the experiences of student-athletes by establishing some sense of balance between athletics and the university's traditional educational role. NCAA rules limit student-athletes to 20 hours per week of supervised practice and training time during the season and eight hours per week in the

off-season, and they restrict the number of student-athletes who live in the same residence hall room. Despite these efforts, many student-athletes in the high-profile sports of football and men's basketball at Division I institutions continue to graduate at significantly lower rates than their nonathlete peers (Eitzen, 2009; NCAA, 2008). This lack of academic achievement underscores a central problem facing college athletics. Considering the possible role conflicts that develop early among first-year student-athletes and the importance of effective educational practices and policies to student success, it is instructive to examine transitioning student-athletes more closely.

Literature Review

Role Identities

According to the literature, role combinations for student-athletes influence their desired outcomes both positively and negatively (Harrison et al., 2009; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). Many of these students enter college having more balanced academic and athletic identities, yet throughout their collegiate careers, the athletic role tends to compromise the academic role, especially in male revenue-generating sports. Adler and Adler (1991) investigated a Division I athletic program over the course of several years and found that male revenue student-athletes transition into college life with feelings of optimism and pragmatism about their academic futures; however, student-athletes eventually tend to devalue the academic role early on because of coaching demands and expectations from the athletic subculture. In a similar vein, Settles, Sellers, and Damas (2002) examined the extent to which Division I student-athletes perceived the academic and athletic role as separate from and interfering with each other. Settles and colleagues found that role interference was negatively associated with student-athletes' psychological well-being, whereas student-athletes who viewed their roles as separate and distinct were more likely to experience psychological well-being. Exploring the student-athlete experience, Parham (1993) also identified the challenge of balancing (a) athletic and academic endeavors, (b) social activities with the isolation of athletic pursuits, (c) athletic success or lack of success with maintenance of mental equilibrium, (d) physical health and injuries with the need to keep playing, and (e) the demands of various relationships (e.g., coaches, family, friends).

The overconsumption of the athlete role can make it difficult to perform or meet the demands of the student role. Snyder (1985) explains that the "investment of identity, time, energy, money, and other resources toward

the continuance of the academic and/or athletic role is a reflection of one's commitments" (p. 216), and the level of commitment to a given role depends on benefits and satisfactions that come from that role. Snyder indicates three factors that need to be considered for the student-athlete to maximize rewards within the dual roles of student and athlete: social support and intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Toward this end, Snyder sets forth a theoretical understanding of student-athletes' role identities, highlighting four types of students based on their relative commitment to each role: (a) *scholar athletes*, (b) *pure scholars*, (c) *pure athletes*, and (d) *nonscholars/nonathletes*. The *scholar athlete* shows a high degree of commitment to both the academic and athletic roles. In this sense, the two roles are not in conflict; instead, he or she is able to perform or meet the demands of both roles. The *pure athlete* identifies with and is primarily committed to the athletic role, with minimal commitment to the academic role (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993). In this case, the student-athlete experiences role conflict and, therefore, reduces involvement in the academic role. As a result, *pure athletes* are more likely to suffer from involuntary withdrawal from the college or university. By contrast, the *pure scholar* demonstrates opposite role identities of the *pure athlete*, where the commitment to the academic role leaves minimal energy for athletics. Lastly, the *nonscholar/nonathlete* is not committed to either the student or athlete role. Snyder reported that these individuals often engage in other extracurricular activities within the college environment, neglecting both sport and academics.

Student Engagement

Several studies have explored the relationship between student engagement and learning and personal development (Astin, 1993; Hu & Kuh, 2002, 2003; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The concept of student engagement grows out of Astin's (1984) theory of student involvement, which suggests that students experience positive gains in learning and personal development by becoming involved on campus. Chickering and Gamson's (1987) "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" lend further support to this concept by defining several characteristics of academic environments that influence student personal and academic talent development. Such principles promote student-faculty interaction, task orientation, cooperation among students, opportunities for communication, active learning, respect of diverse talents and ways of learning, and prompt feedback (Chickering & Gamson). Similarly, Pascarella and Terenzini found that the impact of college is largely determined by the degree to which students engage

in various in- and out-of-class activities (e.g., preparing for class, interacting with instructors inside and outside of class, and learning how to work well with peers on problem-solving tasks and community service work; Kuh, 2001).

