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Abstract:
The purpose of the study was to describe, analyze, and compare selected support services provided to male and female members of revenue and non-revenue sports teams at Division I institutions across the U.S. during Spring semester, 1993. One hundred eighty-three Division I directors of athletic academic support service programs provided demographic and academic support services information from a survey instrument entitled the Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire.

Five hypotheses were tested and analyzed using chi-square tests of independence. A range of 17 support services were found to be available through the athletic departments for male and female, revenue and non-revenue team members (hypothesis 1). When the same 17 services were available through another campus department, one service, personality assessment (an inventory measuring personality traits and interests), was provided more often for men’s revenue teams than for women’s revenue team members or for men’s or women’s non-revenue team members (hypothesis 2). While men’s revenue teams were travelling for sport related purposes, two of a possible five services, an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table, were available more often for men’s revenue team members than for men’s non-revenue team members (hypothesis 3). When the women’s teams were travelling for sport related purposes, the five services (an academic advisor/counselor, administration of tests, computer use, a proctored study table, and a tutor) were available but no one service was provided to an extent greater than the other services for any women’s teams (hypothesis 4). The respondents perceived that athletic academic support service programs enhanced the academic classroom performance of male and female, revenue and non-revenue team members (hypothesis 5).

Most services and athletic academic support programs were available for student-athletes regardless of gender and sports team membership. Men’s revenue teams were provided the availability of three services (academic advisor/counselor, proctored study table, and personality assessment) more often than for any other group.

This study added to the body of knowledge of support services available to encourage strong academic performances of Division I student-athletes. Additional study of the relationships between athletic services and academic achievement should be undertaken.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to describe, analyze, and compare selected support services provided to male and female members of revenue and non-revenue sports teams at Division I institutions across the U.S. during Spring semester, 1993. One hundred eighty-three Division I directors of athletic academic support service programs provided demographic and academic support services information from a survey instrument entitled the Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire.

Five hypotheses were tested and analyzed using chi-square tests of independence. A range of 17 support services were found to be available through the athletic departments for male and female, revenue and non-revenue team members (hypothesis 1). When the same 17 services were available through another campus department, one service, personality assessment (an inventory measuring personality traits and interests), was provided more often for men's revenue teams than for women's revenue team members or for men's or women's non-revenue team members (hypothesis 2). While men's revenue teams were travelling for sport related purposes, two of a possible five services, an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table, were available more often for men's revenue team members than for men's non-revenue team members (hypothesis 3). When the women's teams were travelling for sport related purposes, the five services (an academic advisor/counselor, administration of tests, computer use, a proctored study table, and a tutor) were available but no one service was provided to an extent greater than the other services for any women's teams (hypothesis 4). The respondents perceived that athletic academic support service programs enhanced the academic classroom performance of male and female, revenue and non-revenue team members (hypothesis 5).

Most services and athletic academic support programs were available for student-athletes regardless of gender and sports team membership. Men's revenue teams were provided the availability of three services (academic advisor/counselor, proctored study table, and personality assessment) more often than for any other group.

This study added to the body of knowledge of support services available to encourage strong academic performances of Division I student-athletes. Additional study of the relationships between athletic services and academic achievement should be undertaken.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the 1950's and throughout most of the 1960's there was strong optimism in American universities regarding the positive direction in which institutions were moving. As enrollments grew there was a marked increase in faculty influence, number of faculty, institutional revenue (Kerr, in Riesman, 1980; Jencks & Riesman, 1968), facilities, and student service programs including the support of academic advising programs for undergraduate students (Grites, 1979).

Since the late 1960's, throughout the 1970's and into the 1980's, there has been a shift in American faculty influence from "academic merit" to "student consumerism" (Kerr, in Riesman, 1980, p. xi). Faculty were no longer regarded as dominant, nor were there as many faculty (Gilley, 1991), revenue was harder to generate (Gilley, 1991), facilities were harder to come by, and students were increasing their influence in postsecondary institutions particularly regarding protection of their interests in regulating their institutions. Kerr considered this shift from academic merit to student consumerism as "one of the . . . greatest reversals of direction in all the history of American higher education" (Kerr, in Riesman, 1980, p. xi). This trend of student consumerism has continued into the 1990's as students realize they were, in a very real sense, consumers (Shore, 1991).
According to Gordon (1992), financial retrenchment, educating diverse student populations, a global economy, and other issues that were relevant to a changing society were also current challenges faced by higher education.

Intercollegiate athletics during the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's experienced growth in the number of sports and athletes, in securing the reputation of being able to generate revenue for their institutions and in offering student-athletes the opportunity for a postsecondary education. However, beginning in the 1970's and into the 1980's intercollegiate athletics have been increasingly plagued with controversy surrounding student-athletes and college athletics (Hurley & Cunningham, 1984; Underwood, 1980). In the early 1990's, seldom did many days go by without television, radio, newspapers, or journal articles questioning some aspect of college athletics, the student-athlete (Coakley, 1990; Cone & Rosenbaum, 1990; Shore, 1991; Telander, 1989), or an intercollegiate athletic program (Funk, 1991).

In a study reported by Lapchick (1989) over half of the respondents in a national opinion poll judged intercollegiate athletics as being overemphasized, academics neglected, and illegal activities common. Funk (1991) and Telander (1989) concurred that illegal activities in various forms were occurring.

One of the many accusations aimed at college or university athletic programs was that some of the student-athletes did not graduate after four years of playing for a university (Berg, 1989a; Coakley, 1990; Gup, 1989). Some authors stated that the student-athletes were granted degrees even though they may have
been illiterate or unable to handle the demands of life without athletic renown (Hurley & Cunningham, 1984). Whiddon (1989) noted that student-athletes needed to be realistically prepared for "life when the game is over" (p. 13). Nikow and DiNardo (1985) and Underwood (1984) mentioned that former student-athletes were sometimes without the skills deemed necessary for life after college. Pearson and Petitpas (1990, p. 8) noted that many athletes were "ill prepared to handle life without sports" at the end of their university playing careers. Telander (1989) mentioned that he has seen several former student-athletes who appeared lost when their playing days were over. However, Simon (1991) stated that "just because an athlete fails educationally, it does not follow that it is always the fault of the institution, athletic program, or coach. It may be the fault of the individual athlete" (p. 184).

The relationships between athletic participation and the academic performance of intercollegiate athletes have become a topic of major national (Coleman & Barker, 1991; Underwood, 1984; Whitner & Myers, 1986) and scholarly concern (Adler & Adler, 1985; Shore, 1991). The main issues surrounded academic integrity (Bailey, 1993; Coakley, 1990; Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 1991; Sellers, 1992) and student-athletes (Coleman & Barker, 1991; Sellers, Kuperminc & Waddell, 1991). Also, the "philosophies and politics of university athletic departments and the ability of the NCAA to govern its member institutions and to protect the rights of student-athletes [in order] to
receive an education and graduate from college" (Sailes, 1993, p. 29) have been questioned.

In response to demands for academic accountability in intercollegiate athletic programs, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1983 initiated Bylaw 14.3, referred to as Proposition 48 (Prop 48), which required freshmen athletes to have a minimum 2.0 (out of a maximum 4.0) cumulative grade point average (CGPA), with a minimum 2.0 CGPA in 11 high school core courses consisting of three years of English, two years of social science, mathematics, natural or physical sciences, and two additional years in any of the above areas or from other recognized core courses. Furthermore, each prospective student-athlete must score a minimum of 17 on the American College Test (ACT) or a minimum of 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) (National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA] Manual, 1993-94, pp. 129-131).

Beginning in August 1995, the standards for all NCAA affiliated Division I institutions will increase to a 2.5 minimum CGPA in 13 core courses (Berg, 1992; NCAA Manual, 1993-94) and a minimum of either a 700 SAT score or a 17 ACT score. Any prospective student-athletes who do not meet the above mentioned freshmen academic requirements may establish eligibility through an Initial-Eligibility Index (NCAA Manual, 1993-94) which is a sliding scale for CGPA's and scores on the standardized ACT or SAT test. Also, the NCAA is requiring student-athletes to complete a specific percentage of courses within each major which will be applicable toward graduation in order to stay eligible. The new bylaw will
require student-athletes to have a CGPA that is at least 95% of the minimum required in order to maintain eligibility (Bailey, 1993). The NCAA is making an effort to place more importance on the academic performance of student-athletes while they are still in high school.

Some institutions of higher education have placed an increased emphasis on the academic development and progress of student-athletes by means of athletic academic advising/counseling programs. Academic advising has been part of American higher education for students since approximately 1877 (Biggs, Brodie & Barnhart, 1975). Grites (1979) explained that student academic advising had evolved from a routine, isolated, single-purpose, faculty activity to a comprehensive process of academic, career, and personal development performed by personnel from most elements of the campus community. This evolution has resulted from changing enrollment patterns, a new diversity of college students, increased student involvement in academic processes, and the recent economic and labor conditions of the country; it has been reflected in the attitudes toward advising, a changing definition of advising, and a limited number of theoretical models of advising. (p. 5)

Grites (1979) also stated that academic advising would assume a larger role in the future of higher education and would become a total institutional process. One way that academic advising has already assumed a larger role in higher education is its involvement with student-athletes in intercollegiate athletics.

In 1975, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A) was formed to help bridge the gap between academic advising and intercollegiate athletics. This national organization is still continuing to grow and is the governing body for individuals working with student-athletes at the collegiate level. The
NCAA has also responded in part to some of the allegations against athletic programs by introducing Bylaw 14.3 and Bylaw 16.3 which mandate academic counseling and tutoring for recruited student-athletes. Recently, Funk (1991) commended the NCAA because of the current monies spent toward "research and programs to counteract some of the less-than-admirable trends" (p. 110) seen in present athletic programs.

Division I-A universities have responded to criticisms from television, radio, newspapers, and magazines by providing additional support services and athletic academic advising/counseling programs for student-athletes. Division I-AA and Division I-AAA institutions have attempted to establish programs that are similar to what the "big" universities have initiated; however, some of these "smaller" institutions have often not been as effective in terms of academic advising program development because of lack of staffing, lack of facilities, and lack of money.

The NCAA in June of 1991 provided assistance to all Division I institutions by setting aside $7.4 million from its general operating budget "... for enhancement of academic support systems for student-athletes..." (Memo from the NCAA, see Schultz, 1991). Each Division I school annually received $25,000 to implement or increase services and academic programs for student-athletes. The total annual dollar amount to each Division I institution increased to $30,000 starting with the 1993-1994 academic year. The total amount allotted for all Division I institutions now totals $8.94 million. "The money is intended to enhance
academic support systems for student-athletes" (NCAA News, September 13, 1993, p. 1).

In another effort to assist institutions in achieving academic integrity, the NCAA has required all Division I member institutions to provide an annual Admissions and Graduation-Rate Disclosure (Bylaw 30.1) which went into effect in the Fall of 1991. This report included the following information: I. undergraduate enrollment data, which consisted of: (a) the total number of entering student-athletes who received athletically related financial aid which was to be reported separately and by race in football, men's and women's basketball, baseball, men's and women's cross country, and track; and (b) the total number of full-time, degree seeking undergraduate students at the institution classified by gender and race; II. student-athletes average admission data which included: (a) individual student-athletes average score(s) on the ACT or SAT; (b) the average high school CGPA according to the qualifier definition of Bylaw 14.3; and (c) the number of student-athletes admitted to each school, college, or department of the institution (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, pp. 129-131, 373).

