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The purpose of this study is to identify which characteristics of student-athletes are most helpful in making administrative decisions about intercollegiate athletic programs, and then to develop a descriptive profile of a group of student-athletes at a particular university. Additional purposes include comparing these descriptive data with other group data and with perceptions of the same group of student-athletes by faculty administrators at the same university.

Data were collected in four phases. First, a jury of three experts developed a list of student-athlete characteristics they believed to be helpful in making administrative decisions regarding those athletes. Next, information was gathered to develop a descriptive profile of a selected group of eighteen student-athletes based on the identified characteristics. Next, statistical comparisons were made with available data from other groups of students and from the eight Athletic Council members' perceptions of
the study group.

Major findings include the identification of useful characteristics, inconsistencies between student-athlete high school ranks in class and SAT scores, high scores in hostility, and accurate perceptions of student-athletes by Athletic Council members.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Not since the events leading to the formation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) have leaders in higher education faced such critical decisions about intercollegiate athletics as they do today. Almost daily, the public encounters reports of illegal and unethical activities among athletic departments associated with institutions of higher education. The situation poses several alternatives for officials to consider. The chosen solutions will determine the destiny of college athletic programs and, perhaps, of higher education.

Recognizing the situation and their responsibilities, university administrators have attempted to regain control. By promoting more stringent regulations and more effective penalties in controlling intercollegiate athletic programs, higher education leaders have declared their intention to help re-establish integrity in college sports.

Once a leader has determined the desired extent of general administrative involvement in intercollegiate athletic practices at a particular college or university, specific, practical alternatives must be addressed. Decisions must be rendered concerning academic standards,
admissions practices, drug abuse policies, budgetary
determinations, and other affairs significant to the
integrity and well-being of the institution and its
students.

As administrators make decisions that affect students,
certainly the impact on those students should be considered. Critical decisions about college athletics should be made with a basic understanding of and sincere consideration for the student-athletes involved. Although specific student needs should not overshadow institutional needs, they should be among the factors to be reviewed in the decision-making process (13, pp. 131-133; 18, pp. 354-369).

To develop an enhanced understanding of the student-athletes at a particular university, administrators might utilize various instruments designed to measure human characteristics. Along with constant monitoring and analysis of academic performance, the use of personality profiles, interest inventories, aptitude tests, and other similar instruments could help the general administrator develop an accurate perception of the student-athletes and their needs at a particular campus. This thorough knowledge of the specific population could lead to the most appropriate decisions possible concerning student-athletes' higher education experiences (8, pp. 43-45).

A descriptive profile of student-athletes at a college or university could provide valuable information to be used
in administrative decision-making processes. This type of information could be especially helpful to the administrator who has limited experience with student-athletes but must make administrative decisions which directly affect them.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the need for increased knowledge of student-athlete characteristics by higher education administrators who must make decisions about intercollegiate athletic programs at particular colleges and universities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify which characteristics of student-athletes would be most helpful in making administrative decisions, and then to develop a descriptive profile of student-athletes at a particular university.

The specific purposes of this study are to:

1. Identify which group characteristics of student-athletes would be most helpful in making administrative decisions.
2. Describe the identified characteristics of a group of student-athletes at a specific university.
3. Compare these descriptive data with national norms and with other available group data.
4. Compare these descriptive data with the perceptions of the same group of student-athletes by general and
academic administrators at the same university.

Research Questions

To carry out the purposes of this study four major research questions regarding the development and use of student-athlete group profiles have been investigated.

1. What group characteristics of student-athletes at a particular university would be helpful in making administrative decisions about the athletic program at that same university?

2. What are these characteristics for a group of student-athletes at a particular university?

3. How do these characteristics compare with national norms and with other available group data?

4. How do these characteristics compare with the perceptions of the same group of student-athletes by general and academic administrators at the same university?

Background and Significance of the Study

From the first Princeton-Rutgers game in 1869 to the early twentieth century, college football had developed into a brutal, loosely regulated activity. There were numerous reports of participation by individual players on several different teams, ingenious ways of rewarding players with financial benefits, and other similarly corrupt activities. In 1905, eighteen Americans died playing football. The corruption and brutality so appalled the American public
that President Theodore Roosevelt declared that if colleges would not properly control the game, he would abolish it. He indicated that he was not opposed to the game simply because it was "rough," but he insisted that it must be played fairly (11, p. 352; 23, p. 54; 26, pp. 371-377; 36, pp. 24-25).

College leaders responded favorably, and the Intercollegiate Athletic Association was formed (26, pp. 377-393; 27, pp. 13-15). As the NCAA has evolved from the old Intercollegiate Athletic Association, attempts at self-regulation have developed into an extensive manual—almost 400 pages—including a constitution, bylaws, regulations and interpretations (20). Voluntary membership in the NCAA is an agreement to abide by the regulations passed by member institutions. These regulations are outlined in basic principles involving amateur status, institutional control, academic standards, financial aid, recruiting activities, ethical conduct, postseason competition, season restrictions, player eligibility, and squad limitations (27, pp. 15-16).

In addition to compliance with NCAA regulations, administrators are involved in the development, awareness, and observance of institutional and conference guidelines. Although these types of self-regulation have been somewhat effective for the past several decades, the current epidemic of violations indicates a need for increased control.
In August, 1983, the American Council on Education's Committee on Division I Athletics recommended the formation of a presidents' council that could veto or modify NCAA rules and initiate its own rules. After a series of compromises with the NCAA, a presidents' commission with limited authority was established. Forty-four presidents were elected to form the approved commission, which continues to function in an advisory role within the NCAA, making recommendations designed to enhance the integrity of college athletics (6, 24).

University administrators are finding themselves more closely linked to their universities' athletic departments than in the past. President Fred C. Davison of the University of Georgia resigned his position after disclosures of academic improprieties involving that university's athletic department (19). University of Maryland Chancellor John Slaughter suddenly appeared in printed and broadcast media as he led his institution's athletic department through scandals involving drugs and academics (16, 28). After repeated charges of illegal activities in the Southern Methodist University football program, President Donald Shields announced his resignation due to health problems. Members of the Board of Governors, the Faculty Senate, and the Student Senate have demanded an immediate end to the unethical practices of the SMU athletic department (14). As these and other similar reports of
misconduct continue to emanate from college athletic departments (2; 5; 15; 17, pp. 219-280; 21; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 37), administrative leaders must determine their own roles in the complex process of reformation.

The American Council on Education adopted policy statements in 1979 addressing the governance of collegiate athletic programs. These statements clearly indicate that the chief executive officer of an institution is ultimately responsible for its athletic program. Even though extreme delegation of authority might be appropriate, assurances of programmatic and administrative integrity are embedded in the presidential responsibilities (25). Davis (4) has agreed that presidential authority in intercollegiate athletics must be recognized and practiced.

In athletics, as in other sectors of the university, someone has to be in charge—that someone is the president. He must have the backing of his governing board in athletics as well as in other university operations, and he must have the responsibility and the power to act (4, p. 426).

Becker and others (3) have contended that university presidents have the power to control athletic programs, but that wisdom and caution are needed for effective use of that power. They have recommended dividing responsibility between an athletic administrator and a governing board composed of faculty and administrators. The specific delegations would depend on the particular institution's situation. Responsibilities must be clearly defined, with
each group accountable to the chief executive officer.

For example, a recent institutional self-study report of the University of North Texas—formerly North Texas State University—contains descriptions of the various responsibilities in the governance of its intercollegiate athletic program.

The Board of Regents exercises the control responsibility for athletics at North Texas State; the president or his designated representative (vice president for external affairs) exercises the regulatory responsibility. The Athletic Council exercises an advisory responsibility, and the athletic director executes the program (22, chap. VII, p. 34).

Specific duties of the vice president for external affairs in regard to intercollegiate athletics are listed as supervision and promotion of the athletic program, employment of qualified personnel, administration of the athletic budget, and obtaining supplementary funds from outside sources (22, chap. II, p. 20). Similarly, the athletic director "is responsible for employing and maintaining strong personnel, keeping the program financially solvent and seeking funds from outside sources" (22, chap. II, p. 21). Duties of the Athletic Council include the following:

...to assist in the overall development of athletic policy; to serve as a strategic body in assisting in the dissemination and communication of athletic policy to the general faculty, staff, student body, and community; to provide advice with regard to the preparation of the athletic budget; to review and provide comment upon academic athletic policies and practices; and to be represented in screening procedures for employment of head coaches (22, chap. VII, p. 34).
Recipients of athletic scholarships are generally selected by the coaching staff based on athletic ability and academic achievement. Information is then coordinated with the university financial aids office (22, chap. VII, p. 30).

Student services specialists also find themselves more involved in intercollegiate athletic programs. Student-athletes are receiving increased attention as a group of students with unique needs in higher education. The recognition of these needs has prompted the development of student services efforts to address them. The University of Florida program described by Wittmer and others (38) has been designed to enhance the personal development of student-athletes. The program consists of residential counselors/advisors, a personal development course, and a senior exit seminar. Alumni are encouraged to return for career counseling (1). Each facet of the program is designed to meet specific needs of the student-athlete.

Foster (7) and Grites (10, pp. 67-81) have recommended the increased use of athletic academic advisors who specialize in the specific challenges faced by the student-athlete. These professionals must develop thorough understandings of student-athletes as well as the athletic and academic systems in which they must function.

As Hurley and Cunningham (12, pp. 51-58) have contended, the student-athlete faces unique adjustments to higher education. Administrators are obligated to try to
understand those special needs and to provide services to address them. Golden (9, pp. 59-70) has insisted that this desire to meet these needs should emerge from a philosophy implemented at levels of top administration.

Presidents and other non-athletic administrators have suddenly found themselves intensely involved in the athletic component of higher education, responsibilities for which have been delegated or ignored for years. The sudden, significance of intercollegiate athletic programs has found many university officials pitifully ignorant of their own athletic programs and the students involved in them (4, pp. 420-421). As this situation demands an increase in administrative attention, leaders will be faced with increasingly urgent needs for information and understanding.