While there are a host of studies on student engagement related to the general student population, research that examines the student-athletes' engagement in educationally purposeful activities and its influence on a set of outcomes is scant. Using data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, Comeaux (2005) found that the benefits derived from the relationship between faculty and students who are athletes are to some extent contingent upon the specific nature of contact. Academically oriented interactions with faculty account for modest significance in Division I student-athlete academic success compared to informal/social interactions. For example, faculty assistance in achieving their professional goals was positively associated with student-athletes' academic success. Furthermore, Umbach, Palmer, Kuh, and Hannah (2006), using data from the National Survey of Student Engagement, found in part that student-athletes do not differ from their nonathlete peers on participation in effective educational practices such as interaction with faculty. More recently, Gaston-Gayles and Hu (2009) examined factors related to student-athlete engagement in educationally sound activities. Using a dataset from the Basic Academic Skills Study, they found that the extent to which student-athletes interacted with faculty did not significantly influence a set of desirable outcomes. On average, student-athletes' interaction with students other than their teammates had positive impacts on personal self-concept and learning and communication skills.

Purpose of The Study

In light of the challenges that transitioning student-athletes face with negotiating the dual roles of student and athlete, this study was designed to explore first-year student-athletes' self-concept (e.g., drive to achieve academically and athletically, intellectual self-confidence, degree aspirations) and aspects of the environment (e.g., faculty and peer interactions, classroom experiences, studying, extracurricular involvement). It also sought to explore how these self-ratings might differ for Division I student-athletes in the revenue-generating sports of men's basketball and football and their nonrevenue² counterparts. In addition, this study examined how first-year student-athletes' engagement in educationally purposeful activities influenced leadership skills and general academic self-concept while controlling background characteristics and other factors. Limited extant empirical research considers the role identities of first-year student-athletes while examining the impact of the broader college

community. The current study sought to advance the knowledge on the extent to which first-year student-athletes' transition to college. Such insights are critical for forging deeper and more responsive intervention strategies for first-year student-athletes so that they may experience positive gains in learning and personal development over the course of their undergraduate program.

Method

Participants

The research was conducted at four NCAA Division I public universities in the United States with similar size and admission standards. Each participating university had graduation rates slightly higher than the national average for both student-athletes and the general student population. The sample ($N = 222$) included student-athletes, ranging from first-year students to seniors. Of the participants, 147 revenue and nonrevenue first-year student-athletes were drawn from this sample. Demographic data for participants in this study revealed that 96 (65%) were revenue student-athletes and 51 (35%) were nonrevenue student-athletes; 77% were male; 58% were White, 37% were Black, 5% were Other Ethnicity. Other Ethnicity included American Indian, Asian American, Mexican American/Chicano, Puerto Rican, Other Latino, and other.

Data Collection

Student-athlete participants in this study were recruited from four NCAA Division I public universities. One of the researchers met with key stakeholders in the athletic department at each institution to obtain permission both to survey student-athletes in the department and to determine which sports might be willing to participate in the study. For the sports that agreed to participate, each participant was asked to complete an online questionnaire during scheduled academic team meetings in early fall of the academic year.

The questionnaire was developed by a team of researchers to understand the experiences of transitioning first-year student-athletes. Astin's (1984) theory on student involvement and Chickering and Gamson's (1987) "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education," served as a conceptual framework for the construction of this questionnaire. The questionnaire addressed several aspects of the participants' experiences: (a) precollege academic and personal experiences, (b) life goals, (c) degree aspirations, (d) experiences with campus faculty, and (e) measures of academic and athletic identity. Incorporated in the questionnaire were a series of Likert-type items designed to

measure student-athletes' engagement with members of the campus community (e.g., development of close friendships with nonathletes, regular communication with professors), academic self-concept, and leadership skills.

Variables

The variables in this study were divided into three groups: (a) background characteristics, (b) engagement variables, and (c) outcome variables. Background characteristics included gender, race/ethnicity, degree aspirations, and sport. Background variables were measured as follows: gender, where 0 = female, 1 = male; race, as a set of dummy variables: Black, other ethnicity (American Indian, Asian American, Mexican American/Chicano, Puerto Rican, Other Latino, and other), and White, with Whites as the reference group; degree aspiration was coded as a set of dummy variables: master's degree, doctorate degree, other (vocational, certificate, or associate degree), and bachelor's degree, with bachelor's degree as the reference group; and sport was coded as a set of dummy variables: 0 = nonrevenue student-athletes, 1 = revenue student-athletes.