The Graduation-Rate Disclosure information also included freshmen cohort graduation-rates for all students as well as student-athletes who received athletically related financial aid who had not attended any university full-time in the past, plus the following information: (a) average graduation rates of the students who received athletic aid and (b) the average length of time needed to graduate. Lastly, there was a refined graduation rate which provided information about the degree
program studied and the number of student-athletes who graduated within each program. There is other information included in Bylaw 30.1 that is not relevant to this study. Bylaw 30.1 was enacted to assist prospective student-athletes make a more informed decision regarding which institution to attend and from which institute to graduate. Leonard (1993) said as part of an indice of academic achievement, graduation rates need to be examined because "a variety of confounding factors may make them dubious indicators of scholastic performance" (p. 299). Mallette (1992) stated that different graduation rates could be obtained using differing methodologies. There is also a "true" graduation rate and a "refined" graduation rate, further adding to the confusion of determining the meaning of graduation rates.

In order for institutions to be classified as Division I members, the universities during the 1993-94 academic year were required by NCAA regulation to sponsor a minimum of six all-male or mixed team sports of males and females, and six all-female sports with at least two team sports. However, the total number of varsity sports will increase effective September 1, 1994, and, therefore, the minimum number of team sports' requirements will also increase (NCAA Manual, 1993-94).

Besides the minimum requirements for Division I the NCAA has different requirements for institutions which have football programs. The two football classifications within Division I are Division I-A and Division I-AA (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, p. 333).
Division I-A membership requires seven all-male or mixed teams of male and female sports including football, seven all-female sports with a minimum of two all-male/mixed team sports of males and females and two all-female team sports. There are also specific football attendance requirements and scheduling requirements for Division I-A institutions (NCAA Manual, 1993-94).

Division I-AA universities have the same criteria as Division I institutions except that football can be included in the six all-male or mixed team sports of males and females. In addition, there are specific football scheduling requirements (NCAA Manual, 1993-94).

Division I-AAA institutions are the same as Division I institutions. The classification means that the school has no football program. This classification is recognized, but the NCAA does not use the classification; instead, the NCAA refers to schools with no football programs as Division 1 institutions.

Effective September 1994 (with compliance required during the 1993-94 academic year), all Division I membership schools were required to have seven all-male or mixed teams of male and female sports (including football in Division I-A and Division I-AA), and at least two team sports, seven all-female sports, with at least two all-female team sports. The football scheduling and attendance requirements are the same as above for Division I-A and I-AA schools. Division I membership schools could elect, however, to sponsor "six varsity sports, including at least two team sports . . . involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and
females, and eight varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams" instead (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, p. 333).

It has been well established by Berg (1989a), Hurley and Cunningham (1984), Rhatigan (1984), Saunders and Ervin (1984), and Shriberg and Brodzinski (1984) that the life of a collegiate student-athlete was different from the rest of the student population (Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 1991; Phillips in Mott, 1993), in part because of the amount of time devoted to athletics rather than academics while in high school (Burke, 1993). The amount of time devoted to athletic practice and participation may have marginally prepared student-athletes for the academic college rigor (Gurney, 1990; Willoughby, Willoughby, & Moses, 1991). With the introduction of Proposition 48 and with the smaller amounts of overall operating monies allocated for athletics, it has become something of a problem for Division I-AAA and I-AA and for some smaller Division I-A institutions to implement an athletic academic support service program, or to maintain the academic standards established for their student-athletes and, indeed, to graduate them with life enhancing skills and marketable degrees in hand.

The Study

This study sought to describe, compare, and analyze the services provided for student-athletes within Division I athletic programs at institutions of higher learning across the nation. As Division I athletic programs continued to adjust to
more stringent academic standards and to improve academic accountability for
student-athletes, it became important to project or at least to describe what services
maintain or encourage academically strong student-athletes. The types of services
provided may be major factors in enhancing the academic performance of student-
athletes at Division I institutions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe, compare, and analyze the services
provided to male and female participants of revenue and non-revenue sports teams
at Division I-A, Division I-AA, and Division I-AAA institutions across the United
States during Spring quarter or semester, 1993. The study achieved this purpose by:

1. Describing the services provided for student-athletes in all sports as
   reported by the directors of athletic academic support service programs
   at Division I institutions across the U.S.

2. Comparing the services provided for male and female participants, in
   revenue and non-revenue sports, at Division I institutions across the
   United States.

Need for the Study

Intercollegiate athletes have been identified as having needs different from
other students (Mott, 1993) because of their dual commitment to both academics
and to athletic competition (Funk, 1991; Sailes, 1993; Whittemore, 1985). Athletic
competition included the amount of time the athlete spent at practice, other game preparation (treatments, weights, videos) (Phillips, in Mott, 1993), travelling, and playing the game. James Rhatigan (1984) stated that, on the average, male basketball players at Division I institutions were "required" to be absent from classes 17.3% of the time while in season. A minimum of at least 80 men's teams from Division I institutions will be a part of postseason tournaments, adding an additional absence from classes of 2 to 6%. Thus, the intercollegiate student-athlete basketball player could conceivably be away from classes 19.3 to 23.3% of the time during the entire basketball season. Rhatigan commented that these percentages would be analogous to students who received scholarships, loans, or grants to be required to miss 15 to 20% of their class work in order to maintain the financial aid. It is documented that Division I men's revenue sports teams have differing needs, such as more demands on their time both athletically and academically, than do student-athletes of men's non-revenue and women's revenue and non-revenue sports teams (Funk, 1991; Sailes, 1993; Telander, 1989).

Gurney, Robinson, and Fygetakis (1983) stated that Division I student-athletes committed up to 40 hours per week while in season to athletically related activities in addition to carrying a full-time academic load. The NCAA, in an effort to limit the amount of hours committed to practicing and playing, has established the 20-hour maximum per week practice/play rule (NCAA Manual, 1993-94). The bylaw (17.1.5.1) does not, however, account for days the student-athletes are not on campus to attend classes or days that are spent travelling. Thus, the intercollegiate
student-athlete basketball player could conceivably be away from classes almost one third of the time during the season.

Faculty expect student-athletes to keep up with their academics; however, no other students were required to miss a large percentage of their classes in order to maintain scholarships, grants, or loans (Rhatigan, 1984). Jordan and Denson (1990), Shriberg and Brodzinski (1984), and Grites (1982) have all alluded to the fact that there is no question that student-athletes constitute a special population of college students. Grites (1982) noted that student-athletes often bring characteristics of both honor students and high-risk students to the collegiate advising relationship because of their "unknown failure[s] and . . . narrow career goal[s], along with academic skill deficiencies" (p. 80). Baillie and Danish (1992) and others have also postulated that having a tight and exclusive athletic identity could cause adjustment problems for athletes ending their competitive sports involvement. This suggestion by the authors may strengthen the perspective that student-athletes are a special population of college students.

Just as there are many varied programs and services within academic advising, there are also many college and university students who have different advising or different advisor needs. One group of students who have been identified as having different needs were students who participated in intercollegiate athletics (Gurney, 1990; Hurley & Cunningham, 1984; Mihalich, 1984; Mott, 1993). According to Grites (1982), having a specialized approach for different needs or different groups of students was one way to assure that the majority of students
received the advising they needed. With documented benefits such as increased self-concept, academic achievement, greater retention, and student satisfaction (Hurley & Cunningham, 1984) identifying the services that were provided for assisting student-athletes and further study of academic advising/counseling programs, provided for student-athletes appeared important (Gurney, 1990).

Much literature about academic advising exists, but hardly any literature exists for academic advising programs and there is even less existing empirical research for academic advising and academic advising/counseling support services and intercollegiate athletes. The research that has been conducted on academic advising support services and student-athletes often only compared grade point averages and credits carried (Purdy, Eitzen & Hufnagel, 1985) and completed, to determine freshmen eligibility for participation in intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Division I institutions (American College Test [ACT], 1984). After reviewing the literature Whitner and Myers (1986) found

no reports of comprehensive academic support programs for student-athletes. Descriptions of various academic support programs for this population need to be documented so that individuals who work with student-athletes can readily identify problem areas and apply appropriate measures for resolution in their milieus. Without documentation, universities have no models to use as guidelines when developing their own programs. (p. 660)

In response to the allegations of inconsistencies between academics and athletics many colleges and universities have established or attempted to establish some sort of academic advising/counseling support service programs for their student-athletes. The University of California-Los Angeles, University of Nebraska,
University of Wyoming, University of Florida (Whiddon, 1989), Montana State University, and many other colleges and universities have some sort of athletic academic advising/counseling program. However, there are few empirical studies conducted at Division I institutions which describe the services provided and the availability of academic advising/counseling support services for student-athletes. In times of fiscal constraint and the media invective toward intercollegiate athletic programs, empirical research and evaluation are necessary "to determine program effectiveness for the users of services and for the institution" (Frisz & Lane, 1987, p. 241). Given such lack of research, evaluation, and empirically tested surveys and instruments, and literature concerning academic advising/counseling support services for intercollegiate athletic programs, it is time to generate data based studies.

Athletic institutional representatives make commitments to student-athletes regarding educational and athletic opportunity, offering financial support in the form of scholarships, and permitting athletes to serve as representatives of the institution. As we acknowledge problems or conflicts between the role of student and the role of athlete for student-athletes at Division I institutions across the United States, and the documented need for athletic academic advising/counseling support services and programs for student-athletes, it is necessary to investigate academic advising/counseling support services for student-athletes and to draw some conclusions based on empirical study and findings. Comprehensive academic advising/counseling support services for student-athletes that can strengthen the
relationship between student and athlete and can help the intercollegiate athlete achieve the educational mission of the institution can benefit all Division I colleges and universities. "A need exists for studies to determine the effectiveness of the advisement/counseling services" (Whiddon, 1989, p. 12).

General Procedures

The following procedures were undertaken in order to achieve the purpose of the study. Descriptive information regarding the nature of the athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs was provided by the directors of athletic academic support services. Information concerning the services provided was requested of the directors of athletic academic advising/counseling support services (or their designees). The descriptive information and the academic advising/counseling services information was provided from the instrument entitled the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire (AAASSQ) (Appendix B). The instrument was developed by the researcher in 1992. Information concerning the services provided, and the availability of the services as stated by the directors of athletic academic support services or their designees, was determined from the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire.

The study included private and public NCAA Division I-A, I-AA and I-AAA institutions across the United States (Appendix A). These institutes (N = 274) were selected because they were all governed by the same rules and regulations of the NCAA. Also, the structure of the athletic departments was similar, in that the
general organization included at least an athletic director (either men’s, women’s or combined), at least one associate and/or assistant athletic director (either men’s, women’s or combined), and most, if not all, institutions had a senior women’s administrator (each institution’s Chief Executive Officer determines if this position is filled).

The descriptive information was analyzed using charts, numerical tally, frequencies and percentages. The data generated by the analyses of the hypotheses were analyzed using chi-square tests of independence.

Limitation of the Study

The study was limited to cooperating Division I-A, Division I-AA and Division I-AAA public and private universities’ directors of athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs in the United States.

Definition of Terms

Academic Advising: "A developmental process which assists students in the clarification of their life/career goals and in the development of educational plans for the realization of these goals. It is a decision-making process by which students realize their maximum educational potential through communication and information exchanges with an advisor; it is ongoing, multifaceted and the responsibility of both student and advisor" (Crockett, 1978, p. 3). Gordon (1992) added that advising included scheduling, interpreting institutional procedures,
providing career information, counseling students, and helping them make academic decisions.