Although obtaining factual information is a fairly simple process, developing an understanding of people and their needs requires dedicated effort. Decisions regarding athletic programs could be made with no consideration for the students involved. This approach would, however, conflict with the philosophy and goals of typical higher education institutions. For example, a recent institutional self-study report of the University of North Texas--formerly North Texas State University--indicates a philosophical sensitivity to student needs.

The University seeks to provide for all students an environment conducive to academic achievement by students responding to the opportunities afforded them
and through a campus life supportive of the highest personal development of intellect, spirit, body and social concern (22, chap. I, p. 6).

More directly stated, "North Texas State University is committed to a fully developed program of student services" (22, chap. VII, p. 1).

Among specific goals, the self-study mentions student support services and intercollegiate sports programs.

The University should continue to support student counseling programs (e.g., academic, interpersonal, employment, financial, legal and career planning and placement) and should make certain that they respond to the needs of various student groups, including off-campus and other nontraditional students (22, chap. I, p. 15).

The University should maintain a comprehensive program of recreation and athletics encompassing a wide range of sports at individual, intramural, and intercollegiate levels; it should periodically re-examine the role and scope of its participation in intercollegiate athletics, with emphasis on the prudent use of the University's resources (22, chap. I, p. 16).

These statements indicate an institutional desire to consider student needs as well as university limitations when making programmatic decisions. Resource limitations are usually well recognized, but one must aggressively pursue an understanding of student needs and development. This understanding of student-athletes is neither more nor less important than that of other student groups. As administrators attempt to better understand special groups such as commuters, returning adults, the learning disabled, fraternity and sorority members, ethnic groups, and international students, they might devote similar efforts
to the study of student-athletes.

This study is an attempt to provide a descriptive profile designed to facilitate a more accurate perception of student-athletes and their needs at a particular university. Although this enhanced understanding would not necessarily affect policy decisions, it would have definite applicability in administrative decisions. For example, a university's leadership might adopt a policy requiring academic support for all student-athletes at that particular university. Administrative decisions related to that policy might be based on student-athlete characteristics.

Specifically, for which student-athletes, if any, should participation in the academic support system be required? Should support efforts include the development of self-confidence? Should the system provide sessions in organizational skills, communication techniques, or critical thinking? The resolutions to these and other similar issues are found in the particular characteristics of the population in question. A knowledge of those characteristics can be vital to making effective decisions in a needs based program.

Delimitations

This study is confined to descriptive characteristics of the scholarship freshman participants on a Division IAA university intercollegiate football team.
Procedures for Collection of Data

The data collection consisted of four phases corresponding to the four research questions. The first phase included information gathered through individual, preliminary discussions with a jury of experts. The athletic director, the head football coach, and the athletic academic coordinator at the university under study contributed their ideas about which student-athlete group characteristics would be most useful in making administrative decisions.

The second phase consisted of collecting data to describe the identified characteristics of the group of student-athletes under study. After student-athletes had signed permission forms for the collection and use of data (see appendix A, p. 100), background information was obtained from student files at the university intercollegiate athletic office and the university registrar's office. Developmental characteristics were measured through use of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (see appendix A, p. 101), using the dominant/submissive scale to measure leadership capabilities and the self-disciplined/impulsive scale to measure levels of self-discipline (29, pp. 37-42). Athletic demands on student-athletes' daily schedules were estimated by the head football coach.

In addition to those characteristics identified by the
jury of experts, self-reported study habit strengths and weaknesses were measured by administration of the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory (see appendix A, p. 102) according to published guidelines (39, pp. 1-2). This instrument was administered along with the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis.

The third phase consisted of the collection of campus, conference, and NCAA data with which to compare the study group's characteristics. Data were requested from the university's admissions and planning offices, from the office of the conference in which the university competes, and from the NCAA (see appendix B). National college norms (30, pp. 39-46) were obtained for comparisons of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis results.

The fourth phase consisted of contact with university faculty. Each of the eight faculty members of the Athletic Council was asked to complete a Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaire and a supplemental questionnaire (see appendix C) to reflect that group's perceptions of the student-athletes being studied.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Characteristics identified as useful by the jury of experts were categorized and listed. Descriptive characteristics of the student-athlete population were reported as group means with medians and ranges.
Group means of student-athlete characteristics were compared with available group means of national and conference data and with Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis national college norms. Analyses were conducted to determine the significance of the difference between each available pair of means.

Group means of student-athlete characteristics were compared with group means of the Athletic Council's perceived characteristics of the same group. Multivariate statistical techniques were used to determine the significance of the differences between the two group mean profiles.

Summary

Chapter I contains the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, background and significance of the study, delimitations, and procedures for the collection and analysis of data. Chapter II presents a review of related literature. Chapter III details the methods and procedures of the study, including particulars of the instruments, the population, and the collection and analysis of data. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study in tabular form. Chapter V includes a summary and discussion of the findings with conclusions and recommendations for future research. Appendices and a bibliography are provided.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The recent controversies in intercollegiate athletic programs have fostered an abundance of literature on the subject. Most recent studies address either the integrity crisis in college sports, specific characteristics and needs of student-athletes, student services for student-athletes, or the governance and administration of college athletic departments. In several cases, authors deal with various combinations of these emphases.

Integrity Crisis in College Sports

Since the mid-1970's, authors have addressed the current integrity crisis in college athletics. Renick (84) identifies a major part of the problem as abuse of student-athletes. She describes a system in which "pressure to field a successful team sometimes encourages practices which are not in the best academic interest of the students" (84, p. 549). Hanford (44) traces major controversies in collegiate athletics from the early twentieth century to the late 1970's. He contends that current crises have developed around four issues: the economics of college athletics; unethical activities in recruiting and compensating athletes; opportunities for women; and the relationship
between athletics and higher education.

More recently, Sanoff and Johnson (89), cite specific examples of student athletes who were used and discarded by university representatives. Axthelm and others (6) discuss even more cases of illegal recruiting, grade tampering, and criminal behavior by university officials, along with unrealized dreams among student-athletes. Other authors report similar examples and question the intentions of college athletic officials (16, 25, 52, 113, 115, 116).

Not all of the negative attention is directed toward college personnel. Some reports indicate the harsh effects of criminal behavior by student-athletes themselves (6, 26, 65, 97, 107, 115, 116). Wallisch (111) explains the intense negative effects of these types of incidents on the public relations of the university.

While the NCAA has tried to monitor and regulate certain aspects of the athletic programs of member institutions, its activities have become extremely complex and often misunderstood (75, 91). Involvement in intercollegiate athletics has become a frustrating experience for college officials (78).

By early 1985, both athletic and academic leaders had begun to demand reform (77). In response to the increasing number of scandalous reports, university leaders began to develop a presidents' commission to influence the NCAA (81). In June, 1985, college presidents made an impressive show of
strength by dominating a special session of the NCAA. Stricter rules and tougher penalties were called for by the chief executive officers of member institutions (74). For the next several months, the presidents' commission continued to provide direction and support in reformation efforts through the NCAA (27). Since the special session in 1985, NCAA activities have focused on stricter enforcement of rules and harsher punishment for offenders. Regular reports indicate a growing number of institutions being penalized by the NCAA (102, 103, 104, 105).

As the initial intensity for reform has waned at the national level of control (63, 64), momentum is building at the local campus level. As individual leaders attempt to bring integrity back to their own athletic programs, specific strategies for positive change come from a variety of sources (17, 87, 110). Occasional articles praise those individuals and institutions making efforts to develop and maintain model programs (4, 5, 11, 14, 38, 66, 67, 79, 83).

**Characteristics and Needs of Student-Athletes**

Vernacchia (109) provides a superficial discussion of the sociological problems of athletes, describing the typical over-emphasis on winning for male athletes and traditional sex discrimination for female athletes. Renick (84, p. 551) offers a more radical description of the student-athlete's situation. "He is treated as a commodity
to be exploited for the benefit of others and is left with no viable alternatives to conformity if he wishes to participate in intercollegiate sports," she contends.

Hurley and Cunningham summarize the situation, "The needs of student-athletes are special because of the unique demands that are placed upon their time, energies, and egos as a consequence of their athletic participation" (54, p. 53).

Camp and Epps (12), Raney and Knapp (82), and Rhatigan (86, pp. 5-12) present compelling pictures of the dual commitments of the student-athlete. The athlete too often finds himself stretched in opposite directions by academic and athletic obligations. Monaghan (76) reports that this "role conflict" is much more intense in the highly competitive Division I programs.

Grites (41, pp. 67-81) treats student-athletes as a special population along with "returning adult students," "high-risk students," and "honor students." He indicates that one should be aware of the special characteristics and specific needs of these special populations when developing advising programs to serve them. Lanning (59) identifies four areas of special counseling needs of student-athletes: unique peer group problems, time management and study skills problems, career development problems, and self-concept problems. Based on research at the University of Pittsburgh, Weston (114) identifies other special problem areas of student-athletes: scholastic disabilities, personal
development, adjustments, pain, and lack of motivation.

Blann reports that student-athletes often do not "formulate mature educational and career plans" as well as other students (10, p. 118). Similarly, Kennedy and Dimick (57) contend that student-athletes demonstrate lower levels of career maturity than do other college students. A study by Sowa and Gressard reveals "that athletes have difficulty in formulating well-defined educational goals and gaining personal satisfaction from educational experiences" (96, p. 238). Lawrence (61), Mills (73), and Paul (80) draw similar conclusions based on their separate research efforts at selected universities.

While research studies by Rucker (88), and Valliant and others (108) reveal only a few differences in personality traits between college football players and other students, Diamond (20) concludes that among football players, athletes who play in different positions display different personality traits. Comparing athletes with other students at Michigan State University, Underwood (106) reports that football players and other students on that campus share similar values.