The engagement variables included the following: studying/doing homework, developing close friendships with nonathletes, communicating regularly with professors, developing friendships with athletes that value education, and developing academic talents. In light of the literature previously discussed (e.g., Astin, 1984; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Hu & Kuh, 2002, 2003; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005), the aforementioned variables are appropriately linked to the concept of student engagement.

Two outcomes variables were used in this study: leadership skills and general academic self-concept. The measures for each outcome were based on the mean across items on each scale, which ranged on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (below average) to 4 (highest 10%). The leadership skills construct reflects students' self-ratings of various aspects of leadership ability. General academic self-concept were measured as the sum of the student-athletes' responses to three items on the questionnaire. The Appendix includes a listing of the items used for each dependent variable.

Data Analysis

The questionnaire data were tabulated, and a series of frequency distributions were calculated to understand and compare revenue and nonrevenue student-athlete participants' self-rated background and environmental aspects, as well as self-concept during their first year. In addition, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was employed to examine the influence of background and engagement characteristics on a set of outcome measures. Blocks of variables

were entered into the regression chronologically such that background variables were controlled prior to the entry of the engagement characteristics block. In the analyses, there were no collinearity issues because the bivariate correlation coefficients were small and the independent variables were slightly correlated.

Results

Student-athletes' self-rated degree and career aspirations were grouped according to revenue and nonrevenue sports (Table 1). In their first year of college, 47.9% of revenue student-athletes reported that they intended to obtain a master's degree, compared to 68.6% of nonrevenue student-athletes. Moreover, self-ratings showed that 92.7% of revenue student-athletes in this study have interests in sport careers such as sport management, coaching, or being a professional athlete, relative to 64.7% of nonrevenue student-athletes.

Table 1
Degree and Career Aspirations for First-Year Student-Athletes by Sport (N = 147)

	Revenue (n = 96)	Nonrevenue (n = 51)
<i>Degree Aspirations</i>		
Associate degree or none	5.2%	3.9%
Bachelor's degree	37.5%	15.7%
Master's degree	47.9%	68.6%
Doctorate degree	9.4%	11.8%
<i>Career Aspirations</i>		
Sports related ^a	(92.7%)	(64.7%)
Business	(39.6%)	(17.6%)
Undecided	(17.7%)	(19.6%)
Other ^b	(48.9%)	(70.6%)

Note: Doctorate degree includes PhD, EdD, MD, DO, DDS or JD. Participants could mark up to three choices for career aspirations, therefore the percentages do not add up to 100%.

^aSports related includes sports management, coach, and/or professional athlete.

^bOther includes artist, doctor or dentist, research scientist, engineer, social worker, lawyer, clergy or religious worker, teacher (high school or elementary), nurse, college professor, and/or professional entertainer (musician or comedian)

Rates of academic and athletic identities along with purposeful engagement activities for revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes were found. With respect to grades, 71% of revenue student-athletes reported an overall high school grade point average of *B* or higher, as compared to 90% of nonrevenue student-athletes. Revenue student-athletes in their first year of college were less likely to report their drive to achieve academically was either “above average” or in the “highest 10%” (55.2%), than nonrevenue student-athletes (92.7%). Yet, the revenue student-athletes in their first year of college, rated themselves as “above average” or in the “highest 10%” in athletic ability, at about the same rate as their nonrevenue counterparts (92.7% vs. 92.1%, Table 2). Revenue student-athletes were slightly more likely to view themselves more as an athlete than student, than nonrevenue student-athletes (39.6% vs. 31.4%).

In terms of their academic and social expectations, revenue student-athletes reported there was “some chance” (64.6%) that they would communicate regularly with faculty outside of class as they started the year, compared to 58.8% of nonrevenue student-athletes (Table 3). Yet, they were less likely to say there was a “very good chance” that they would develop friendships with athletes who value education, than nonrevenue student-athletes (67.8% vs 82.4%). It is also worth noting that 61.5% of revenue student-athletes reported that they would attend classes even if it was not required for eligibility to participate in intercollegiate athletics, as compared to 88.2% of nonrevenue student-athletes.