**Academic Advisor:** "The advisor serves as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent of referral to other campus agencies as necessary" (Crockett, 1978, p. 3). Gordon (1992) said the academic advisor was a resource person to assist students in academic, career, and life planning functions.

**Academic Year in School:** Freshmen, sophomore, junior or senior academic year in college or university as determined by the institutions.

**Athletic Academic Advising/Counseling Support Service Program(s):** An academic advising/counseling program designed for student-athletes, either separate or in combination with other academic advising systems or center(s) on campus used for an undergraduate student population.

**Athletic Eligibility:** (See National Collegiate Athletic Association Proposition 48).

**Bylaw 16.3:** Academic and other support services that are mandatory, permissible, and nonpermissible for Division-I student-athletes. Mandatory services are academic counseling and tutoring made available to all recruited student-athletes. The services may be provided by the athletic department or through nonathletic student support services. Permissible services that may be financed by an institution are: (a) tutoring expenses; (b) drug-rehabilitation program expenses; (c) counseling expenses related to the treatment of eating disorders; (d) on-campus
student development and career counseling; (e) future professional athletics career counseling; (f) actual and necessary expenses needed to attend proceedings relating to a student-athlete's eligibility . . .; (g) the use of computers and typewriters; and (h) the cost of a field trip, if the trip is required and the fee is specified in the institution's catalog. Nonpermissible support services include the following: (a) typing costs; (b) course supplies; and (c) a copy machine only for student-athletes (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, p. 197).

Division I: Division I membership is utilized for certain legislative and competitive purposes. Criteria for being an NCAA Division I institution is that the institution shall sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I and six varsity intercollegiate sports, including at least two team sports, involving all-female teams in Division I, (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, Bylaw 20.9, p. 333).

Division I-A: A classification within Division I regarding athletic scholarship allocation within football programs with specific football attendance and scheduling requirements.

Division I-AA: A classification within Division I regarding athletic scholarship allocation within football programs and specific football scheduling requirements.

Division I-AAA: A classification within Division I and an institution with no football program.
Faculty Advisor: A part-time or a full-time tenured or nontenured person with at least the title of instructor, who teaches and/or performs service and/or research and who is responsible for advising undergraduate students.

Full-Time Student: The U. S. Government and the National Collegiate Athletic Association considers any student-athlete to be a full-time student who carries 12 or more credit hours (quarter or semester system) (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, 14.1.6.2.2).

Higher Education: Public, private or regional institution which offers courses that culminate in a baccalaureate degree and may include graduate studies and graduate degrees.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA): Governing body for student-athletes and member institutions.

Non-revenue Sport or Sports Team: Any NCAA intercollegiate varsity athletic team other than football, men’s basketball, women’s basketball, volleyball or hockey.

Revenue Sport or Sports Team: Football, men’s basketball, hockey, women’s basketball and women’s volleyball.

National Collegiate Athletic Association Proposition 48: Bylaw 14.3. All entering freshmen need to score a minimum of 700 (out of a possible 1600) on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), or 15 (out of a possible 36) if taken prior to October 28, 1989 or a minimum of 17 out of a possible 36 on the American College Test (ACT), achieve a minimum of a grade C average in eleven designated high
school courses, which includes English, mathematics, social sciences and physical sciences. Any athlete who does not meet the SAT or ACT requirement is not barred from the institution; however, the student-athlete may not practice as a freshmen. The student-athlete may participate as intercollegiate student-athletes as sophomores after meeting NCAA academic requirements for a freshmen and have three years of eligibility and three years of varsity participation remaining in Division I, I-A and I-AA institutions (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, Bylaws 14.3, 14.3.1, 14.3.1.1, pp. 129-131).

**Student-Athlete:** "A 'student-athlete' is a student whose enrollment was solicited by a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests with a view toward the student's ultimate participation in the intercollegiate athletics program. Any other student becomes a 'student-athlete' only when the student reports for an intercollegiate squad that is under the jurisdiction of the athletics department" (NCAA Manual 1993-94, 12.02.6, pp. 53-54).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Academic advising/counseling has several types of delivery systems or programs which have been used in various ways at different colleges and universities across the United States. Athletic academic advising/counseling programs and services are relatively new provisions within the last two decades that have received widespread use at some institutions, and not much use at other institutions. There have been numerous articles written about the different types of programs but little empirical research has been undertaken.

The research literature on academic advising/counseling systems and athletic academic advising/counseling programs and services was divided into 4 different categories. The categories are as follows: (a) an overview of academic advising/counseling and a historical overview; (b) an overview of academic advising/counseling programs; (c) an overview of evaluation of academic advising/counseling programs; and (d) an overview of athletic academic advising/counseling programs and services.
Overview of Academic Advising/Counseling and a Historical Overview

According to some researchers, American higher education since 1636 has been concerned with education for the whole student - intellectually, physically and spiritually (Brubacher, 1962; Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Ender; Winston, Jr., & Miller, 1982; Shore, 1991). Along the way, specifically during the boom of the 1950's, 1960's and into the 1970's, the integrity of the quality of the learning obtained at institutions of higher education has been questioned (Shore, 1991). As the number of students who attended postsecondary institutions increased many researchers and educational historians believed that mediocrity prevailed on college and university campuses in the United States (Ender, Winston, Jr., & Miller, 1984; Shore, 1991). Also because of increased enrollment, the educational process became, through necessity, more depersonalized, more mechanized. No longer, it appeared, was the "total" student able to be cared for.

Now in the early 1990's, with continued predictions of increased enrollments and tighter fiscal budgets (Shore, 1991), campuses were still in the early throes of admitting more nontraditional students, (international students, older students, minority students, and women) (Gilley, 1991). These problems of increased enrollment and different student demographics have led educators at institutions of higher learning to return to a reemphasis and concern for the intellectual, physical and spiritual aspect of each of their students. One way that postsecondary
institutions have purported to meet this three-pronged mission was through academic advising/counseling of and for the student (Winston, Jr., & Sandor, 1984).

During the 1970's and 1980's there was a resurgence of "getting back to the basics" or a continuance of "getting back to the basics" in academic advising/counseling; instead of just concern for parts of students' growth, there was a shift toward addressing the total needs of the student. This shift was prompted in part by "student concerns for more interpersonal campus relationships, by the need for better academic planning, and by the concern over increased attrition rates" (Grites, 1979, p. 1). Gordon (1992) concurred with Grites' assessment. Kerr (in Riesman, 1980) defined this shift as "student consumerism." Crockett (1978) defined academic advising as a "decision making process during which students realize[d] their maximum educational potential through communication and information exchanges with an advisor" (p. 3). Gordon (1992) stated that academic advising was receiving renewed attention as an important function in higher education because of the changing needs of the students and the different issues impacting the institutions. She went on to say that students in the 1990's were more aware of the need for expert advice and colleges and universities need to provide the best advising and counseling services possible. Academic advisors were now seen as resource persons for academic, career, and life planning functions for students (Gordon, 1992).

One approach to academic advising that received considerable attention, because it included all components of student needs, was developmental academic
advising (Astin, 1977; Bowen, 1977; Brown, 1972; Chickering, 1969; Ender et al., 1982; Gordon, 1992; Heath, 1968; Miller & Jones, in Chickering & Associates, 1981; Miller & Prince, 1976). Whittemore (1985) defined "developmental" as a "proactive enhancement intervention." In the 1970's and 1980's developmental advising was recognized within the academic advising field as the most viable approach to use with students due to the theoretical frameworks of Chickering, Perry and others. Developmental advising/counseling is now often used in athletic and academic advising/counseling for undergraduate students. Ender et al. (1982) operationalized developmental advising as the process which

both stimulates and supports students in their quest for an enriched quality of life; it is a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources. (p. 8)

American higher education has come complete circle since its inception. In its early years, the intellectual, physical, and spiritual development of its students were of paramount importance. Now in the 1990's institutions' representatives were again concerned with all aspects of the student's growth. One way that this concern was evident was the emphasis on developmental academic advising/counseling with regard to students. Gordon (1992) indicated that developmental advising will become the only acceptable approach to use in the future.

Academic advising has evolved from a very personalized process, to an impersonal function or responsibility mainly overseen by faculty, to an era of specialization within the advising field in the 1990's. Developmental advising
appears to be the tenet behind the approach best utilized when advising students of today.

**Overview of Academic Advising/Counseling Programs/Systems**

Colleges and universities have tried or actually use a variety of programs of academic advising, depending on such variables as the institution itself (its milieu, for example), the students' needs, and the available resources. The success of these systems has varied at each of the institutions (Crockett, 1986) and not all delivery systems are appropriate for all situations. Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979) suggested that most academic advising systems were clustered around four common delivery formats for students. The most common format for freshmen students was to meet with academic advisors according to the students' major, and additional services were provided for students who were transfers, undeclared, or have special needs. The next most frequently used format was similar to the first format in that all freshmen students were assigned to an advisor; the difference was it did not matter what the student's major was or would be. The next delivery format was clustered around a general academic advising center where all students were advised and, once a student had declared a major, a specific advisor was assigned to the student. The last delivery format noted by Carstensen and Silberhorn evolved around a general advising center which provided advising for the entire undergraduate student population regardless of any other factors which could have influenced the advising situation.
In the literature there are some models of academic advising; however, there are many delivery systems which only could be found categorized under the following headings: faculty, peer, paraprofessional, staff, computer-assisted, group advising systems, self-advising, and contractual advising (Grites, 1979). Gordon (1992) included professional advisors and counselor advisors to the list of delivery systems. Crockett (1982) also mentioned academic advising centers. Gordon (1992) indicated that the emergence of the academic advising professional, someone who was a specialist and served as a resource person within the advising center, was the model of the future. Crockett (1982) noted that it was more important to have commitment and personalization than a specific type of delivery system for the student.

The following overviews briefly describe the advising or delivery systems that were, and still are, in existence. Each overview includes the advantages and disadvantages of each type of system.

Faculty

Most colleges and universities utilized faculty as the primary delivery mode (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979) for the academic advising of undergraduate students. Habley and Crockett (1988) saw the traditional faculty system as dominating. In the 1990's, faculty were still seen as the primary delivery system (Gordon, 1992). Yeager (1984) noted that faculty were used as academic advisors because it was presumed that they were very knowledgeable, that they were well
informed, and that the expense of using faculty as advisors was not costly. Yeager further added that faculty were the most appropriate individuals to assist students in their advising needs. Crockett (1982) provided the information that faculty advising systems evolved from the historical notion of the faculty-student relationship (i.e., in loco parentis) and the delivery mode existed because, "correctly or incorrectly, [it was assumed] that faculty members [were] interested in advising and consider[ed] it important" (p. 43).

Using faculty advisors had been thought to be a good approach to academic advising because the professors were presumed to be the most knowledgeable persons regarding their department's requirements. In 1939 Shofstall believed that the traits of a good advisor and a good teacher were the same, and advising students was the highest form of teaching. Faculty were usually concerned with the students they teach and especially those who were intending to major in the same academic area (Kramer & Gardner, 1977). However, many faculty advisors could only be concerned with the student's course selection, class scheduling, and specific graduation requirements because of their other commitments (e.g., academic work load, research endeavors, committee and community service). Also, faculty were often thought to be unprepared to assume the additional responsibility of the academic progress of the student, nor did the faculty think they had received adequate education to assume such an important role. Nowadays, faculty have "become as heterogeneous as their students" and this Gordon (1992) noted opened the door for other advising arrangements as services in areas such as orientation,
testing, and the needs of special populations; all of which may need to be addressed for the students by the institutions.