Research by Johnson and Mottley (55) indicates that academic retention of student-athletes is somewhat predictable. Cerra (13) provides specific characteristics which proved to be significant in differentiating betweenpersisters and dropouts among student-athletes at a specific
university. Ervin and others also conclude that the SAT score of a student-athlete is in fact "an appropriate yardstick for determining whether a student's academic skills are adequate for successful performance at an academically competitive college or university" (24, p. 123). Based on a study at the University of Miami, Lang (58) reports twenty-six variables significantly related to the academic success of that university's football participants. She concludes that traditional predictive models may be too restrictive.

Grant (39) discusses the major psychological aspects of sports competition to help athletes—and those working with athletes—better understand the uniqueness of the athletic experience. Thirer and others (101) report that the athletes in their study experienced greater levels of depression than nonathletes. In addition to examining the psychosocial dimensions in which a typical student-athlete functions, Harrison describes some limiting factors in the athlete's environment.

Although most students are preoccupied with alienation, academic challenges, and natural immaturity, the impact of these factors on the student athlete is quite distinct. For example, most colleges still tend to segregate their athletes from the general population through separate living facilities and indirectly, through scheduled practice and competition. As they have less time to fully develop interpersonal relationships outside their world, many athletes often feel uncomfortable in more universal situations (48, p. 114).

Yellen and Yellen (122) provide helpful information on
a special group of student-athletes—those with learning disabilities. These students have even more unique problems with corresponding needs for special assistance. Dickason (21) predicts that college athletics will continue into the foreseeable future, but that the nature of the student-athlete will change along with that of students in general. This possibility compels administrators to continually monitor the characteristics and needs of their athletes. To be effective, services must be dynamic, changing with the needs of targeted students.

Student Services for Student-Athletes

One of eight major recommendations Garland has made for student affairs professionals is that they "become experts on students, their expectations, needs, interests, and abilities" (33, p. 108). Miller maintains, "Student services must decentralize, seek out the student, anticipate his needs, and share in his hopes, goals, dreams, and joys" (72, p. 359). Mable and DeCoste (68) recommend intensified efforts in needs-based student services for higher education. They contend that systematic collection and analysis of student data should allow more relevant services for all students. Similarly, Andrews and others (1) contend that advising services can and should be customized according to specific student characteristics and needs.

Student services designed specifically for college
athletes have followed in the wake of recent intercollegiate scandals. Preventive services have been developed to help the high school student-athlete prepare for the college experience. Lapchick (60), Mauro (69), and Selleck (92) have written books describing the recruiting/selection process with practical hints for making appropriate decisions. The National Association of College Admissions Counselors has produced a booklet with similar content (51). Wong (121) offers a book focusing on current laws and regulations of amateur athletics. With more emphasis on a successful academic experience in college, Henderson and Weber (49) have produced a manual of information on time management, study skills, and test taking skills. Wilbur and Wilbur (118) address the adjustment to the academic demands of higher education with a checklist designed to help athletes identify self-defeating behavior.

Recommendations for special services for college athletes abound. Gerdy (35) maintains that colleges and universities must assume responsibility for changing the image of student-athletes as "dumb jocks" by helping them to succeed in all aspects of their higher education experience. Foster (31) and Grites (41, pp. 67-81) recommend the increased use of athletic academic advisors who specialize in the specific challenges faced by the student-athlete. These professionals must develop thorough understandings of student-athletes as well as the athletic and academic
systems in which they must function. Gatto (34) declares a need for specialized counseling to help student-athletes apply the positive lessons of the athletic experience while avoiding the hazards.

Sherman and others (93) report general agreement among athletic directors that academic assistance programs for student-athletes have a positive effect on graduation rates of athletes. The research of Gibson and Creamer (36) indicates that athletes' attitude toward support programs is directly related to academic encouragement from college personnel.

Gurney and Johnston describe the advising process as "essential to the academic success of the student-athlete, for it is this process which creates the necessary climate of encouragement and support" (43, p. 37). In addition to needs-based advising services, Gurney and Stuart (42) recommend developing academic support services based on the needs of athletes.

Once support services have been developed for student-athletes at a college, they should be constantly evaluated for relevance and effectiveness (18). Addressing higher education in general, Keller argues that data should be maintained to help understand students as they enter the system and to evaluate the effect of the system on the student (56, p. 132). Emphasizing the critical nature of support services for athletes, Fuller (32) strongly
recommends that professionals avoid complacency and continually look for more effective ways to assist this target group of students.

The University of Florida program described by Wittmer and others (120) has been designed to enhance the personal development of student-athletes. The program consists of residential counselors/advisors, a personal development course, and a senior exit seminar. Alumni are encouraged to return for career counseling (2). Each facet of the program is designed to meet specific needs of the student-athlete.

Walter and Smith (112) discuss an intense academic support program at the University of Michigan. Academic support begins with extensive testing prior to the first freshman semester of classes. Once assessments have been completed, appropriate levels of remediation and support are determined and required. Through constant monitoring of each student's progress, support activities can be adjusted as individual needs change.

The University of North Texas—formerly North Texas State University—reports a 50 percent increase in the retention of freshmen athletes since initiating a support program for athletes (90). In addition to a daily study hall required for all freshmen, all first year transfers, and all others with unacceptable grade point averages, the program includes study skills training, individual advising, and personal encouragement.
Sulz (100) discusses a unique arrangement at Northern Illinois University. By basing the Athletic Counseling Program in the Counseling and Student Development Center, officials hope to avoid any possible conflicts of interest that might exist if the support service were part of the athletic department. One disadvantage of this approach is that it makes communication between the counseling staff and coaches more difficult.

McCloud (70) reviews unique features of the support program at Virginia Commonwealth University. In addition to traditional academic support, the staff also provides intense orientation sessions for freshmen, creative incentives for academic success, and receptions for graduating athletes.

Whitner and Myers (117) trace the experiences of a freshman student-athlete through the Athletes Educational Planning Program at the University of Toledo. Findings indicate that the program has a positive effect on the athletes involved.

Northeastern University has developed a program to help professional athletes complete requirements for the college degrees they never earned (28). To qualify for half-price tuition in the program, participants must agree to appear at high schools and junior high schools to talk with students about the importance of education. Other universities are joining Northeastern in a consortium to
expand this dynamic project across the nation.

A successful academic support program at the University of Central Arkansas demonstrates that even smaller schools can provide assistance for student-athletes. Greer and others (40) contend that through efforts of the athletic staff, the academic staff, and the student services staff of a university, basic support services can be offered.

Harden and Pina-Tallmon (45) report that Montgomery College, a two-year college, also has developed a multifaceted academic support program for athletes. The eight components of the program include summer orientation, advising and registration, progress reports, individual conferences, workshops, study halls, peer mentors, and research and evaluation. Early observations indicate an increase in grade point averages and retention rate.

Based on research at the University of Mississippi, Cooker and Caffey present data to suggest that group counseling for student-athletes can produce positive changes "in the areas of problem solving, interpersonal relationship building, and expression of feelings" (15, p. 383). Henderson (50) concludes from his study at Alabama A & M that systematic counseling does contribute to improved grades and increased class attendance among college athletes. Harney (46) indicates with his research that the Freshman Athlete Scholastic Training at Washington State
University does effectively improve athletes' academic performance. Stuart (98, 99) attributes the superior academic success of Iowa State University student-athletes to the extra personal attention and academic support services provided at that university. A recent report that the graduation rate of College Football Association football players is at an all time high (95), indicates that the increase in support services may be helping athletes to achieve academic success.

As Hurley and Cunningham (54, pp. 51-58) contend, the student-athlete faces unique adjustments to higher education. Administrators are obligated to try to understand those special needs and to provide services to address them. Harrison (47) has demonstrated that crucial descriptive data can be gleaned from student records to enhance one's understanding of athletes at a specific university. Golden (37, pp. 59-70) insists that the desire to meet the special needs of student-athletes should emerge from a philosophy implemented at levels of top administration.

Administration of College Athletic Departments

Presidents and other non-athletic administrators have suddenly found themselves intensely involved in the athletic component of higher education, responsibilities for which have been delegated or ignored for years. The suddenly
recognized significance of intercollegiate athletic programs
has found many university officials pitifully ignorant of
their own athletic programs and the students involved in
them (19, pp. 420-421; 85, p. 347; 119).

As Besvinick states, "Universities, of course, do not
'examine missions' or make conscious efforts; it is their
leaders who do so. By their decisions, they move the
universities along one path or another" (9, p. 573). Davis
applies this general concept to athletic programs, "In
athletics, as in other sectors of the university, someone
has to be in charge--that someone is the president" (19, p.
426). Richard D. Schulz, executive director of the NCAA
helped to clarify the president's role at a recent meeting
of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and
Colleges.

Virtually all of the problems in college sports ...
start on individual campuses.

Many of them result from the coach "who's so
powerful he can move past the chief executive officer
and the athletics director and go straight to board
members, who can make things happen so he can have a
good program."

Problems arise on the flip side ... when board
members, interested in building a strong program, bypass
presidents and athletics directors and go straight to
the coaches, offering their help (94).

Athletic troubles at one major university even brought about
questions as to the administration of the university in
general (53, 62).

Even though the president should retain ultimate
responsibility for a university’s athletic program, delegation of most of the related administrative tasks is a necessity. Golden recommends that the chief student affairs officer be the primary recipient of these delegated assignments.

Organizationally, athletic programs and athletic directors should report to the CSAO, who in turn reports to the chief executive officer (CEO). This is important because athletics are developmental in nature, and they need the attention of a CSAO who embodies the college or university to athletic administrators, coaches, support staff, and athletes. The CSAO should also interpret and, when necessary, enforce rules and regulations that affect athletes individually and collectively (37, p. 61).