Table 4 summarizes the results on the influence of student-athlete background characteristics and engagement variables on leadership skills and general academic self-concept. The overall model for leadership skills was significant and accounted for 24% of the explained variance [$F(11, 135) = 3.76; p < 0.000$]. Being Black and playing a revenue sport were significantly and positively related to leadership skills. Specifically, Black student-athletes reported stronger leadership skills than White student-athletes in their first year of college, and revenue student-athletes rated themselves as having stronger leadership skills than nonrevenue participants.

Table 2
Drive to Achieve Academically and Athletically by Sport (N = 147)

	Revenue (n = 96)	Nonrevenue (n = 51)
<i>Academically</i>		
Below average	0%	1.9%
Average	44.8%	23.6%
Above average	45.8%	58.8%
Highest 10%	9.4%	15.7%
<i>Athletically</i>		
Below average	0%	0%
Average	7.3%	7.8%
Above average	47.9%	58.8%
Highest 10%	44.8%	33.3%

Table 3
Student-Athlete Engagement Variables by Sport (N = 147)

	Revenue (n = 96)			Nonrevenue (n = 51)		
	No chance	Some chance	Very good chance	No chance	Some chance	Very good chance
Develop close friendships with nonathletes	2.1%	33.3%	64.6%	0%	35.3%	64.7%
Communicate regularly with your professors	5.2%	64.6%	30.2%	0%	58.8%	41.2%
Develop friendships with athletes that value education	2.1%	28.1%	67.8%	0%	17.6%	82.4%

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Background Characteristics and Engagement Variables on Outcomes

Variable	Leadership skills			Academic self-concept		
	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	SE <i>B</i>	β
<i>Block 1</i>						
Male	0.415	0.415	0.105	0.361	0.312	0.112
Black	0.765	0.335	0.198*	0.491	0.252	0.169*
Other ethnicity	0.260	0.491	0.042	-0.253	0.369	-0.055
High-profile sports	0.967	0.386	0.254*	0.292	0.290	0.102
Master's degree	0.136	0.312	0.037	0.122	0.235	0.045
Doctorate degree	0.591	0.507	0.099	0.396	0.381	0.088
<i>Block 2</i>						
Studying/HW	0.045	0.102	0.037	0.050	0.077	0.054
FNA	0.032	0.303	0.85	0.078	0.228	0.029
CWP	0.280	0.299	0.082	-0.085	0.225	-0.033
FAVE	0.496	0.354	0.130	0.536	0.266	0.187*
DAT	0.407	0.340	0.109	0.748	0.255	0.266*
Constant	3.713	1.127		5.033	0.847	
R ²		0.24			0.23	

Note. FNA = develop close friendships with nonathlete. CWP = communicate regularly with your professor. FAVE = develop friendships with athletes that value education. DAT = develop your academic identity.

* $p < 0.05$.

The overall model for general academic self-concept was significant and accounted for 23% of the variance [$F(11, 135) = 3.67; p < 0.000$]. Being a Black student-athlete, developing close friendships with athletes who value education, and developing academic talents were significant and positively associated with general academic self-concept. In particular, Black student-athletes reported higher levels of general academic self-concept compared to White student-athletes in their first year of college.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the role identities of first-year student-athletes and understand the impact of engagement variables on a set of outcome variables. In particular, the study sought to understand the extent to which revenue and nonrevenue, first-year student-athletes differed regarding their role identities and whether educationally purposeful engagement activities were positively associated with leadership skills and general academic self-concept.

The descriptive statistics revealed that transitioning revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes in this study entered college with a higher athletic identity than academic identity when considering their self-rated drive to achieve both athletically and academically. Nonetheless, both revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes rated themselves relatively high on most academic measures in this study. This suggests that student-athletes transition into college life feeling optimistic about their desired academic goals, lending support to previous work (Adler & Adler, 1991).

First-year revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes, however, differed regarding their academic identity. Nonrevenue student-athletes, for example, entered college with higher grade point averages and reported a somewhat higher drive to achieve academically compared to revenue student-athletes. This finding is not surprising considering that revenue student-athletes tend to matriculate from high schools and environments with inferior academic resources and tend to be less academically prepared (Coakley, 2004; Eitzen, 2009; Sellers, 1992).