**Professional Advisors**

Professional advisors were the next most frequently used type of student advisors at four-year institutions. Crockett and Levitz (1983) stated that this type of delivery system was also often found in two-year institutions.

Professional advisors may come from a variety of academic backgrounds. As programs become more specialized, the variety in educational preparation may assist the increasing need for specialized services to be provided to students by advisors (Gordon, 1992). King (1988) viewed professional advisors as being accessible to, and for, students. King also reported that professional advisors could be more "proactive" with students than perhaps other types of advisors were able to be.

King (1988) suggested that a full-time professional advisor could become overworked due to the large number of students who were assigned to his/her caseload. This was substantiated by Austin, Coordinator for the Academic Advising Center at the University of Wyoming (personal communication, October 25, 1993). The size of the caseload of professional advisors could have been a drawback to this type of advising arrangement.

It should be noted that academic advisors were not counselors and may have had no formal counseling background. The advisor was concerned with the whole
student (particularly with information sharing) (Grites, 1981), but if personal problems arose outside of academics, in advising sessions, the advisor would often refer the student to the student counseling center for professional, qualified assistance.

Gordon (1992) suggested that the professional advisor will be the delivery system most appropriate in the 1990's. The professional advisor must be knowledgeable in a variety of areas to fully help the students of the 90's and beyond.

**Academic Counselors**

Carstensen and Silberhorn (1979) noted that two-year community colleges used counselors most often as the primary academic advisor and utilized a counselor type system. Smaller four-year colleges and universities may have also used counselors as advisors.

Utilizing advisors with counseling training was advantageous because of their student development backgrounds (Dameron & Wolf, 1974), which could assist students in career planning and life-style choices. If any personal counseling became necessary, counselors had the skills to aid the student.

The disadvantages of utilizing academic counselors were that while the counselors were free from academic departmental bias, they may have been more concerned with the personal problems encountered by students. Academic counselors were often interested in psychological and therapeutic counseling
(Grites, 1979; Pappas, 1978), and the counselors may or may not have been well informed regarding campus requirements in departments, majors, graduate and career opportunities (Crockett & Levitz, 1983).

Peer Advisors

Peer advising has worked well at many institutions (Frisz & Lane, 1987) whether the upper level students were paid or had volunteered. Students naturally sought the help and assistance of peers who aided in course selection, scheduling, the filling out of forms, and even assisted in student orientation to college. Upper level students were informed about services, graduation requirements and other routine preparations. If peer advisors were trained, they were an asset to the advising process as student advisors, since they were often aware of, and empathetic with, common student problems (Crockett & Levitz, 1983). This form of advising also provided an opportunity for campus involvement (Grites, 1979) for many students. In a study by Habley and Crockett (1988), the authors indicated that 17% of the respondents used peer advising as part of the advising services that were provided for students. Austin (personal communication, October 25, 1993) uses peer advising in conjunction with full-time professional advisors.

Some advantages for utilizing peer advisors as part of a program were the way the students related with the peer advisors, and how it was most often less costly to employ peer advisors as opposed to faculty or professional advisors. Peer advisors were often more available to the students than were faculty (Habley,
1981). It was also indicated that this type of assistance provided other advisors more in-depth time if necessary for student advising needs.

The main drawbacks of peer advising were that the advisors were not prepared to deal with complex problems, and by the time the upper level students had developed their skills they were ready to graduate (Crockett & Levitz, 1983). The advantages and disadvantages of utilizing peer advisors as supplements to the advising system needs to be assessed prior to the implementation of such an arrangement.

Paraprofessional and Staff Advisors

Paraprofessional or staff advising ranged from the secretary in the office or a departmental clerk to an organized collection of adjuncts, retired professors, senior citizens, graduate assistants, and other individuals from the community. The staff advisors, while providing a worthwhile service, often did not have any formal preparation for advising students and so were not recognized as a genuine advising system, but rather as an addition to an established academic advising program. Paraprofessionals were usually individuals who had received some sort of in-service.

The advantages of utilizing paraprofessionals were cost effectiveness, the freeing up of the professional staff for other student interactions, and providing a sense of worth for the paraprofessionals (Crockett & Levitz, 1983). The disadvantage of utilizing paraprofessionals as additional support staff was their lack of specific training in academic advising issues.
Computer-Assisted Advising

Some institutions used computer-assisted advising to supplement another form of academic advising, while other colleges and universities used computer advising as the main academic advising system. Depending on the computer program used, the system provided graduation requirements, course information, demographics, grades, and identified students who had academic difficulties (Grites, 1979).

The advantages of utilizing a computer-assisted program were that it provided information on each student as often as needed, it decreased the amount of paperwork on students, it made the advisee more available for individualized academic and career planning (Kramer, Peterson, & Spencer, 1984), and it allowed the advisor the time to provide the "personal touch" for all students, especially students who needed individual interaction with an advisor. The lack of personal interaction between student and advisee was the drawback to computer-assisted advising as well as some advisors' assumptions that because the computer had generated up-to-date factual information on the student's academic progress that the advising meeting was complete.

Group Advising

Crockett and Levitz (1983) and Grites (1979) termed group advising a technique rather than a system of academic advising. It appeared to be growing in popularity as a method of sharing procedural information, avoiding repetition, and
separating fact from fiction. The drawback to group advising was the lack of individual personal interaction.

Another group approach that was mentioned by Gordon & Grites (1984) was the group method in which a student earned credit while learning about the college experience during a registered university course. Austin (personal communication, October 25, 1993) said the University of Wyoming currently utilizes the group semester seminar as an offshoot of the advising center program.

Some advantages of group advising were that information could be shared and hands-on experience could easily be provided to the students. Also specialized staff and faculty were available to provide specific and current information to students. The disadvantage of group advising was that the class usually ended after one semester and there was no follow-up for the student.

Self-Advising

Self-advising was often used in addition to another form of academic advising. If advising was considered only course selection, scheduling, and graduation requirements, then this system of self-advising was adequate for students. It promoted decision making and a responsibility for one's own advising (Grites, 1979). If, however, advising contained the components of career planning and academic goal setting, then self-advising was not sufficient by itself as an advising system for most students. As a supplement to another form of advising, it was beneficial because the student had made some decisions for him/herself and it
allowed the advisor more time for other aspects of advising. Most institutions used self-advising as a supplement to other systems already in existence through the use of the institution's bulletin or registration materials, et cetera. The student preplanned his/her schedule and then met with an academic advisor (Gordon, 1992).

**Contractual Advising**

Kramer and Gardner (1983) described contractual advising as "a shared definition of what [was] to be accomplished, the principal duties of each party, and the procedures . . . used to monitor, evaluate, or change that relationship" (p. 26). Usually faculty or professional advisors used contractual advising in conjunction with another type of delivery system. The contract served to establish the responsibilities of both the advisee and advisor and clearly defined academic goals for the advising session.

The advantages of an advising contract were directing progress toward specific goals, monitoring student development and growth, and making decisions when contract conditions were not being attained (Grites, 1984). Grites stated that contractual advising was very useful with students who required considerable structure in the advising process or learning environment. The drawback of an advising contract was that it could alter the developmental process of students, so it should be used only after determining it was the most appropriate tool for that particular student.
Academic Advising Centers

In 1983 academic advising centers were considered the newest type of advising systems (Crockett & Levitz). Glennen, Farren, Vowell and Black (1989) viewed the centralized advising center as a catalyst for including all the necessary components of effective advising. Gordon (1992) reported that the advising center was a vehicle for emphasizing and concentrating advising services. Most centers were staffed by professional advisors, but the staffing could have involved just about any combination of personnel, such as professional advisors, faculty, paraprofessionals and/or peers.

The advantages of centers were that they were often "student service agencies" and "student centered" rather than "department centered." Since the centers were advising oriented, they tended to be complete in all areas of advising. The main disadvantage to such a center was the cost.

Gordon (1992) also referred to advising centers as centralized advising. She added decentralized advising as a additional type of advising center. Gordon reported that decentralized advising was often maintained by a college, school, or department in the bigger institutions. The advantages of a decentralized advising center were the contact with the faculty and control over the process of what took place and how things were being undertaken. The drawbacks of a decentralized advising center were that there have been duplications of the services and students with special needs did not always get all the necessary services in one location. The last type of center mentioned was the central coordinating office (Gordon,
1992) where a designated office oversaw and coordinated services and information so that all areas utilized the same services which provided strong communication links between the individual units.

The future of academic advising cannot be foretold. However, with university clientele changing from a traditional student population to a diverse clientele of differing individuals with many divergent needs, there will likely be a need for specialists (Gordon, 1992) within the advising arena.

There were and are several systems utilized for providing academic advising services for students. The milieu of the school, the student population, the mission, et cetera, were and are all important factors in identifying the best type of delivery system and for determining the best individuals to provide the service(s).

**Overview of Evaluation of Academic Advising/Counseling Programs**

Gordon (1992) noted that evaluation for advising purposes examined and judged how the goals that have been set have been accomplished. Grites (1979) maintained that good or strong academic advising systems did and will play a prominent role in higher education, particularly through the recruitment of, and the retention of, students. In times of retrenchment, decreased enrollments, increased costs, and "predicted shortages in portions of the professional labor force" (Grites, 1979, p. 3), the evaluation of academic advising systems became more necessary. However, few colleges and universities assessed the academic advisors and the advising system by formal measures at their institutions. Brown and Sanstead
(1982) stated that 75% of colleges and universities did not have a formalized evaluation process. Crockett (1988) found that less than 50% of the institutions undertook some kind of regular or systematic evaluation of their advising program. Crockett stated, "Evaluation of some kind, by someone, for some purpose, formal or informal, is an element in virtually all organized efforts" (p. 379). He thought that advising programs should apply some principles of evaluation for academic advising systems. Crockett provided six basic assumptions or premises on which to base the organization and delivery of advising services in relation to evaluation. They were:

1. evaluation and measurement can improve program effectiveness and individual advisor performance;

2. academic advising programs, as well as individual advisors, should be systematically and periodically appraised;

3. advisee evaluation is the most direct and useful method of assessing advising effectiveness;

4. if advising is part of an individual's position responsibility, then effectiveness as an advisor should be a consideration in decisions about that individual involving promotion, tenure, merit pay, etc;

5. for an evaluation program to have any usefulness there must be a strong link between performance, appraisal of performance, and reward for quality performance; and

6. every evaluation system can be improved; there is no perfect method of evaluating the totality of advisor or program performance. (p. 379)

Crockett reported that academic advising programs should be evaluated every 2-3 years.
Gordon (1992) said that the importance of evaluation for the program, the individual advisor, and for the academic advising process has become more of a necessity during the last decade. She noted that some colleges and universities evaluated academic advisors regularly. As well, Gordon indicated that there were several types of models that have been and should be used to evaluate all aspects of the program.

The most common types of models for evaluation were "systematic, goal-directed, and student-centered" approaches (Gordon, 1992). The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS) provided components of an academic advising program that Gordon said could be used to develop an evaluation strategy.

Advisors were evaluated differently within each program and institution. Evaluations were found to be "informal, ad hoc, or an institutional format" (Gordon, 1992). There were and are a variety of evaluation techniques for a variety of university and college academic advising delivery systems.