Becker and others contend that presidents can control athletic programs more effectively with active involvement of academic and administrative colleagues. Even though chief executive officers have sufficient formal power to control college athletics,

they are unlikely to be successful on their individual campuses if they attempt to wield that power directly, and few have the time or inclination to do it effectively. Equally important, the political risks are too great. Too visible involvement will generally result in negative reactions—from many faculty when the athletic program is successful and from others when it is not. These negative reactions can be lessened or redirected if control is exercised more indirectly, with responsibility divided appropriately between an athletic administrator and a governing board made up largely, if not totally, of faculty members and administrators (8, p. 432).

El-Khawas (23) recommends a campus advisory committee as a vital component of the traditional self-regulation of college athletics. Floyd (30) concurs that faculty
participation enhances the decision-making process in higher education.

Policy statements of the American Council on Education (ACE) support the preceding suggestions. Recommendations for college presidents include:

Presidential delegation of authority for all types of programs, including athletics, is necessary to effective administration. Presidents who delegate authority to an athletics director for the conduct of collegiate athletics programs are, nevertheless, responsible for assuring themselves and their various constituencies that their respective programs are being conducted with integrity.

When authority for the athletics program is delegated to a faculty committee, the president still has responsibility to oversee the program and to be assured of its integrity (85, p. 347-348).

A recent study by Barrett (7) indicates that while rethinking their roles in the athletic programs at their respective universities, many presidents are searching for more effective methods of operating in their athletic conferences and the NCAA. Farrell (29) reports in a limited study that athletic departments with stronger presidential control experience fewer problems related to breaking rules.

Most recommendations for improved governance of intercollegiate athletic programs seem to focus on the chief executive officer of the college or university. As one of three specific suggestions for cleaning up college sports, Atwell calls for "an organized effort on the part of the presidential establishment" (3, p. 373). Mihalich challenges presidents to take charge of the sports component
of higher education.

Concerned college administrators must confront enthusiastic alumni who are willing to pay any price to make their schools nationally visible through sports. They must confront society at large—a society hooked on sports and willing to equate the sporting experience with the values of the ages. And they must confront sports governing bodies that have perhaps been influenced by the national euphoria over bowl games and other championships. But they must confront them, since this is the key to survival (71, p. 74).

Eitzen contends, "Presidents, as chief executive officers, must be responsible. They must set up mechanisms to monitor athletic programs and detect illegal or unethical acts" (22).

Summary

Recent literature openly reveals the current crisis of integrity in intercollegiate sports. Scandals have brought forth penetrating questions about the administration of specific universities as well as the mission of higher education in general. In response to accounts of extensive academic abuse of student-athletes, scholars are beginning to realize the special characteristics and needs of this group of students. The recognition of special needs tends to breed special services. Student services designed specifically for student-athletes are beginning to emerge at colleges and universities across the nation.

The resolution of current crises in intercollegiate athletics lies in the hands of chief executive officers at participating colleges and universities. Athletic directors
and coaches cannot maintain aggressive and ethical sports programs without strong leadership and consistent support from university presidents. Both individually and collectively, chief administrators will determine the future of college sports through either proactive involvement or passive neglect.
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CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Population

The population of student-athletes in this study consists of the scholarship freshman participants on a Division IAA university intercollegiate football team during the 1986-87 academic year. Since the entire population of eighteen student-athletes was utilized, no sampling procedures were required.

The administrator/faculty population consists of the university administrators and faculty serving as members of the Athletic Council of the university during the 1986-87 academic year. Since the entire population of eight individuals was utilized, no sampling procedures were required.

Instruments

The supplemental questionnaire (see appendix C, p. 112) is an instrument designed by the researcher to assist in the collection of necessary data for this particular study. The intent was to ascertain university administrator and faculty perceptions of population characteristics.

The standardized instrument for collection of
developmental characteristic data is the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis. The purpose of the instrument is stated in its manual:

The T-JTA is used to measure a number of important and comparatively independent common personality variables or attitudes and behavioral tendencies which influence personal, social, marital, parental, scholastic, and vocational adjustment. It is designed to aid the counselor in ascertaining and evaluating the significance and role of these traits in the overall problem or circumstance (7, p. 1).

The manual explains that the primary use of the instrument is not for diagnosis of "extreme maladjustments" but rather "...for use in the more ordinary counseling situation, such as individual, pre-marital, marital, and family counseling, and in student and vocational counseling and guidance" (7, p. 1).

A unique feature of this instrument especially applicable to this study is the "criss-cross" administration. This technique permits an individual to answer the questionnaire as another person, reflecting the respondent's perception of the other person (7, p. 1). This technique produces an other-perceived profile that can be compared to a self-perceived profile.

The nine bipolar traits measured by the instrument are nervous/composed, depressive/lighthearted, active-social/quiet, expressive-responsive/inhibited, sympathetic/indifferent, subjective/objective, dominant/submissive, hostile/tolerant, and self-disciplined/impulsive. The
instrument also includes a built-in attitude scale to detect testing bias which produces overly critical or overly favorable responses (7, pp. 7-15).

Reliability and validity studies indicate that the instrument deserves respect and confidence. Reliability studies support both the stability and the consistency of the instrument while validity studies substantiate both empirical and construct validity (7, pp. 19-26).

Small provides a positive critique from an external perspective:

In sum, the T-JTA is a very useful test. It has an elegant history, extensive statistical research, and wonderful possibilities for counseling. The test's strong points are its usefulness in youth work and relationship counseling, and the weak points can be moderated by interpretation. It is highly recommended (2, p. 658).

Mosher (1, p. 573) presents a positive but more reserved evaluation. He states, "Overall, the TJTA is a carefully constructed test which might very well be useful in individual, premarital, and marital counseling."

The instrument used for measuring study habit strengths and weaknesses is the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory. This self-reporting, twenty-eight item questionnaire is recommended for the determination of study weaknesses of a group of students so that appropriate assistance can be provided (8, p. 1).
Data Collection

The collection of data was conducted in four phases corresponding to the four research questions. The first phase involved gathering information through a jury of experts. Because of their intense involvement with intercollegiate student-athletes, the athletic director, the head football coach and the athletic academic coordinator at the university under study were selected for participation. In individual interviews, these experts were asked to submit their ideas about which student-athlete group characteristics would be most helpful in making administrative decisions about athletic programs. These lists were then compiled and presented to the experts for their evaluation. All three agreed that the list reflected their convictions.

The characteristics identified as most useful by the experts fall into three categories—demographic, academic, and developmental characteristics. Critical aspects of a student-athlete's demographic background include the size of the high school attended, the distance of the hometown from the university, the economic strength of the family, and the type of hometown community setting—metropolitan, suburban, town, or rural. Useful academic data include high school rank in class, SAT score, and college grade point average. Developmental characteristics identified as helpful include leadership capabilities and self-discipline level. In
addition to these personal characteristics, the experts also emphasized the importance of understanding the weekly athletic demands on the student-athlete's time.

The second phase consisted of collecting data to actually describe the identified characteristics of the group of student-athletes under study. After participants had signed permission forms for the collection and use of data (see appendix A, p. 100), information was obtained from student files through the university intercollegiate athletic office.

The size of a high school was measured by the number of students in the 1986 graduating class. This number was derived from the denominator of each student's rank in class. Distance from each hometown to the university was determined from The Official State Mileage Guide (5). Hometown populations were determined from the 1986-87 Texas Almanac (3, pp. 444-457). Types of hometown had been classified according to the following standards. Metropolitan classification indicates a city with population greater than 250,000. Urban classification indicates a city with population between 50,000 and 249,999. Small town classification indicates a community with population between 10,000 and 49,999. Rural classification indicates a community with population less than 10,000.

High school ranks in class, SAT scores, first year college grade point averages, and Pell Grant qualifications
were also found in student files. In the four cases with ACT scores but no SAT scores, the ACT composite scores were converted to SAT total scores using a published conversion chart (4, p. 4). In this conversion process, the median SAT score was used to represent the range of SAT scores corresponding to each ACT score.

Developmental characteristics were measured through use of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, using the dominant/submissive scale to measure leadership capabilities and the self-disciplined/impulsive scale to measure levels of self-discipline (6, pp. 37-42). The intercorrelation between these two scales is reported to be .212 and is described as "generally low" (7, p. 26). Results of the other seven scales were calculated and reported as additional information.

Student-athletes completed Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaires in regularly scheduled study hall sessions. Those missing regular sessions were rescheduled until maximum participation was achieved. Only one student refused to participate.

Athletic demands on student-athletes' daily schedules were estimated by the head football coach. Hours committed to athletics were estimated to be about twenty five per week during the fall football season, and about ten per week during the spring semester.

In addition to those characteristics identified by the
jury of experts, self-reported study habit strengths and weaknesses were measured by administration of the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory. This instrument was administered along with the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis. Again, only one student refused to participate.

The third phase consisted of collection of data from several other groups with which to compare the study group's characteristics. Telephone inquiries were made to find comparable data for all freshmen at the university of the study group. Through the admissions office, the registrar's office and the planning office, the only data available were the average SAT score and the average high school rank in class for the subjects' cohorts. Responding to a written request for information (see appendix B, pp. 105, 106), the office of the athletic conference in which the university competes could provide only the average SAT score and the average high school grade point average for the freshman student-athletes in the conference. Answering a similar written request for information (see appendix B, pp. 107, 108), the NCAA responded that none of the requested information was available through its office.

National college norms were obtained for comparisons of the characteristics measured with the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (7, pp. 38-45). A national average score was found for the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory (8, p. 2).
The fourth phase was designed to determine the perceptions of the group of student-athletes by a group of university officials. Members of the Athletic Council were selected because of their direct involvement in the university's athletic program. Each member was asked to complete a Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaire and a supplemental questionnaire (see appendix C, pp. 111, 112) to reflect that group's perceptions of the student-athletes being studied.

This process was conducted with mailed materials and written instructions (see appendix C). Each packet was coded to facilitate follow-up communication. After three weeks were allowed for completion and return of each mailed questionnaire, only three council members had provided the requested information. Two others responded that they had chosen not to participate due to their own lack of information. Additional packets with personal cover letters (see appendix D, p. 115) were mailed to the three who had not responded at all. Two of those three returned the packets, indicating that they did not know the student-athletes well enough to speculate on their characteristics. One failed to respond at all.