Furthermore, of particular interest are the conditional effects of background characteristics and several engagement variables on leadership skills and general academic self-concept. Black student-athletes reported stronger leadership skills compared to their White counterparts. This is an interesting finding, and more research is needed to further understand the kinds of contextual factors that influence the leadership skills of student-athletes regardless of race/ethnicity and sport. In addition, the engagement variables in this study were not significant predictors of leadership skills for first-year college student-athletes. However, two engagement variables, developing close friendships with athletes that value education and developing their academic talents, were significant predictors of general academic self-concept. This suggests that the kinds of educationally purposeful activities that first-year student-athletes engage in have a positive influence on general academic self-concept, which is consistent with previous research on student engagement (Astin, 1993; Hu & Kuh, 2003; National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005; Pascarella &

Terenzini, 1991, 2005). The finding is encouraging, and additional research is needed to operationalize the engagement variable, develop their academic talents, for college student-athletes. It is also worthwhile to note that first-year, Black student-athletes in this study rated themselves as having higher levels of general academic self-concept than White student-athletes. This finding is promising given that Black student-athletes tend to enter college less academically prepared than their White counterparts (Comeaux & Harrison, 2007).

Limitations

While the present study produced useful findings and has implications for student affairs practitioners, it also had shortcomings. Despite the data being obtained from four large public institutions, the sample was not necessarily representative of all sectors of American higher education. Thus, generalizations from this study should be made with caution and consideration of this factor. Second, although this study focused on transitioning first-year student-athletes and factors that are positively associated with desirable outcomes, it would have been helpful to have comparable studies on their nonathlete peers. Third, student-athlete self-reported data were used in this study. It is worth noting that while self-reports have been shown to be valid, all respondents may not use the same standard to respond to survey questions (Pascarella, 2001).

Conclusion

The findings from this study in part support previous research that reveals the positive impact of engagement in effective educational practices on college outcomes for first-year student-athletes (Gaston-Gayles & Hu, 2009; Umbach et al., 2006). It appears that transitioning first-year student-athletes can benefit from sound engagement practices in a similar manner as their nonathlete peers (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Such engagement practices, however, should be approached with caution. Previous research (Edwards, 1984; Harrison, 1998; Lapchick, 1996; Sailes, 1993) suggests that a hostile campus climate consisting of negative stereotypes toward student-athletes may in fact hinder the quality of their engagement in educationally purposeful activities. For some student-athletes, relationships with members of the campus community can be difficult to establish, particularly when campus members harbor prejudicial attitudes regarding their intellectual abilities (Comeaux, 2010; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995).

Nonetheless, these results should be used to inform policy and practice for first-year student-athletes in higher education. In particular, head coaches and student affairs professionals, especially academic advisors and counselors who are committed to creating more positive learning environments, should advise and inspire transitioning first-year student-athletes to engage in educationally purposeful activities. Such efforts can cultivate meaningful relationships between student-athletes and student affairs practitioners, and ultimately, lead to positive gains in general academic self-concept for student-athletes. Further, student-athletes' increased campus involvement can not only enhance their personal and learning development but may also disrupt popular notions that coaching demands and the athletic subculture limit their engagement in sound activities on campus (Howard-Hamilton & Watt, 2001; Jayakumar & Comeaux, 2006; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Wolverton, 2008).

Student affairs practitioners should also find new and imaginative ways to create meaningful academic activities for first-year student-athletes. While we know that coaching demands restrict the type and magnitude of campus involvement for student-athletes, student affairs practitioners should consider working closely with head coaches to design programs that allow student-athletes to maximize their opportunities to interact with faculty members and their nonathlete peers, which will likely lead to gains in learning (Gaston-Gayles & Hu, 2009; Umbach et al., 2006). Building meaningful and enduring relationships between head coaches and student affairs practitioners may increase the coaches' academic investment and also increase accountability for the academic successes and failures of their student-athletes. Likewise, basketball coaches might consider looking seriously at one-year-renewable athletic scholarships and the impact it has on the academic and athletic priorities of many student-athletes. Under the current system, athletic scholarships can be withdrawn on the basis of athletic ability, which essentially prioritizes the athletic role. Indeed, an academic model that supports and encourages athletes as students first is critical to transitioning student-athletes' academic success in American higher education.