Overview of Athletic Academic Advising/Counseling Programs and Services

In 1984 Mihalich wrote, "College athletic programs are in danger of losing their educational credibility, and their survival depends on the unified intervention of concerned college administrators" (p. 71). In 1990 Coakley noted that it is possible for athletic departments and coaches to design their programs to foster learning and personal growth in addition to boosting graduation rates. If this is not done, the academic integrity
of the university is compromised and the educational relevance of sport becomes a farce. Unfortunately, academic integrity and educational relevance have been given a lower priority than winning and making money in too many athletic departments. (p. 334)

Funk (1991) commented that

the state of academics in the Division I athletic environment is sometimes comical, sometimes pitiful, sometimes uplifting, and often saddening. The academic-athletic relationship at major institutions of higher education spans a wide range of educational realities and varying degrees of ethics. (p. 7)

In 1993 Sailes reported that

student-athletes have high academic aspirations but face structural as well as personal obstacles in maintaining control over their academic experiences. Time demands of their sports, lack of high school preparation, and inadequate personal study habits collectively contribute to academic problems experienced by student-athletes. (p. 27)

He further added that research on academic experiences of student-athletes has revealed varied and paradoxical findings (p. 28).

Bailey and Littleton (1991) suggested that what plagues intercollegiate athletics could be "characterized as an illness of higher education" (p. ix). Shore (1991) concurred that the importance of college athletics has continued to grow over the past decades and has led to what he thought was one of the few genuine crises facing American universities in the 90's. A solution to this crisis was and will be to strongly stress the importance of personal (Blann, 1990) and intellectual growth as well as obtaining a degree for each student-athlete. In order for student-athletes to realize their potential, advising was and will be needed from athletic and academic faculty (Berg, 1989a; Shore, 1991). Milburn (in Berg, 1989b) concurred,
and added that athletic departments were "educationally irresponsible" (p. 12) if they did not provide services for student-athletes. Meyer (1993) noted that nationally there were support services provided at colleges and universities in "hopes of helping [student-athletes] develop good study habits [and] eventually enhance their achievement in the classroom" (p. 42).

**History of Athletic Academic Advising/Counseling**

The origin of athletic academic advising can be traced back to the early 1970's (Whidden, 1989) when freshmen became eligible to compete their first year in college in 1972 (Stratten, 1990, p. 16). Preceding 1972, less than 40% of U.S. universities and colleges had established academic support services for student-athletes (Underwood, 1984), and during the early 70's athletic advising/counseling for student-athletes was not well documented nor of monumental concern (Underwood, 1984). However, when the NCAA required a 2.0 CGPA in order for athletes to be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletic competition, and in 1972 the freshmen became eligible to compete, athletic academic advising/counseling became more important.

Before these regulations were in effect, the athletes did not need to meet as stringent eligibility requirements in order to compete. After 1973, these same student-athletes could not compete because they could not meet the academic requirements. Something needed to be done to help the student-athletes, but it wasn't until the late 1970’s, early 1980’s that the legitimacy of student-athletes as a
special population was accepted (Lanning, 1982). Since then, other authors such as Jordan and Denson (1990), Shriberg and Brodzinski (1984), and Grites (1982) have all concurred that student-athletes were a special population of college or university students. Gordon (1992) included a section in her book on special populations, and student-athletes were one of the groups discussed as having special needs.

Before 1978, it was assumed that women performed well in the classroom, so they did not need athletic academic support services and were not provided them. The male student-athletes were provided support services. After 1978, the services were available to both men and women when the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) permitted tutoring for females (Whiddon, 1989, p. 12). With the implementation of Proposition 48 in 1986, Bruno, Holland and Ward (1987) saw academic advising/counseling as the most appropriate place to enhance educational and personal development of intercollegiate athletes. Since then, Serrano (1987) reported that 80.7% of Division I-A institutions had athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs with services available for both men and women.

McElroy (in Berg, 1989a) said there was a proliferation of programs across the country and these services were the best hope for improving student-athlete's academic performance (Whiddon, 1989). With the increased academic standards required for student-athletes by the NCAA beginning in 1995, it has become important to identify the services that effectively enhance the educational experience of student-athletes (Berg, 1989b), increase the graduation rates
Need for Athletic Academic Support Services and Programs

The need for athletic academic support services or programs has been well established (Berg, 1992, 1989a; Coleman & Barker, 1991; Cone & Rosenbaum, 1990; Gurney & Johnston, 1986). "The backgrounds of many student-athletes and the unique demands placed upon them in college [have] indicate[d] a need for programs designed to enhance their educational and personal development" (Hurley & Cunningham, 1984, p. 51).

For student-athletes who may be "at-risk" (marginally prepared for college) (Stratten, 1990) and have the additional demands of intercollegiate athletic participation, Willoughby et al. (1991) stated that student-athletes should be facilitated by programs that provide assistance for their personal developmental needs (Ferrante & Etzel, 1991) and academic success. Coakley (1990) reported that student-athletes with less than adequate scholastic preparation from either high school or community colleges were unable to manage the demands of college classes without extra academic assistance.

Gurney (1990) viewed athletic academic support service programs as the "bridge between [the] two very different worlds of academics and athletics." He referred to the programs as "instruments" which could be used to create harmony between the two diverse areas of academics and athletics. Oja (1987), Camp and
Epps (1986), Funk (1991), and Sailes (1993) all concurred that there were very
different expectations for student-athletes in the classroom and on the playing
surface.

Beginning in 1991, the NCAA required that all Division I institutions have
some type of support services or programs for its recruited student-athletes.
Perhaps as an incentive for the universities to institute such services, the NCAA
began to send the institutions $25,000 a year from the NCAA Academic-
Enhancement Fund. Since the time of this study, the annual amount provided to
all Division I institutions has increased to $30,000. The majority of universities
have acknowledged the necessity of providing academic support services/programs
for recruited student-athletes (Gurney, 1990). McElroy (in Berg, 1989a) noted that
Texas, UCLA, Nebraska, Penn State and Ohio State all had athletic academic
support service programs and were pioneers in the development of such programs.
Currently these programs and services are still functioning at each of these
institutions. Several of the above mentioned programs are considered "model"
programs.

It should be noted that under NCAA rules and regulations that govern
intercollegiate athletes, men and women who participate on revenue and
non-revenue sports teams must receive the same services that are available to the
general student population. However, due to the role conflict experienced by
student-athletes (Camp & Epps, 1986) and the dual commitment required of college
student-athletes (Gurney, 1990), these same services could be made available
differently for the special population group of student-athletes. For example, Gurney (1990) wrote that it may be only the location of services that has to be different or it may take the format of special interest seminars, workshops, et cetera. What Hurley and Cunningham (1984) purported to do through athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs was to make student-athletes systematically aware of the services available to all students through "explicit cooperation between the athletic department and the adviser or advisers" (p. 52). This same philosophy was still espoused as part of the athletic academic advising/counseling programs at many institutions in the 90's (Denson, 1992; Jordan & Denson, 1990).

Athletic Academic Advising/Counseling Programs/Models and Services

In an unpublished manuscript that surveyed approximately 50 Division I institutions, Youlden (1985) found that colleges and universities had differing ideas of what constituted athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs. Some institutions had no specific program. Some institutions used graduate students serving internships as academic advisors, and some institutions had formalized programs separated from the institutions' undergraduate advising services. Other institutions had academic advising on campus with the student-athletes being included as members of the general undergraduate student population. In 1991, programs and services were still very diverse in their offerings and style (Willoughby et al., 1991).
Colleges and universities had different approaches toward the types of athletic academic support service programs offered for student-athletes at Division I institutions. Most programs furnished services within the athletic department as well as utilizing existing campus services that were provided for the general student population. Some athletic academic support programs were developed around specific model types to enhance the success of the student-athletes. The programs tended to fall into two general categories: additional services geared toward the student-athletes or programs that only used existing campus services.

Programs that offered additional services through the athletic department were usually developmental or comprehensive in approach. Below are some examples of specific institutions' athletic academic support service programs and the types of services provided. The programs demonstrated the diversity and similarities among programs and services within Division I collegiate institutions.

The University of Wyoming offered the following services: tutoring, scheduling, academic monitoring, and professional counseling. In addition to personal counseling, there was also drug/alcohol counseling, academic, and athletic counseling provided for the student-athletes (Whiddon, 1989).

UCLA's program provided study hall, orientation, workshops, tutorials, "pre-enrollment" classes, career development seminars, personal counseling, an honors program and academic performance reviews. The program also offered counseling for prospective professional sport athletes. Personnel from other areas on campus assisted with the Student-Athlete Service Program (SASP). The
program extended assistance after eligibility had been completed for student-athletes who were working toward completing a degree (Whiddon, 1989).

Louisiana State University had a program that encouraged recruiting only athletes who would probably be able to succeed academically at the collegiate level. Included in the program for student-athletes who needed or wanted the assistance were the following services: study hall, counseling, and remedial testing (Whiddon, 1989).

The University of Florida used the Office of Student Life on campus to provide counseling services, orientation for new student-athletes, tutor scheduling, and academic monitoring. Progress reports were periodically sent to the student-athletes' individual professors. Courses were offered each year to assist the student-athletes in a variety of issues and skills (Whiddon, 1989).

Berg (1989b) mentioned Georgia Tech's Total Person Program (developed by Homer Rice) as a very comprehensive athletic academic support program. In addition to academic counseling, the program provided "personal growth seminars, drug/alcohol counseling, career planning, a wellness program and a follow-up effort to see how student-athletes fare after they leave" (p. 12) college.

At the University of Kentucky, the Center for Academic and Tutorial Services (C.A.T.S.) provided student-athletes with study rooms, tutoring, advising and career planning. Academic monitoring, freshmen orientation classes for student-athletes, and testing of reading ability were also provided. The program utilized a reading coordinator and graduate assistants among the program's staff.
(Whiddon, 1989). Sanders (1992) suggested implementing a career development program for student-athletes in addition to the athletic academic support program at the University of Kentucky. The program started in the freshmen year with a non-credit class, then had follow-up classes where student-athletes could "shadow" community people for a realistic look at a prospective career field. Then a mentoring and internship program followed. Concurrently, the Wildcat Career Development Program provided seminars on social issues, problems, et cetera. The concluding component of the University of Kentucky athletic academic support service program consisted of job search strategies.

Denson (1992) provided an example from the University of Delaware that encompassed the above components in a program called Student Services for Athletes (SAS). The original mission of the program was to "provide increased access for student-athletes to basic student development services . . . by offering these services at times and places that were more convenient for student-athletes" (p. 16). The program then expanded to include five main areas of emphasis. The five service areas were: academic monitoring services; programming functions; consultation; counseling; and teaching. The SAS incorporated an integrated approach utilizing centers, departments and faculty already on campus who could further assist the student-athletes achieve success at the collegiate level (Denson, 1992).
Sanders's and Denson's examples showed the progression within two programs over time. Services and the emphasis of the programs have changed to meet the changing needs of the student-athletes.

In addition to specific institutional athletic department programs there were also models that were designed to enhance programs that were already established. These approaches were either developmental, comprehensive or holistic in design.