Finally, attempts were made to contact by telephone all five of the council members who had not provided information to ask for their responses to an abbreviated questionnaire (see appendix D, p. 116) and the original
supplemental questionnaire. This shortened instrument was designed to obtain council members' perceptions of the student-athlete group under study in each of the nine categories of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis on a scale ranging from one to ten.

One council member consented to report his perceptions in the telephone interview. Two others asked that the abbreviated form of the questionnaire be mailed to them for consideration. The remaining two members of the original group were unavailable for telephone contact in spite of repeated attempts. New packets with cover letters (see appendix D, pp. 117, 118) were mailed to all four of these council members, asking for their responses to the abbreviated questionnaire. All returned their responses, but one still failed to complete the supplemental questionnaire. No additional follow-up attempts were made.

Data Analysis

Characteristics identified as useful by the jury of three experts were categorized and listed. Descriptive characteristics of the student-athlete group were reported as group means with medians and ranges.

Group means of student-athlete characteristics were compared with other available means from the university, the conference and national norms. A t test was used for each comparison since data were not available in all categories.
Significance was be determined at the .05 level with two-tailed t tests.

Group means of student-athlete characteristics were compared with group means of perceived characteristics of the same group by Athletic Council members. Multivariate analyses of variance were used to obtain Hotelling's T square to determine the significance of differences between the two group profiles.

Summary

The initial phase of this study was achieved through discussions with a jury of experts to identify which characteristics of student-athletes would be most helpful in making administrative decisions about intercollegiate athletic programs. The experts easily agreed upon a list including demographic, academic, and developmental characteristics.

The student-athletes selected for this study were the eighteen freshman scholarship football participants at a Division IAA university. Descriptive information about these students was obtained through university files, the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, and the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory.

Study group characteristics were then compared with the same characteristics of other groups. Comparisons were made with the entire freshman class at the study
group's university, the freshman football participants in the university's intercollegiate athletic conference, and available national norms.

Finally, the study group's characteristics were compared with the university Athletic Council members' perceptions of the study group based on the same characteristics. These perceptions were obtained through the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis and questionnaires designed for this study.

Appropriate statistical techniques were conducted to analyze and report data. T tests were used for comparisons of individual characteristics and multivariate analyses of variance were used for group comparisons.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The data obtained through the procedures described in Chapters I and III were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques to address each research question. The results of these analyses are presented in tabular form.

Identification of Characteristics

The first phase of the study was to identify which characteristics of intercollegiate student-athletes would be most helpful in making administrative decisions that would affect them. A jury of experts agreed on the characteristics listed in table 1.

Personal characteristics were grouped into three distinct categories—demographic, academic, and developmental. Characteristics classified as demographic consist of those which relate to a student's hometown, high school, or family background. Academic characteristics include measures of a student's scholastic ability and achievements. Developmental characteristics are traits related to a student's personal development. Although it is not a personal characteristic, the experts insisted that the time a student-athlete commits to athletics should be a critical consideration in administrative decisions regarding
Table 1.--Characteristics of Intercollegiate Student-Athletes Useful in Making Administrative Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristic Identified as Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
<td>Size of High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance of Hometown from University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Strength of Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>High School Rank in Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAT Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Time Committed to Athletics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

athletic programs.

Study Group Profile

The second phase of the study was to describe a group of student-athletes based on the characteristics identified in research question one. These data were obtained and analyzed to produce a descriptive profile of the group of student-athletes selected for this study. The student-athlete group profile is reported in table 2 as the minimum, maximum, range, median, and mean values of the group data.
Table 2.--Characteristics of Study Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in High School Senior Class</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>383.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles from Hometown to University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hometown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Strength of Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank in Class (Percentile)*</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>98.46</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>68.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>827.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

* Percentile mean is used to conform to institutional data.
Type of hometown—based on population—and economic strength of family—based on Pell Grant qualification—were coded to facilitate manipulation of data. For types of hometown, metropolitan classification was assigned a value of 4, urban 3, small town 2, and rural 1. For family economic strength, a student who qualified for a Pell Grant was assigned a value of 0, and a student who did not qualify was assigned a 1. Scores for leadership capabilities and level of self-discipline as measured by the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis were converted to sten scores (7, p. 43).

Extreme maximum values for the number in the high school senior class and miles from the hometown to the university caused the mean values for those characteristics to noticeably exceed the median values. Even though ranges are substantial for all characteristics, they are most apparent for the number in the high school senior class, miles from the hometown to the university, type of hometown, and high school rank in class.

Since the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis was administered in its entirety for the study group of student-athletes, scores for all nine traits were analyzed and reported for the study group. After raw scores had been converted to sten scores (7, p. 43), descriptive statistics were compiled and are reported in table 3.

The single lowest minimum value appears for the
Table 3.—Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Traits Scores of Study Group, Sten Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composed, Nervous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Hearted, Depressive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, Active/Social</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited, Expressive/Responsive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, Sympathetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective, Subjective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive, Dominant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant, Hostile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Self-Disciplined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean values have been rounded to hundredths.

impulsive/self-disciplined trait, indicating a low level of self-discipline for the person or persons demonstrating that score. This value of one is the lowest possible sten value. Maximum values of ten—the highest possible sten value—appear for six of the nine traits. These values indicate high tendencies for nervousness, depression, sympathy, subjectivity, dominance, and hostility in the individuals associated with the maximum scores for each trait. The largest range appears for the indifferent/sympathetic trait.
Group Data Comparisons

The third phase of the study consisted of comparisons of the characteristics of the study group with those of larger populations. Although comparative information was scarce, some data were found at university, conference, and national levels. These data are reported in table 4.

Table 4.--Available Group Means of Identified Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Study Group Mean</th>
<th>University Freshmen Mean</th>
<th>Conference Freshmen Mean</th>
<th>National Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in HS Senior Class</td>
<td>383.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles from Hometown to University</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hometown</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Strength of Family</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Class Rank (Percentile)</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>827.78</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>797.11</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grade Point Average</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.
Of the characteristics identified as useful in this study, university officials could supply freshman class means for only two—high school rank in class and SAT score. The mean percentile high school class rank for the freshman class of the study group was reported to be 69, and the mean SAT score of the same class was reported to be 904. There were 2,170 students in that particular freshman class.

Two-tailed t tests were used to compare the study group means and the university freshman class means for the two characteristics with complete data. Results of these t tests are reported in Table 5.

Table 5—Two-Tailed T Test Results for Comparisons of Study Group Means and University Freshman Class Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Study Group (N=18)</th>
<th>University Freshmen (N=2,170)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Class Rank (Percentile)</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>827.78</td>
<td>95.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean, standard deviation, and t values have been rounded to hundredths, and p values have been rounded to thousandths.

* p < .05
Statistical values were calculated using an IBM personal computer and ABSTAT software (1, p. 94). Since no standard deviations were available for the university data, the software used that of the study group as an estimate for that value in the calculations. Even though the difference in high school class ranks did not prove to be significant, the study group mean SAT score tested to be lower than the university freshman class mean at the .003 level of significance.

Two-tailed t tests were used to compare the study group means and the Conference freshmen means for SAT scores. The results of these t tests are reported in table 6.

Table 6.--Two-Tailed T Test Results for Comparison of Study Group Means and Conference Freshmen SAT Score Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Study Group (N=18)</th>
<th>Conference Freshmen (N=97)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>827.78</td>
<td>95.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

Conference officials also supplied high school grade point averages, but since that characteristic was not included in the list composed by the jury of experts, no
efforts were made to include that data in the statistical analyses. Statistical values were calculated using an IBM personal computer and ABSTAT software (1, pp. 91-92). The difference in means did not test to be significant.

National norms were available for the SAT and for the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis. Results of the two-tailed t tests used to compare the means are reported in table 7.

Table 7.—Two-Tailed T Test Results for Comparison of Study Group Means and Available National Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Study Group (N=18)</th>
<th>National Norms</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean (Estimate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>827.78</td>
<td>95.01</td>
<td>906 (95.01)</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean, standard deviation, and t values have been rounded to hundredths, and p values have been rounded to thousandths.

* p < .05

The mean national SAT score for the nation's freshman class was 906 with 1,000,748 scores reported (5, pp. 1, 3).
Since Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis scores were converted to sten scores using national norms for male college students (7, p. 43), 5.5 was used as the mean and 2.00 as the standard deviation for the national norm. Differences in the two Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis trait scores did not test to be significant, but the study group mean SAT score tested to be lower than the national mean at the .003 level of significance.

Statistical values were calculated using an IBM personal computer and ABSTAT software (1, p. 94). Since no standard deviation was available for the national SAT mean, the software used that of the study group as an estimate for that value in the calculations.

As additional information, all study group means on the nine traits measured by the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis were compared with national male college norms using two-tailed independent t tests with sten scores. These data are reported in table 8. Statistical values were calculated using an IBM personal computer and ABSTAT software (1, pp. 92-93).

None of the differences proved to be statistically significant except for the trait measuring levels of tolerance and hostility. The study group mean tested to be less tolerant and more hostile than the national norm for college males at the .002 level of significance.

Also, as additional information, the results of the
Table 8.---Two-Tailed T Tests Results for for Comparisons of Study Group Means and T-JTA National College Male Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Study Group (N=17)</th>
<th>National Norms (N=1,644)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composed, Nervous</td>
<td>6.24 1.92</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Hearted, Depressive</td>
<td>6.53 1.66</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, Active/Social</td>
<td>5.24 1.60</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited, Expressive/Responsive</td>
<td>5.06 1.39</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, Sympathetic</td>
<td>5.41 1.97</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective, Subjective</td>
<td>6.65 1.80</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive, Dominant</td>
<td>6.82 1.85</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant, Hostile</td>
<td>7.41 1.42</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Self-Disciplined</td>
<td>5.12 1.87</td>
<td>5.50 2.00</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean, standard deviation, and t values have been rounded to hundredths, and p values have been rounded to thousandths.