Notes

¹This paper was made possible by Scholar-Baller™. The authors thank the anonymous reviewers of this manuscript for their comments and suggestions during the review process.

²Nonrevenue sports consist of all sports other than men's basketball and football in this study. It is important to differentiate these sports given that revenue student-athletes tend to enter college less academically prepared, and

they tend to be more challenged with balancing their academic and athletic roles compared to nonrevenue student-athletes (Eitzen, 2009).

References

- Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (1991). *Backboards and blackboards: Colleges and role engulfment*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Chartrand, J. M., & Lent, R. W. (1987). Sports counseling: Enhancing the development of the student-athlete. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 66, 164-167.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39(7), 3-7.
- Coakley, J. (2004). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Comeaux, E. (2005). Environmental predictors of academic achievement among student-athletes in the revenue-producing sports of men's basketball and football. *The Sport Journal*, 8(3).
- Comeaux, E. (2010). Racial differences in faculty perceptions of collegiate student-athletes' academic and post-undergraduate achievements. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 27(4), 390-412.
- Comeaux, E., & Harrison, C. K. (2007, July). Faculty and male student athletes in American higher education: Racial differences in the environmental predictors of academic achievement. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10(2), 199-214.
- Edwards, H. (1984). The Black "dumb jock": An American sports tragedy. *College Board Review*, 131, 8-13.
- Eitzen, D. (2009). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Engstrom, C., Sedlacek, W., & McEwen, M. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student athletes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 217-227.
- Gaston-Gayles, J. L., & Hu, S. (2009). The influence of student engagement and sport participation on college outcomes among Division I student athletes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3), 315-333.
- Goode, W.J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.
- Harrison, C. K. (1998). Themes that thread through society: Racism and athletic manifestation in the African American community. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 1(1), 63-74.
- Harrison, C. K., Stone, J., Shapiro, J., Yee, S., Boyd, J. A., & Rullan, V. (2009). The role of gender identities and stereotype salience with the academic performance of male and female college athletes. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 33(1), 78-96.

- Howard-Hamilton, M., & Watt, S. (Eds). (2001). *Student services for athletes* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 93). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 43*, 555-575.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2003). Diversity experiences and college student learning and personal development. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*, 320-334.
- Jayakumar, U., & Comeaux, E. (2006, April). *The mis-education of student athletes: A case study of an athletic organization*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the national survey of student engagement. *Change, 33*(3), 10-17, 66.
- Lapchick, R. (1996). *Sport in society: Equal opportunity or business as usual*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). (2008). *Division I graduation success rate*. Retrieved December 3, 2009, from http://web1.ncaa.org/app_data/instAggr2008/1_0.pdf
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2005). *Student engagement: Exploring different dimensions of student engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Parham, W. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990s profile. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*, 411-429.
- Pascarella, E. T. (2001). Using student self-reported gains to estimate college impact: A cautionary tale. *Journal of College Student Development, 42*, 488-492.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research* (Vol. 2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sailes, G. (1993). An investigation of campus stereotypes: The myth of Black athletic superiority and the dumb jock stereotypes. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 10*, 88-97.
- 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.
- Shulman, J., & Bowen, W. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Snyder, E. E. (1985). A theoretical analysis of academic and athletic roles. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 2*, 210-217.
- 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? In S. Watt & J. Moore (Eds.), *Student services for athletes* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 93, pp. 7-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolverton, B. (2008, January 25). Athletes' hours renew debate over college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>
- Yopyk, D., & Prentice, D. (2005). Am I an athlete or a student? Identity salience and stereotype threat in student-athletes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(4), 329-336.

Reader May Respond:

Eddie Comeaux
Assistant Professor
College of Education
University of Kentucky
222 Seaton Building
Lexington, KY 40506
Phone: (859) 257-2706
E-mail: edcomeaux@uky.edu

Appendix

Leadership Skills and Academic Self-Concept Variables, Item Loading and Reliability

Factor and Individual Item Measures	Loading	α
Leadership skills		0.73
Leadership ability	0.78	
Self-confidence (intellectual)	0.59	
Self-confidence (social)	0.52	
General academic self-concept		0.72
Self-confidence (intellectual)	0.71	
Drive to achieve (academically)	0.49	
Self-understanding	0.44	