In 1988 Petitpas and Champagne suggested a developmental approach using a psychoeducational programming model which included most of the components listed in the programs above. The psychoeducational programming model was based in Perry’s cognitive developmental approach. The authors noted that the program was also consistent with Erickson’s, Super’s, Tiedeman’s and O’Hara’s developmental approaches. The goal of the psychoeducational approach was to guide students through Perry’s stages of thinking. This programming model had four different foci, one for each of the student-athlete’s first four or five years at a college or university. The emphasis during the first year was dealing with the developmental issues of college age adults through a group credit class by the same title. The second year goal was to experiment with new behaviors in a weekly support group. The third year goal was an emphasis on career exploration, again through the weekly support group. The fourth and subsequent years emphasis was on preparation for transitions after college. Petitpas and Champagne believed that the psychoeducational model would enhance student-athletes’ athletic and academic performance.
Jordan and Denson (1990) suggested a Student Services for Athletes (SSA) model which was sponsored by a Center for Counseling and Student Development on campus in conjunction with the athletic department. The program was housed outside of athletics. The SSA provided services that were available for all students, but at times and locations that were more convenient for student-athletes. In addition to the university services the SSA also provided services specifically designed for student-athletes. The SSA model emphasized four areas which were: academic monitoring; consultation with university community; special programs and workshops; and personal counseling. The SSA also emphasized intervention and professionals with a strong working knowledge of the unique characteristics of student-athletes. The program personnel also acted as liaisons between athletics and academics. Two services that were not provided in the SSA which were usually found in programs for student-athletes were study table and specialized academic advising. The support of the athletic department of the SSA model was crucial to its success.

Ferrante and Etzel (1991) perceived student-athletes as a special population with special needs, problems and pressures due to the roles student-athletes were required to assume and because of the special demands placed on them. They stated that student-athletes had high visibility on campus both on and off the field and were the most visible ambassadors for the institution. The authors indicated that whoever worked with student-athletes had the responsibility of attending to the developmental needs of young adults. Ferrante and Etzel believed their
"person-oriented perspective," which was concerned with the student-athlete as an individual, was not what many athletic academic support service programs emphasized. Ferrante and Etzel presented a humanistic approach which met the needs and assisted in the personal development of student-athletes through expanded human services which addressed personal, academic and athletic challenges faced by the individual. They thought it would be nearly impossible, or at least very difficult, for student-athletes to experience a normal college life due to the conditions under which student-athletes lived, studied, played, and developed. If the situation was to remain as it was in 1991, Ferrante and Etzel believed that athletic departments had a responsibility to student-athletes to provide expanded professional helping services for their clientele. They thought this could be accomplished through their person oriented approach to the athletic academic support service programs. This perspective, in conjunction with existing programs, would enable student-athletes the opportunity to succeed in college and in life.

Ferrante, Etzel, and Pinkney (1991) suggested a model to assist student-athletes using existing on-campus facilities (other than what the athletic department provided) utilizing student affairs professionals or counselors or psychologists, who were specifically trained to work with student-athletes. The program was overseen by someone outside of athletics, and the program could be located outside or within the athletic department. This comprehensive model was based on developmental, educational, preventative, and cooperative approaches. The five major program functions were education, clinical/counseling services, assessment, consultation, and
referral. In order for this model to work, the authors noted that it was imperative to have the strong support of the chief of the student affairs officer (CSAO), the athletic director, and a counselor or psychologist. Also, the athletic director needed to stress to the department staff the importance of using existing campus services for the model to be effective.

Lottes (1991) reported that informal support services for student-athletes were being questioned by professionals and others as to their success in dealing with student-athletes of the 1990's and were being questioned with regard to the availability of a holistic type of assistance program for athletes. Lottes suggested providing a comprehensive "whole-istic" model which had four general headings: academic, athletic, personal/social, and career issues. Her "whole-istic" model could be implemented using support services existing on most college campuses and by using consultation from off-campus professionals if an athletic academic support service program was already in existence. She believed that a "whole-istic" model would broaden the focus of many existing programs for student-athletes. The components and services offered through the "whole-istic" model would depend on the services needed to assist the particular individual student-athletes. By implementing this broad and "whole-istic" type of model Lottes thought that the winners would be both the student-athletes and higher education. In Lottes study, where the program was located was as diverse as her respondents, and she concluded that the location should be determined by the physical layout of each campus.
College and university athletic academic support service programs incorporated approaches that were developmental, comprehensive, or holistic in their focus. The services provided depended on the emphasis of the program and the needs of the institutions' student-athletes. Where the programs were located and to whom the individuals reported depended on the model used and the geographical layout of the individual campus. Models that were developmental, comprehensive, or holistic should assist in the development of the student-athlete as a total individual and prepare the person for life during and after college.

In a 1991 study conducted in response to Lottes's findings (cited earlier) that holistic programs were not available on college campuses for student-athletes, W.D. Kirk researched 80 Division I revenue sports team programs. The results of the Kirk study found that there were few if any programs which addressed holistic programs with services provided in the areas of transition (from college) and retirement. Kirk also reported that no colleges or universities had developmental programs that dealt with the "psychosocial dynamics" of student-athletes. However, the psychoeducational model which utilized "psychosocial dynamics" was suggested by Petitpas and Champagne in 1988 and was cited earlier in this review.

Kirk did find that 22% of the responding institutions reported that their programs offered the revenue sports teams three services primarily through the athletic department. These services were: academic advising, academic monitoring, and academic assistance (Kirk & Kirk, 1993). This study was conducted prior to
the distribution of the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund and before Bylaw 16.3 (see definition of terms) became effective in August of 1991.

Gurney (1990), Berg (1989b), Bruno et al. (1987), and Serrano (1987) all included tutorial assistance, academic career counseling, and skill development as components or services that were necessary in athletic academic advising/counseling programs. Gurney (1990) added study table, workshops, and seminars. Bruno et al. recommended providing special classes plus any other instructional support services that were needed by the athletes. The authors stated that the important focus for athletic academic support service programs must be to assist the student-athletes to learn to concentrate on academics. The systematic method suggested by Bruno et al. was developmental in its approach.

Coleman and Barker (1991) acknowledged that athletic academic advising/counseling programs were gaining in national popularity. However, they found that comprehensive programs that provide personal, academic, social, and athletic needs were still restricted. They stated that their model had the added components to strengthen the student-athletes' academic performance and career success. Their comprehensive model included individual assessment and evaluation, which they suggested be done prior to the student-athletes' arrival on campus from the high school materials already available to the athletic academic advisor/counselor. The other components in this comprehensive model included study table, academic support and monitoring, staff development, and information
dissemination, research and evaluation. The authors believed the above services were necessary components for student-athletes’ success.

Gould and Finch (1991) advocated a long-term developmental perspective when working with student-athletes. They also acknowledged the importance of using preventative measures when working with the athletes. They, along with Lottes and Ferrante and Etzel, supported model approaches which acknowledged the importance of treating the student-athletes as individuals.

Willoughby et al. (1991) suggested the service of mentors for student-athletes, to assist them in the development of basic study skills and time management competence. They thought mentors would be a possible aid in the academic success of student-athletes who received scholarships. Willoughby et al. reported that the responsibility of providing a well rounded start to college student-athletes may be too immense for academic advisors to provide by themselves and that mentors could assist the advisors. Owing to the fact that many student-athletes in revenue sports devoted a great deal of time to athletic participation in high school, it was thought by the authors that mentors could assist in the academic skill development necessary to all university students.

Shughart offered what he thought was a viable alternative to the academic versus athletic dilemma. While his ideas were reported in this review of literature, the suggestions have not received much credibility from the academic and athletic community.
Shughart (1990), a professor of economics at the University of Mississippi, in an article in the Wall Street Journal offered three suggestions to assist student-athletes in men's revenue sports (football and basketball) at big time institutions. One suggestion directly related to this study was to offer a four-year degree program in football and basketball. He equated the degree program to bachelor's degrees in art, drama, and music. Shughart asked, "Why should academic credit be given for practicing the violin, but not for practicing a three-point shot?" (p. 6). Kirkpatrick (1991, p. 25) agreed with Shughart and thought the idea sensible. Kirkpatrick added that treating college teams as semi-professional farm clubs for major football, baseball, and basketball leagues would perhaps end the hypocrisy that he acknowledged existed in collegiate athletics. Shughart also suggested extending the time limit on athletic scholarships by two years to allow student-athletes the time to complete a college degree. This has been done to a degree at the majority of "big" football and basketball programs.

In conclusion, athletic academic support programs offered many similar and diverse services for student-athletes. The services furnished for student-athletes depended in part on the type of developmental, comprehensive, or holistic approach used by the institution's athletic department. The services provided for student-athletes also depended on whether the services were available through the athletic department, a nonathletic department or through a combination of campus departments.
Whiddon (1989) suggested that directors of athletic academic support service programs consider the following services if an institution were considering implementing a program: student-athlete assessment, academic advisement, vocational, social/personal counseling, orientation sessions, study halls, tutors, and remedial services. She thought that an athletic academic support program could be a "viable part of the solutions to today's student-athlete dilemma" (p. 13).

Swann, in a 1989 study of 134 Division I respondents (47% response rate), found no significant differences in the types of programs offered at public or private institutions. He also found no significant differences in the offering of services between male and female student-athletes in revenue or non-revenue sports. The majority of universities (90%) provided at least the following services: academic advising, counseling, tutoring, and study skill assistance. Swann also found that most respondents perceived that their programs and services were effective with regard to student-athletes.

Kirk and Kirk (1993) concluded in their book on student-athletes that the majority of programs provided course selection assistance, tutoring, and study tables for student-athletes. They also concluded that there were no "typical" models for athletic academic support service programs. They believed that more departments should consider the holistic approach suggested by Lottes to aid athletes while at college and to assist student-athletes in the transition after college.

Athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs or services can run the gamut from one-person operations with few amenities, to specific
models, to full blown, fully staffed separate departments. "As institutions acknowledge their responsibility for facilitating the academic success of student-athletes, new paradigms are evolving [constantly]" (Coleman & Barker, 1991, p. 18).
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study compared, analyzed, and described the services which were provided for intercollegiate male and female athletes who participated on revenue and non-revenue sports teams. Information that maintained or encouraged the strong academic performance of student-athletes is essential in the process of understanding and supporting the services provided for student-athletes. The type of services provided or made available to athletes may be important and significant factors in enhancing the academic development and performance of student-athletes at Division I institutions.

Chapter 3 is presented according to the following topics: (a) purpose, (b) general questions to be answered, (c) a description of the study and the population, (d) a description of the categories included in the investigation, (e) a description of the instrument, (f) a description of the methods used to collect data, (g) the hypotheses, (h) a description of the methods used to analyze the data, and (i) the precautions taken to ensure accuracy. The topics provide an overview of how the study was undertaken.
The purpose of this study was to compare, describe and analyze the services provided to male and female participants of revenue and non-revenue sports teams at Division I-A, Division I-AA, and Division I-AAA institutions across the United States during Spring quarter or semester, 1993. The study achieved this purpose by:

1. Describing the services provided for student-athletes in all sports as reported by the directors of athletic academic support service programs at Division I institutions across the U.S.

2. Comparing the services provided for male and female participants, in revenue and non-revenue sports, at Division I institutions across the United States.

General Questions To Be Answered

Three questions were also addressed in this study to help achieve an understanding of the problem. The three questions were as follows:

1. What are the services provided to student-athletes in the athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs?

2. Are there differences in what services the athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs provide for revenue and non-revenue sport teams?
3. Are there differences in what services the athletic academic advising/counseling support service programs provide for male and female student-athletes?

**The Study and Population Description**

The design of this study was descriptive. A survey questionnaire was used to collect the data from a sample population. The directors of athletic academic support service programs at 274 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I-A, I-AA and I-AAA institutions in the United States were the population in this study. The 274 institutions were derived from an NCAA conference list. The directors of athletic academic support service programs or their designees were the information sources at each institution. The directors of athletic academic support programs were identified from the 1992-1993 National Directory of College Athletics (Men's Edition and Women's Edition) and from a 1992-1993 list provided from the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A). The two directories listed the names of the individuals who were the directors of athletic academic support service programs at Division I institutions included in this study. For a list of participating institutions see Appendix A.