* p < .05

Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory are reported. Descriptive statistics in table 9 include minimum, maximum, range, median, and mean.

While the study group's range of scores indicates a
Table 9.—Descriptive Statistics of Study Group's Scores on Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean value has been rounded to hundredths.

A broad spectrum of study skills development, analysis of each individual student's responses would reveal specific information about each student's strengths and weaknesses. This information would be very helpful in maintaining an effective academic support program.

Table 10 contains the results of a two-tailed t test comparing the group mean with a national mean for the Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory. Statistical values were calculated using an IBM personal computer and ABSTAT software (1, p. 94). Since no standard deviation was available for the national mean, the software used that of the study group as an estimate for that value in the calculations.

Although the difference in means did not prove to be significant, some individual scores indicate substantial deficiencies in the development of effective study skills. Students demonstrating low scores could be diagnosed individually and then grouped for remediation and support services.
Table 10.—Results of Two-Tailed T Test for Study Group's Mean and National Norm on Wrenn Study Habits Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Group</th>
<th>National Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>63.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

Athletic Council Perceptions

The fourth phase of the study involved a statistical comparison of the study group's characteristics and the Athletic Council's perception of those same characteristics of the study group. Results of the Athletic Council members' responses to questionnaires are reported as descriptive statistics in table 11. Minimum, maximum, range, median, and mean values are reported.

Information reflecting council members' perceptions of the study group is based on the characteristics identified in research question one. As with study group data, type of hometown—based on population—and economic strength of family—based on Pell Grant qualification—were coded to facilitate manipulation of data. For types of hometown, metropolitan classification was assigned a value of 4, urban 3, small town 2, and rural 1. For economic strength, a student who qualified for a Pell Grant was assigned a value
Table 11.--Athletic Council Perceptions of Study Group Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in High School Senior Class</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>229.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles from Hometown to University</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>115.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hometown</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Strength of Family</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Rank in Class (Percentile)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>765.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grade Point Average</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.
of 0, and a student who did not qualify was assigned a 1. Scores for leadership capabilities and level of self-discipline as measured by the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis were converted to sten scores (7, p. 43).

The most substantial ranges appear in the number of students in the high school senior class, miles from the hometown to the university, economic strength of the family, and level of self-discipline. The median value for the level of self-discipline is 3.33 and while the mean is 4.63.

Table 12 reports the results of the Athletic Council members' responses to the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaire. These values reflect the council members' perceptions of the study group based on the nine traits measured by the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis.

Three of the council members actually completed Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaires to indicate their perceptions of the study group. These results were then converted to sten scores (7, p. 44). The other five council members responded to the abbreviated questionnaire regarding the same nine traits. These values—from one to ten—were used as sten scores. Due to these two different methods of obtaining information from council members, extreme caution should be taken in the use of any statistical conclusions derived from these data.

Extreme minimum values appear for the inhibited/expansive, indifferent/sympathetic, and impulsive/self-
Table 12.—Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis Trait Scores of Study Group as Perceived by the Athletic Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Trait</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composed, Nervous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Hearted, Depressive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, Active/Social</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited, Expressive/Responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, Sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective, Subjective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive, Dominant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant, Hostile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Self-Disciplined</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

disciplined traits. Extreme maximum values occur for the inhibited/expressive, indifferent/sympathetic, objective/subjective, tolerant/hostile, and impulsive/self-disciplined traits.

The most substantial ranges are found for the inhibited/expressive, indifferent/sympathetic, tolerant/hostile, and impulsive/self-disciplined traits. The single largest range is for the inhibited/expressive trait.
Table 13 displays the means and standard deviations of the study group's characteristics identified in research question one along with the means and standard deviations of the Athletic Council members' perceptions of the study group based on the same characteristics.

Table 13.--Means and Standard Deviations of Study Group Characteristics and Athletic Council Members' Perceptions of Study Group Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Study Group (N=18)</th>
<th>Athletic Council (N=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in HS Senior Class</td>
<td>383.50</td>
<td>325.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles from Hometown to University</td>
<td>99.72</td>
<td>79.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Hometown</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Strength of Family</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Class Rank</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>19.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Score</td>
<td>827.78</td>
<td>95.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grade Point Average</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Capabilities</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Discipline</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.
Data reflecting type of home town and economic strength of family were coded. Leadership capabilities and level of self-discipline values were converted to sten scores.

Table 14 reports the means and standard deviations of the study group's Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis traits along with the means and standard deviations of the Athletic Council members' perceptions of the study group's traits.

Table 14.--Means and Standard Deviations of Study Group T-JTA Traits and Athletic Council Members' Perceptions of Study Group T-JTA Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Study Group (N=17)</th>
<th>Athletic Council (N=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composed, Nervous</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Hearted, Depressive</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, Active/Social</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited, Expressive/Responsive</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, Sympathetic</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective, Subjective</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive, Dominant</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant, Hostile</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Self-Disciplined</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.
These data reflect study group traits as perceived by themselves and by the Athletic Council members. Values were converted to sten scores (7, p. 44) prior to calculations.

Results of multivariate statistical tests for group comparisons are reported in table 15. The value for Hotelling’s T square (3, pp. 179-180; 4, pp. 281-291, 6, p. 453) was used to determine the significance of the differences in means. Calculations were conducted at the University of North Texas Computer Center with BMDP software (2, pp. 98-100).

Table 15.—Hotelling's T Square Test Results for Comparison of Study Group Characteristics and Athletic Council Members' Perceptions of Study Group Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics Identified in Question One</th>
<th>Hotelling's T Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traits Measured by T-JTA</td>
<td>28.71</td>
<td>9, 16</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>9, 16</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

* p < .05

Since the p value for the test of significance for the characteristics identified in question one is greater than .05, no additional analyses were conducted for that data.
However, the p value for the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis traits is less than .05, so follow-up tests were conducted to determine the traits for which differences were significant. Data are reported in table 16.

### Table 16.--Follow-Up Univariate Test Results for Study Group T-JTA Traits and Athletic Council Members' Perceptions of Study Group T-JTA Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Study Group (N=17)</th>
<th>Athletic Council (N=8)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composed, Nervous</td>
<td>6.24 1.92</td>
<td>5.38 1.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Hearted, Depressive</td>
<td>6.53 1.66</td>
<td>5.00 1.31</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet, Active/Social</td>
<td>5.24 1.60</td>
<td>5.25 1.75</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibited, Expressive/Responsive</td>
<td>5.06 1.39</td>
<td>4.88 3.00</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent, Sympathetic</td>
<td>5.41 1.97</td>
<td>5.25 2.31</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective, Subjective</td>
<td>6.65 1.80</td>
<td>5.63 2.07</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive, Dominant</td>
<td>6.82 1.85</td>
<td>5.50 1.51</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant, Hostile</td>
<td>7.41 1.42</td>
<td>5.25 2.12</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive, Self-Disciplined</td>
<td>5.12 1.87</td>
<td>4.63 2.72</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

*p < .05
Follow-up univariate statistics indicate that study group scores in depressive and hostile traits are significantly higher than the Athletic Council members' perception scores in the same traits. All other statistical differences are not significant. These analyses were conducted at the University of North Texas Computer Center using BMDP software (2, 98-100).

Additional Findings

Finally, the time student-athletes commit to athletics was estimated by the head football coach and by the members of the Athletic Council. Table 17 reports that information for which no statistical analyses were conducted.

Table 17.---Coach's Estimate and Athletic Council Members' Perceptions of Study Group's Time Commitment to Athletics in Hours per Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Coach's Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Time estimates do not include travel time for out of town games. Decimal values have been rounded to hundredths.

The Athletic Council members' mean estimate of student-athlete time committed to athletics for the fall semester--
27.29 hours per week—slightly exceeds the head football coach's estimate—25 hours per week. The range of council member estimates—22.5 hours per week—reflects the members' different perceptions of the time commitment. The council members' mean estimate for the spring semester—14.71 hours per week—exceeds the coach's estimate—10 hours per week—more substantially.

Summary

Several major findings emerge from this study. Although few of them were unexpected, they are interesting and revealing.

1. Early in the study, a jury of experts developed a list of student-athlete characteristics which would be helpful in making administrative decisions about intercollegiate athletic programs. These characteristics include the size of high school, distance from the hometown to the university, type of hometown, economic strength of the family, high school rank in class, SAT score, college grade point average, leadership capabilities, and level of self-discipline.

2. The study group's maximum sten scores for the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis are consistently very high. For six out of nine traits that value is ten—the highest possible sten score.

3. A comparison of the study group and university
freshman data reveals an interesting inconsistency. Even though the difference in high school class ranks does not test to be significant (p = 0.893), the study group mean SAT score tests to be lower than the university freshman class mean at the .003 level of significance.

4. None of the study group's Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis trait score means prove to be significantly different from national norms except for the trait reflecting levels of tolerance and hostility. The study group mean tests to be less tolerant and more hostile than national norms at the .002 level of significance.

5. Based on the characteristics identified as helpful, no significant difference exists between the study group profile and the perceptions of the study group by members of the Athletic Council.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

As intercollegiate athletic programs face intense scrutiny and uncertain futures due to recent exposures of unethical practices, the greatest single impact on their destiny will be the administrative leadership at colleges and universities across the nation. Many chief administrators have attempted to work with their athletic departments to ensure compatibility with institutional missions and goals. These same leaders have initiated collective endeavors to direct college athletics toward higher levels of integrity and respect.

As revelations of scandals unfold, the victims are most often student-athletes who have found themselves abused by systems—or individuals—operating from selfish greed, gross ignorance, or misguided sympathy. The same student-athletes have become the focus of reform. Administrators who are effectively re-establishing the integrity of college athletic programs are doing so by re-affirming the proper role of athletics in the lives of student-athletes.

Even though most intercollegiate athletes experience similar challenges and frustrations, their situations vary
tremendously from sport to sport and from campus to campus. Some general support services can be universally prescribed for athletic participants, but the most effective would be designed for the specific groups to be served. The particular characteristics and needs of the specific group of student-athletes would determine the most appropriate and most effective combination of services for that group. Such a needs based support system requires constant monitoring and evaluation of the group being served. This study provides the structure for initiating such a system in an intercollegiate athletic program.

The purpose of this study is to identify which characteristics of student-athletes would be most helpful in making administrative decisions, and then to develop a descriptive profile of student-athletes at a particular university. Additional purposes include comparing these descriptive data with other group data and with perceptions of the same group of student-athletes by faculty administrators at the same university.

Data were collected in four phases. First a jury of experts developed a list of student-athlete characteristics they believed to be helpful in making administrative decisions regarding those athletes. Next, information was gathered to develop a descriptive profile of the selected group of student-athletes based on the identified characteristics. Collection procedures included
investigation of student-athlete files and administration of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis.

Next, attempts were made to collect similar information about other groups of students for statistical comparisons. Limited data were found for the freshman class of the study group's university, freshman football participants in the university's athletic conference, and national norms. Finally, Athletic Council members' perceptions of the study group were ascertained through a questionnaire developed for this study and the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis.

Characteristics identified as helpful by the jury of experts are categorized and listed. Profile characteristics of the study group are reported as descriptive statistics. Group means of these characteristics are compared with other available group means from the university, the athletic conference, and national norms using t tests. Study group means are compared with group means of Athletic Council members' perceptions using multivariate analyses.

Summary of Major Findings

Particular findings of this study are both interesting and revealing. Most importantly, they demonstrate the feasibility of determining the unique characteristics of a group of student-athletes.

1. Early in the study, a jury of experts developed a list of student-athlete characteristics which would be
helpful in making administrative decisions about intercollegiate athletic programs. These characteristics include the size of high school, distance from the hometown to the university, type of hometown, economic strength of the family, high school rank in class, SAT score, college grade point average, leadership capabilities, and level of self-discipline.

2. The study group's maximum sten scores for the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis are consistently very high. For six of the nine traits that value is ten—the highest possible sten score. For one of the traits, the lowest possible minimum value of one appears.

3. A comparison of the study group and university freshmen data reveals an interesting inconsistency. Even though the difference in high school class ranks does not prove to be significant (p = 0.893), the study group mean SAT score tests to be lower than the university freshman class mean at the .003 level of significance.

4. None of the study group's Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis trait score means proves to be significantly different from national norms except for the trait reflecting levels of tolerance and hostility. The study group mean tests to be less tolerant and more hostile than national norms at the .002 level of significance.

5. Based on characteristics identified as helpful, no significant difference exists between the study group
profile and the perceptions of the study group by members of the Athletic Council.

Discussion of Findings

Due to the small size of the study group population, generalizations of findings should be avoided. The following discussion is limited to the study group and its university.

1. Student-athlete characteristics identified by the jury of experts as helpful in making administrative decisions are relatively few in number and fairly simple to measure. Information regarding demographic and academic background characteristics is readily available in student files. Developmental characteristics are easily matched to traits included in a standard personality inventory. Student time commitment to athletics can be estimated by anyone regularly involved in the program.

2. Study group individual maximum sten scores for Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis traits reach ten for six of the nine traits measured. These scores indicate very high tendencies of nervousness, depression, sympathy, subjectivity, dominance, and hostility among some of the group members. These high scores are distributed among the student-athletes with no one student-athlete demonstrating high scores in all of these traits.

The lowest possible minimum sten value appears for one
trait. This indicates a very low level of self-discipline for at least one of the student-athletes.

3. The study group's mean high school class rank is almost identical to that of the university's freshman class, but the study group mean SAT score is significantly lower. This inconsistency might be due to athletes' overachieving in high school, attempting less difficult courses than their classmates, underdeveloped test-taking skills, or some other less obvious reason. Further investigation might reveal interesting and helpful information about this group of student-athletes and student-athletes in general.

The study group's mean SAT score is significantly lower than the national mean. A national average SAT for student-athletes was not available to determine if this trend is typical for athletes.

4. The only personality trait for which the group mean tests to be significantly different from the norm is that of hostile. This trait is defined as "critical, thoughtless, or overtly inconsiderate . . . . impatient, sarcastic, angry, argumentative, unreasonable" (1, p. 10). It may also be demonstrated as "hostile attitudes or reactions to others, an intolerance of weakness in others, and a superior, overbearing attitude and manner" (1, p. 10). This finding warrants further investigation.

5. The members of the Athletic Council demonstrate a good general understanding of the study group based on the
characteristics identified as useful. Even though some of the members were reluctant to participate, their responses indicate a fairly accurate group perception of the student-athletes.

Conclusions

Conclusions are few but crucial. If colleges and universities continue to maintain intercollegiate athletic components, then it behooves all involved to make athletics a positive experience for all the students involved.

1. It seems that university administrators have a valuable source of knowledge and wisdom about student-athletes in their colleagues in athletic offices. Even though their backgrounds may not always be of the highest academic caliber, coaches and athletic directors are partners in the higher education of college students as long as universities continue to promote intercollegiate athletics. Working relationships between athletic professionals and academic professionals can only help to enhance the development of the student-athlete.

In this particular study, campus athletic officials were excited to be asked to contribute their expert ideas. They expressed their enthusiasm for participating in a project that might enhance the collegiate experience of their student-athletes.

2. The study group's profile based on this list of
characteristics seems to describe a diverse group of students. Wide ranges occur for measures of most of the characteristics identified as helpful.

These substantial ranges indicate a broad spectrum of high school and hometown backgrounds. Senior class sizes vary from 32 to 1,258 students. While the distances from the hometowns to the university varies from 30 to 300 miles, most are less than 100 miles. A wide range occurs again in types of hometowns. Students bring backgrounds of all types from rural settings to major metropolitan areas.

The group's high school ranks reveal a wide range of academic success. The college grade point averages for the freshman year indicate that some of the students are, in fact, struggling academically.

Wide ranges also exist for the measures of developmental attributes. Leadership capability scores reflect a level generally higher than the norm. Even though the difference in group means is not statistically significant, several of these students demonstrate scores which indicate strong leadership capabilities. The group mean for self-discipline is not significantly different from the norm, but a few individual scores indicate a need for development in this trait.

3. Group data for comparison with the study group seems to be unreasonably limited. Group information was available from the university for only two of the nine
characteristics identified as helpful. The athletic conference provided data for only one characteristic, and the NCAA had records for none. National means were available for the two Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis traits and for SAT scores.

It seems that campus administrators could agree upon a standard set of descriptive data to be gathered and maintained in an organized effort to enhance their understanding of student-athletes. This endeavor would require participation beyond the individual campus. Studies could be conducted at all levels—campus, conference, and national—to help university administrators revitalize their intercollegiate athletic programs.

4. This study demonstrates that descriptive data can be identified and obtained to help officials understand the specific strengths and needs of a particular group of student-athletes. It appears that the ultimate value of these types of data depends on how officials choose to use them.

It seems that an administrative leader who is committed to helping student-athletes will hire and support a staff who will share that commitment. Understanding and helping any group of students requires intentional effort. Someone in charge must make that effort a priority.

5. Finally, it seems that the implications of this study also apply to groups of students other than
intercollegiate student-athletes. A deeper understanding of students can enhance the effectiveness of higher education professionals in developing and delivering meaningful educational opportunities to all students.

Recommendations for Future Research

The investigation of student-athlete characteristics is open for many exciting studies. Several additional research possibilities emerge from this study.

1. A more extensive look at which student-athlete characteristics would be helpful in making administrative decisions might provide a common list as a guide for more complete data collection.

2. With more data, a study might be conducted to see which of those characteristics are most stable at specific universities and which would require extensive monitoring.

3. A similar study might be conducted for another special group of college students such as majors in specific academic departments, students on academic probation, or graduate students.

4. Once data have been collected for a group of student-athletes, periodic replications of the study for that group would detect any changes in characteristics. Changes might be attributed to natural maturation, university impact, athletic experience, or other factors.

5. A study involving all student-athletes at a campus
would reveal possible differences in characteristics of several sub-groups based on type of sport, year in college, economic strength, scholarship type, athletic ability, academic success, marital status, and other groupings.

6. Longitudinal research would identify long range implications of the characteristics studied.

7. Broad based research of common characteristics would demonstrate to what extent student-athlete traits differ among universities, among types and sizes of colleges, and among sections of the country.

8. Extensive data collection at all levels of possible comparison would facilitate future comparative studies.

9. Intercollegiate athlete norms might be developed for a personality inventory.

10. An extensive characteristic study at the conference level would provide comparative data for all member institutions.

11. A similar study using a sample of all faculty members would reveal a more general measure of the accuracy of faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

12. A study using a sample of students at a university would provide information on student perceptions of student-athletes.

13. A study of perceptions of student-athletes before and after serving on an athletic council would reveal the effects of that experience.
The topic has numerous opportunities for additional studies. Our increased understanding of student-athletes can only help us to work with them more effectively, and, in doing so, help them to better serve the university.
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APPENDIX A

MATERIALS FOR COLLECTING STUDENT-ATHLETE DATA
NAME (please print)

I hereby give consent to Lindsey Gunn to perform or supervise the following investigational procedures or treatments for dissertation purposes:

1. To obtain and report data from my records at the university intercollegiate athletic office. I understand that data will be reported only in group form.

2. To report the results of my Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis administered in the spring, 1987. I understand that the results will be reported only in group form.

3. To report the results of my Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory administered in the spring, 1987. I understand that the results will be reported only in group form.

I have been provided:

A fair explanation of the procedures to be followed, and their purposes;

A description of any discomforts and risks to be expected;

A description of any benefits to be expected;

A disclosure of any appropriate alternative procedures that might be advantageous;

An offer to answer any questions concerning the procedures;

Assurance that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time without prejudice to me.