**Description of Investigative Categories**

All 274 directors of athletic academic support service programs were mailed a cover letter (Appendix C) along with the Athletic Academic Advising Support
Services Questionnaire (AAASSQ) (Appendix B). The director provided descriptive information on the nature of the athletic academic advising/counseling support service program at their institution for the academic year 1993-1994. The respondents also provided information about the department and the services provided. The questionnaires were returned in stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Instrument

An overview and description of the survey instrument will be described. The validity and the reliability measures are detailed for the reader. Lastly, the test-retest reliability of the instrument was determined.

The Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire (AAASSQ) was developed during the summer of 1992 by the investigator (Appendix B). The instrument was developed after reviewing the literature related to athletic academic support service programs and the services provided for student-athletes. The instrument was further refined from the comments and suggestions of the ten experts who assisted in establishing the validity of the AAASSQ and from their professional knowledge and work experience in the athletic academic advising/counseling field.

The instrument consisted of 23 questions. Questions 1-11 were descriptive and demographic questions which provided information about a specific institution's athletic academic support service program. The following information was provided by the respondents: (a) the name of the institution; (b) the football classification
of the school; (c) the undergraduate enrollment of the institution; (d) whether the
support program was established and, if so, what year; (e) the title of the person in
charge of the program; (f) the name of the person in charge of the program;
(g) the number of full-time advisors/counselors employed in the program; (h) where
the department or unit was located, and to whom the program director reported;
and, lastly, (i) the number of department members who belonged to the N4A.

Questions 12 and 13 asked the respondents to check the groups of student-
athletes who received a range of 17 support services on a regular basis. The
services were provided by the athletic department and/or by a campus department
other than athletics. Question 14 asked respondents to circle the services provided
for advisors/counselors.

Questions 15-18 asked the respondents to check a range of five services that
were provided when the athletic teams were travelling for sport related purposes.
The questions specifically asked which of the services were provided to men’s
revenue, women’s revenue, men’s non-revenue, and women’s non-revenue sports
teams at the following locations: (a) away contests, (b) conference games,
(c) tournaments, (d) when the coaches provided the service(s), and (e) an option of
responding that service(s) were not provided when the teams were travelling.

Question 19 asked for the director’s perceptions of whether or not an
athletic academic support service program improved the academic classroom
performance of student-athletes. Questions 20 and 21 asked respondents for their
response’s on a five item Likert-scale regarding the need for the same services to
be provided for non-revenue and revenue teams, and for women and men student-athletes.

Question 22 asked the respondents to check a range of 16 areas where the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund monies were usually spent. The question also requested the same information regarding where the monies were spent during the past academic year.

Question 23 requested the respondents to return printed materials that described the program in terms of philosophy and/or goals. If no printed materials were available, the respondents were asked to describe the program in terms of philosophy and/or goals in the space provided.

The validity of the instrument was next determined. Experts in the subject-matter area appraised the content of the questionnaire and determined its face validity. If the respondents judged that the instrument actually collected data relevant to the purpose of the study, then the instrument is considered valid (Borg, Gall, & Meredith, 1983).

A selection of ten directors of athletic academic support service programs at Division I institutions from a variety of colleges and universities in and around the state of Wyoming were asked to assist in determining the face validity of the questionnaire. From their comments and suggestions and completion of the survey instrument appropriate changes were made. A cover letter (Appendix E) asking the participants to help determine face validity of the instrument and a thank you letter
(Appendix F) were sent to the ten directors of athletic academic support service programs.

Ten athletic academic advisors/counselors who were not the directors of athletic academic advising programs from various colleges and universities determined the reliability of the instrument. A test-retest design determined the reliability of the test scores. This method of determining reliability "furnish[ed] estimates of the reproducibility of test scores" (Garrett, 1962, p. 337). The correlation was computed between the first and second sets of scores. In the first mailing the athletic academic advisors/counselors were sent a copy of the instrument with instructions to complete and return the instrument. Two months later the same participants were asked to again complete the AAASSQ and return the survey. A cover letter (Appendix G) and a thank you letter (Appendix H) were sent to the ten athletic academic advisors/counselors. The test-retest reliability of the instrument, the AAASSQ, was .77.

An overview and description of the survey instrument was described. The validity and the reliability measures were detailed and the test-retest reliability of the instrument was determined.

Method of Collecting Data

The data were collected through the use of a survey questionnaire. Directors of athletic academic advising/counseling programs provided the responses.
A cover letter (Appendix C) and the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire (Appendix B) were mailed to the directors of athletic academic support services at each Division I institution on January 4, 1993. Each packet of materials was coded for the purpose of identifying non-respondents. A follow-up packet was mailed approximately three weeks (February 15, 1993) after the first mailing along with a different cover letter (Appendix D).

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested to address the purpose as stated in this study. All of the hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. Ferguson (1981) stated, "It is a common convention to adopt levels of significance of either .05 or .01" (p. 162). The .05 level was chosen to balance the probability of committing a Type I or Type II error. "In reaching a decision about the null hypothesis, two types of errors may arise. An alternative hypothesis may be accepted when the null hypothesis is true. This is called Type I error. The null hypothesis may be accepted when an alternative hypothesis is true. This is called Type II error" (Ferguson, 1976, p. 161). The acceptance of hypotheses are decisions about nature.

The following hypotheses were stated as null hypotheses and were tested using the statistic chi-square test of independence. Based on the level of significance, the null hypotheses were either retained or rejected.


H1 The availability of student support services provided by the athletic department for student-athletes is independent of gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

H2 The availability of student support services provided by a department on campus other than athletics for student athletes is independent of gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

H3 The availability of support services provided for male student-athletes when travelling for sport related purposes is independent of whether male athletes are members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

H4 The availability of support services provided for female student-athletes when travelling for sport related purposes is independent of whether female athletes are members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

H5 The program directors' perceptions of whether or not an athletic academic support service program has improved academic classroom performance are independent of student-athletes' gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

**Statistical Methods to Analyze the Data**

To analyze the data, both descriptive and analytical statistics were employed.

The demographic information was descriptive in nature as noted by Gay (1987).
A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are. The descriptive method is useful for investigating a variety of educational problems. Typical descriptive studies are concerned with the assessment of attitudes, opinions, demographic information" (p. 189).

The data were organized into tables based on means, numerical tally, percentage charts, and chi-square test of independence.

The first 11 questions and questions 20, 21 and 22 on the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire (AAASSQ) were analyzed and explained using comparisons, tables, means, numerical tally, and percentage charts. Chi-square tests of independence were used to test hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. These five hypotheses accounted for the statistical process (chi square) and analyzed questions 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and question 19 of the AAASSQ. Tests of independence were utilized for each variable.

**Precautions Taken for Accuracy**

The investigator checked all responses for mathematical error or responses which deviated from the instructions. If errors were detected, a postcard stating the nature of the problem and another copy of the instrument were sent to the respondent. The postcard requested that specific corrections be made, and information regarding how to return the questionnaire by a specified date was included.

The data from the questionnaires were transferred directly to the VAX computer at the University of Wyoming and to the mainframe computer at the
University of Northern Colorado under the direction of a member of the University of Wyoming Computer Center staff and again checked by a member of the University of Northern Colorado Information Technology Center staff. An outside party verified every fifth item as being accurately recorded. Also, a computer printout of the raw data was compared to the original data prior to statistical analysis. The statistical analysis of the results was derived by computer analysis, using SPSS Plus and SAS statistical packages.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA, RESULTS, AND SUMMARY

This study compared, analyzed, and described services which were provided for male and female, revenue and non-revenue sports teams. Understanding the services that were provided for student-athletes may be important in enhancing the academic performance of student-athletes at Division I institutions.

Chapter 4 is presented according to the following topics: (a) an analysis of the data, (b) an analysis of the descriptive information, (c) the statistical results, and (d) a summary. The topics described the analyses of the data obtained in this study.

Analysis of Data

The Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire (AAASSQ) was mailed to 274 (N = 274) directors of athletic academic support service programs. The first mailing yielded 143 returned instruments. Three respondents chose not to participate in the study for the following reasons: (a) one respondent replied that because of lack of time, the individual only responded to questionnaires from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA); and (b) two individuals responded that there was no person in the position to supply the information. The
response rate for the first mailing of usable questionnaires was 51.09%. Forty-three instruments were returned from the second mailing for a return rate of 15.69%. The overall return rate produced 186 instruments for a 67.79% overall return. There were 183 (n = 183) usable instruments returned for a 66.78% return rate used in the analyses. The services provided and the availability of the services for the student-athletes at Division I institutions across the United States were determined by the responses from the heads of the athletic academic support service units (or their designees) who returned the completed instrument.

Responses to the first 11 questions and questions 20, 21, and 22 on the AAASSQ were described using tables, means, numerical tally, frequency and percentage charts. Question 23 asked the respondents to return printed materials that described the athletic academic support service program. If no printed materials were available, respondents were asked to describe the program in terms of philosophy, or goals in the space provided on the questionnaire.

Analysis of Descriptive Information

The information was obtained from analyses of the data from the survey instrument. Questions 1 through 11, 20, 21 and 22 were descriptively analyzed.

There were 85 (46%) Division I-A institutions, 53 (29%) Division I-AA institutions, and 45 (24.6%) Division I-AAA institutions represented in the study. The Division I-AAA institutions did not have football programs.
The mean undergraduate population was 13,871 students. The median number of students was 12,000 (Table 1).

Table 1. Division I undergraduate population distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>MIDPOINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>26045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>36465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>49490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTOGRAM FREQUENCY

MEAN 13871.27  MEDIAN 12000.000

n = 183

The respondents were asked if the athletic academic support service program was institutionally recognized. There were 166 (90.7%) of the programs that were established and recognized by the institution. Fourteen (7.7%) of the
respondents indicated that the program was not established by the institution or institutionally recognized. Six respondents, less than 1%, were not sure of this information.

The mean year for the establishment of athletic academic advising/counseling programs was 1967. Thirty-seven respondents were not sure of the inception date, or could not find the year the program was first recognized. The median year was 1984.

Several different titles were used for the individuals who headed the athletic advising/counseling support service programs (Table 2). The most common title,
Director of Athletic Academic Programs, was listed by 38 (20.8%) of the respondents. The next most frequent title was Coordinator of the program at 28 (15.3%) of the institutions. There were 9 individuals (4.9%) titled the Academic and Compliance Coordinator of the responding institutions. Six (3.3%) of the respondents were called the Student Program Coordinator. There were 14 (7.7%) of the respondents who were the Assistant Athletic Director for Academics and Compliance. Twenty-one (11.5%) of the individuals were titled the Assistant Athletic Director for Student Services/Development. There were 27 (14.8%) of the institutions who called the head of the athletic academic advising/counseling program the Athletic Academic Advisor or Counselor. There were 8 respondents (4.4%) who were named the Associate Athletic Director for Academics and Compliance. There were 5 (2.7%) respondents who were titled the Associate Athletic Director for Student (Support) Services. Lastly, there were 27 (14.8%) of the responding heads of the athletic academic advising/counseling programs who had one of a kind title names that were not categorized in the above groups of title headings.