SIGNED:  
SUBJECT  DATE
Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaire and answer sheet have not been reproduced due to copyright restrictions. Copies may be obtained from the publisher, Psychological Publications, Inc., 5300 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90027.
The Wrenn Study-Habits Inventory questionnaire has not been reproduced due to copyright restrictions. Copies may be obtained from the publisher, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California 94305.
APPENDIX B

DOCUMENTS FOR REQUESTING DATA FROM UNIVERSITY, CONFERENCE, AND NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
Requests for data from the university were conducted through telephone conversations with officials in the admissions office, registrar's office, and planning office.
Dear Colleagues:

I am a Ph.D. candidate at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. As part of my degree requirements, I am writing a dissertation on characteristics of freshman football players at a Division IAA university. In my study, I hope to compare certain characteristics of these student-athletes with those of other students at the same university, other football players in the same conference, and other collegiate football players in general.

If the information is available, please complete the enclosed questionnaire on 1986-87 (school year) freshman football players in the [NAME] Conference. If this information is not available through your office, please let me know so I can pursue other options.

Thank you for your help in this project and for your continued efforts in intercollegiate athletics.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Gunn
914 Pebblebrook
Allen, TX 75002
(214) 881-8120
Please provide the following data concerning 1986-87 (school year) freshman football players in the [NAME] Conference.

| 1. Average size (number of students) of high school graduating class. | Conference Average |
| 2. Average distance from hometown to college/university. | |
| 3. Percent that qualify for Pell Grants. | |
| 4. Percent from each of the following types of residential backgrounds: | |
| Metropolitan (population 250,000+) | |
| Urban (population 50,000 - 249,000) | |
| Small Town (population 10,000 - 49,999) | |
| Rural (population less than 10,000) | |
| 5. Average high school class rank percentile. | |
| 6. Average first year college/university grade point average (4.0 scale). | |
| 7. Average SAT score. | |
| Average ACT score. | |
| 8. Average number of hours a week involved in athletic commitments during football season. | |
| 9. Average number of hours a week involved in athletic commitments during the spring semester. | |

I realize that this information may not be available through your office. Thank you for providing any data you might have.
Dear Colleagues:

I am a Ph.D. candidate at North Texas State University in Denton, Texas. As part of my degree requirements, I am writing a dissertation on characteristics of freshman football players at a Division IAA university. In my study, I hope to compare certain characteristics of these student-athletes with those of other students at the same university, other athletes in the same conference, and other collegiate athletes in general.

If the information is available, please complete the enclosed questionnaire on 1986-87 freshman football players for Division IAA, Division IA, and all divisions combined. If this information is not available through your office, please let me know so I can pursue other options.

Thank you for your help in this project and for your continued efforts in intercollegiate athletics.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Gunn
914 Pebblebrook
Allen, TX 75002
(214) 881-8120
Please provide the following data concerning 1986-87 (school year) freshman football players.

1. Average size (number of students) of high school graduating class.
   
2. Average distance from hometown to college/university.
   
3. Percent that qualify for Pell Grants.
   
4. Percent from each of the following types of residential backgrounds:
   - Metropolitan (population 250,000+)
   - Urban (pop. 50,000 - 249,000)
   - Small Town (pop. 10,000 - 49,999)
   - Rural (pop. less than 10,000)

5. Average high school class rank percentile.

6. Average first year college/university grade point average (4.0 scale).

7. Average SAT score.
   
8. Average number of hours a week involved in athletic commitments during football season.
   
9. Average number of hours a week involved in athletic commitments during the spring semester.

I realize that this information may not be available through your office. Thank you for providing any data you might have.
APPENDIX C

DOCUMENTS FOR REQUESTING INFORMATION FROM ATHLETIC COUNCIL
[DATE]

[INSIDE ADDRESS]

Dear [NAME],

I am a doctoral candidate at North Texas State University. Currently, I am completing a research dissertation titled "A Descriptive Profile of Freshman Student-Athletes on a Division IAA University Intercollegiate Football Team for Consideration in General Administrative Decision Making Processes."

Part of the study requires input from current administrators and faculty at the participating university. Will you please complete and return the enclosed questionnaires this week? The identification code on the answer sheets is for follow-up purposes only, and will not be communicated at any time. Results will be reported in group form only.

Your cooperation will be an important factor in the quality of data used in this critical study. Please read the enclosed instructions carefully and follow them closely.

If you would like to receive a summary of the final report of this study, please indicate your interest on the enclosed self-addressed postcard and mail it to me.

If you have any questions, please contact me by telephone -- collect -- at (214) 727-3473 (residence) or by mail at 914 Pebblebrook, Allen, Texas 75002. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Lindsey Gunn

Enclosures: 6

lg
INSTRUCTIONS

Completing the Taylor-Johnson Questionnaire

Please follow the instructions provided on the front page of the questionnaire. You may ignore the instructions regarding data in the upper right-hand corner of the answer sheet. The only responses you need to make are your answers to the 180 questions. Please mark these answers on the answer sheet.

The blank space (...) in each question will refer to "the typical freshman football player at this university." Please indicate with your response your perception of the current freshman intercollegiate football players at this university in each given situation.

Completing the Supplemental Questionnaire

Please follow the instructions provided on the questionnaire.

Returning Materials

After completing the questionnaires, please return all materials in the self-addressed envelope. The postcard may be enclosed or returned separately.
Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis questionnaire and answer sheet have not been reproduced due to copyright restrictions. Copies may be obtained from the publisher, Psychological Publications, Inc., 5300 Hollywood Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90027.
SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions according to your perceptions of current freshman intercollegiate football players at this university. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

Regarding the 1986 freshman intercollegiate football players at this university, what do you think is ...

1. ... the average size (number of students) of their high school graduating classes?

2. ... the average distance from their hometowns to this university?

3. ... the percent of them that come from homes with incomes that would qualify them for Pell Grants?

4. ... percent of them coming from each of these types of residential backgrounds?

- Metropolitan (population 250,000+)
- Urban (population 50,000 - 249,999)
- Small Town (population 10,000 - 49,999)
- Rural (population less than 10,000)

5. ... their average high school class rank? (Check one)

- Upper 10%
- Upper 20%
- Upper 30%
- Upper 40%
- Upper 50%
- Upper 60%
- Upper 70%
- Upper 80%
- Upper 90%

6. ... their average first semester university grade point average (4.0 scale)?

7. ... their average SAT score?

8. ... the average number of hours a week they are involved in athletic commitments during football season?

9. ... the average number of hours a week they are involved in athletic commitments during the spring semester?
Mr. Lindsey Gunn
914 Pebblebrook
Allen, TX 75002

1. I would like to receive a summarized copy of the final report of the study. Yes _____ No _____

2. Please send the report to the following address:
APPENDIX D

MATERIALS FOR FOLLOW-UP EFFORTS WITH ATHLETIC COUNCIL
Dear [NAME],

This letter is to let you know that I have not received the completed questionnaire I mailed to you on [DATE]. I have (have not) received the postcard indicating your request for summary information of the report.

I have attempted to pursue a study of current interest and significance. Although the athletic department at this university has not been involved in the recent wave of intercollegiate athletic scandals, efforts to establish increased integrity in the program can only result in a stronger bond between the athletic department and the other interests of the university.

I am enclosing a duplicate packet of information for your convenience. If you have any questions, please contact me by telephone -- collect -- at (214) 727-3473 (residence) or by mail at 914 Pebblebrook, Allen, Texas 75002.

Thank you again for your valuable time and expertise.

Sincerely yours,

Lindsey Gunn

Enclosures: 6

ig
Hello, my name is Lindsey Gunn. I am a doctoral candidate at North Texas State University. Over the past few weeks, I have mailed you two packets of materials to ask for your input in a research dissertation. Since I have not received your response, would you be willing to complete an abbreviated version of the questionnaires by phone?

[If respondent answers "yes," then continue. If respondent answers "no," then say "Thank you for your time," and terminate conversation.]

Please rate your perception of the typical 1986 freshman football player at this university on a scale ranging from one to ten in each of the following traits.

One is extremely composed, and ten is extremely nervous.

One is extremely light-hearted and ten is extremely depressive.

One is extremely quiet, and ten is extremely active/social.

One is extremely inhibited, and ten is extremely expressive/responsive.

One is extremely indifferent, and ten is extremely sympathetic.

One is extremely objective, and ten is extremely subjective.

One is extremely submissive, and ten is extremely dominant.

One is extremely tolerant, and ten is extremely hostile.

One is extremely impulsive, and ten is extremely self-disciplined.

[Obtain responses to supplemental questionnaire.]

Thank you for your time and help.

[Terminate conversation.]
Dear [NAME],

Thank you for considering involvement in my dissertation survey. Enclosed is the abbreviated version of the questionnaire I mentioned to you by phone this morning. I am interested in your perception of the group of student-athletes, however accurate that perception might be.

If you choose to participate, please send your completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed envelope. I hope to finish the dissertation within a couple of weeks, so your immediate response is deeply appreciated.

Thank you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Gunn
914 Pebblebrook
Allen, TX 75002
Home (214) 727-4358
Work (214) 881-8120
Dear [NAME],

I am a doctoral candidate at UNT attempting to complete a dissertation. Last fall, I sent you a questionnaire regarding your perception of freshman student-athletes at UNT. Since a member of my committee has urged me to obtain a higher rate of return on that particular questionnaire, I have reduced the number of questions in an attempt to gain more responses. Will you consider completing this shorter version?

Enclosed is the abbreviated version of the questionnaire. I am interested in your perception of the group of student-athletes, however accurate that perception might be.

If you choose to participate, please send your completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed envelope. I hope to finish the dissertation within a couple of weeks, so your immediate response is deeply appreciated.

Thank you for your help in this project.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Gunn
914 Pebblebrook
Allen, TX 75002
Home (214) 727-4358
Work (214) 881-8120
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