The number of people within each athletic academic advising/counseling program ranged from zero to 6 full-time employees. The mean number of people within the athletic academic advising/counseling department was 1.85, and the median number of people was 1.0. There were numerous programs with graduate assistants as additional members of the support service staff.
The next question on the AAASSQ asked the respondents to indicate to which office on campus they were responsible for reporting (Table 3) and where the programs were physically located or housed on campus (Table 4). The majority of program directors, 107 or 58.47%, reported to someone within the athletic department (usually the athletic director), and 122 or 66.7% of the programs were located in the athletic department or an athletically related facility such as the football stadium offices or an athletic dorm. There were 43 respondents (23.5%) who reported to the student services or academic affairs offices on campus. Student services or academic affairs were where 26 (14.21%) of the programs were housed. There were 12 (6.55%) of the respondents who reported to the president’s office or the vice president’s office. Seven individuals (3.83%) reported to another college or department on campus. There were 16 (8.74%) of the programs that were housed in facilities that were not directly related to athletics, the student affairs, president’s, or vice president’s offices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report to</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>58.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Academic Affairs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President’s/President’s Office</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 183</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Departments where athletic academic programs were housed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>58.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs/Academic Affairs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Facility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The physical education department was where 5 (2.73%) of the programs were housed. Fourteen (7.65%) institutional representatives responded that they had no program, and with regard to being institutionally recognized, were not housed in a specific department, nor did they report to any specific person or department on campus. There were many different departments that athletic academic support programs reported to and there were several locations for student-athlete services to be housed.

The number of advisors/counselors that were members of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A) ranged from zero to 6 people within a program. The mean number of people belonging to the N4A was 1.5 for membership and the median number of people was 1.0. Two respondents provided the information that graduate assistants belonged to the national organization but paid for the membership themselves and were not funded through
monies allocated for professional membership through the athletic academic advising/counseling support service program.

The next question on the AAASSQ asked the respondents if there was a need for the same services to be provided for revenue and non-revenue sports teams and for women and men. A summary of these data are presented in Table 5. The directors of athletic academic support service programs checked their responses on a five item Likert-scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) to the following statements:

1. There is a need for the same services to be provided for non-revenue sports as for revenue sports.
2. There is a need for the same services to be provided for women as for men student-athletes.

The majority of the respondents, 128 or 71.5%, strongly agreed that there was a need for the same services to be provided to members of both non-revenue and revenue sports. There were 33 respondents (18.4%) who agreed that non-revenue and revenue sports teams should be provided the same services. There were 9 respondents (5%) who were neutral, 5 respondents (2.8%) who disagreed, and 4 respondents (2.2%) who strongly disagreed with the statement that there is a need for the same services to be provided for non-revenue as for revenue sports.
Table 5. Frequencies and percent of respondents who thought the same services should be provided to non-revenue and revenue sports teams and for women and men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue/ Non-revenue</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/ Men</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were 145 (79.7%) of the respondents who strongly agreed that there was a need for the same services to be provided for women as for men student-athletes and 23 respondents (13%) who agreed with the statement. Only 8 respondents (4.5%) were neutral that women should receive the same services as men. There were 3 (1.7%) of the respondents who disagreed with the statement and just 2 (1.1%) who strongly disagreed that women should receive the same services as men.

Ninety-five respondents (51.9%) added comments to the above responses or answered the question with a written response rather than checking a response on
the Likert-scale. Several examples of the comments, and the number of responses that were similar in content and context follow: "It is the law to provide the same services" (8). "Student-athletes should have the assistance available no matter who they are or what they play" (42). "Non-revenue sports travel less, miss class less, and are frequently non-scholarship which tends to find students more academically focused" (3). "Football and men's basketball are more at-risk" (2). "Women need additional counseling." "I feel strongly that it is beneficial to the working relationship of the entire department to eliminate any semblance of a double standard among gender or sports when speaking [about] academic services. Graduation rate numbers also depend on the cumulative efforts of all your scholarship athletes" (3). "Non-revenue sports normally don't have at-risk students. In general, the same can be said of women's sports" (3). "All students that need the assistance should be able to get it. A lot of times it comes down to whether or not their budget will allow for it" (2). "I believe all services should be available for all student-athletes. PERIOD! We provide services for all competing, non-competing, and former student-athletes until graduation" (4). "Every student-athlete that is asked to attend a college and participate in intercollegiate athletics should be given the best possible assistance to help them achieve success in the classroom." "Non-revenue sports teams miss more class." "Tutorial services, study hall, monitoring of grades, et cetera, should be the same." "Services should be provided, however, the women usually have less of a "need" for" (2). "The larger, higher profile teams tend to have larger percentages of difficulties" (2). "Revenue
and non-revenue sport involvement can be very different realities." "Women are
more independent, more focused to education." "We currently provide such
services, but I believe there is a need for nationally." Lastly, "Why would you
support one and not another?" (6).

From the above comments it appeared that individuals seemed to have many
similar responses on the same services being provided to non-revenue and revenue
sports teams and for women and men. There were 74 respondents who had strong
opinions that equal services should be provided for all student-athletes regardless of
team membership and gender.

Question 22 of the AAASSQ asked all of the respondents to indicate where
the annual $25,000.00 NCAA academic enhancement monies were spent within the
last year, and where the monies were usually spent. According to Keith Martin,
Director of Accounting for the NCAA, the monies could be spent on items not
covered by a grant-in-aid, such as textbooks. Other areas where the money could
be used were tutors, support service staff, and personnel. Scholarships were not the
intended use of the monies (Martin, personal communication, November 1, 1993).
A summary of the responses is presented in Table 6. There were 31 (16.9%) of the
respondents who did not respond to this question and there were 5 (2.7%) who did
not know how the money was spent within the program, or even if the money was
used for athletic academic support services.
Table 6. Annual and usual spending patterns* for NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund $25,000.00**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Spending</th>
<th>Within the 92-93 year</th>
<th>Usually spend some or all $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic banquets</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up costs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference(s)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership(s)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of . . .</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office supplies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five (2.7%) of the respondents did not know how the monies were spent or had not heard of this funding. Thirty-one (16.9%) of the respondents did not complete this question on the AAASSQ.

** In June 1993 the NCAA academic-enhancement funding increased to $30,000.00 at all Division I institutions.
The 16 areas of spending were divided into 3 categories: (a) increases in the number of programs that spent monies in a particular area, (b) the number of areas that did not increase or decrease in the number of programs which spent money in the areas, and (c) decreases in the number of programs that spent monies in particular areas. The respondents indicated the areas where the monies had been spent in the past year and the areas where monies were usually spent. In the "other" category provided at the end of the spending areas, one respondent added mentoring as an area where they usually spent money and had spent money in that area in the past year as well.

The increases in spending areas during the past year are presented from the smallest increases to the largest increases by spending area. There was an increase by one institution, 9 to 10 (4.9% to 5.5%), that spent monies toward scholarships. Three more institutional representatives increased spending on facilities, 15 to 18 (8.2 to 9.8%). There was an increase in four programs that spent additional monies on conferences, 14 to 18 (7.7 to 9.8%), during the '92-'93 year. Five more programs spent more monies than usual in the membership(s) area, 17 to 22 (9.3 to 12%), and office supplies, 15 to 20 (8.7 to 10.99%). Over the past year there was an increase of 7 programs that spent more money on workshops, 13 to 20 (7.1 to 10.9%). Eight programs spent more monies than usual for the study area, 18 to 26 (9.8 to 14.2%), and toward start-up costs, 6 to 14 (3.3 to 7.7%). There were 17 more institutions that spent more monies than usual for tutoring, 51 to 68 (27.9 to 37.2%). Twenty-seven representatives indicated increased departmental spending
on or toward computers, 38 to 65 institutions (20.8 to 35.5%). Personnel saw the largest increase in spending during the past year, from 55 to 83 institutions (30.1 to 45.4%).

There were three categories in which the spending patterns did not change between the usual and past year spending. The three areas were: academic programs, 25 (13.7%); guest speaker(s), 12 (6.6%); and academic research, 5 (13.7%).

There were two spending areas in which respondents indicated that they spent less money than normal. One institution spent less monies than usual on academic banquets, 14 to 13 (7.7 to 7.1%). Lastly, three institutions spent less monies than usual on the maintenance of an unspecified area within the athletic academic support service programs, 13 to 10 (7.1 to 5.5%).

The respondents provided information on where they utilized the NCAA academic-enhancement $25,000.00. They spent some monies directly on services for academic advising/counseling programs, and some institutions spent the money on more indirect services such as office supplies, athletic banquets, and maintenance of the program. Since the time of this study the Academic-Enhancement Fund has increased to $30,000.00 for all NCAA Division I institutions (NCAA News, 9, 1993).

Question 23 of the AAASSQ asked respondents to provide printed materials that described their athletic academic support service program. If no printed materials were available, the respondents were asked to describe (in writing) the program in terms of philosophy and/or goal(s).
Sixty-five respondents (35.52%) returned printed materials with their questionnaire. The materials ranged from a single sheet of paper to a brochure, to a collection of three booklets (academic advising services, goals, a student-athlete handbook, and a tutor handbook). Fifty-seven (31.15%) people provided written responses on the instrument. Forty-two (73.68%) respondents wrote a brief program philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s). Twelve (21.05%) respondents listed the services provided or available for student-athletes and/or wrote what their job descriptions were. One respondent wrote that his/her booklet was two inches thick and could not be mailed. One respondent provided a comment on who should oversee athletics, and one respondent wrote that he had only been in his current position for five months and was not aware of the philosophy or goal(s). There were 58 (31.69%) who did not provide materials or write a response. Three people (1.64%) wrote that they were either putting together new materials or were developing materials at the time of the questionnaire.

The printed materials returned with the questionnaire provided the following information about athletic academic support service programs. Fifty-nine (90.76%) of the printed materials received contained the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s). Six (9.23%) of the materials did not contain the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) and instead listed services available for student-athletes or were job descriptions of what individuals did or provided for the student-athletes.
Reviews of the materials returned by the respondents provided the information that the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the programs were similar in purpose. Fifty-three (81.53%) of the responding institutions stated the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the programs were to provide opportunities for the attainment of academic success by student-athletes. Sixty-three (96.92%) of the programs were committed to providing support services for student-athletes. Thirty-three (50.76%) of the programs included total development of the student-athletes as part of the philosophy, goal(s) and/or mission statement(s). Forty-seven (72.30%) of the programs' philosophies, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) were to provide opportunities for student-athletes to attain a college degree and 6 (10.17%) of the programs had outcomes focused on increasing the graduation rates of the student-athletes. Lastly, 47 (72.30%) programs served as resource centers for the student-athletes, and their program personnel were advocates or liaisons between the student-athletes and the academic community.

After reviewing the printed materials, a list of 30 services available for student-athletes, the number of programs that provided the services, and the percentage of the programs that provided the services was compiled (Table 7).

Not all printed materials were complete documents; therefore, it would be possible for programs to provide a service, yet the service not be listed in the available materials. The question specifically requested philosophy and/or program goal information.
Table 7. Services available to student-athletes through responding athletic academic support service programs as indicated in printed materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring academic progress</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>90.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study table</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College survival skills</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA information and eligibility</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising information</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic eligibility monitoring</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration assistance/scheduling</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career exploration or development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special workshops, seminars, classes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen orientation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting assistance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer lab</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-risk student service</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing in mathematics and reading</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post eligibility services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade checks</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer orientation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence excuse forms</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life management skills</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookroom/textbook loan</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing all incoming student-athletes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer employment opportunities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority registration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport psychologist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental newsletter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member, National Consortium for Academics and Sports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of the written comments on the questionnaire provided the information that 42 (73.68%) of the written comments contained the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the athletic academic support service programs. Fifteen (26.32%) of the responses did not contain the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) and instead listed services available for student-athletes or other comments. Nineteen (33.33%) people wrote that their programs also used services that were already available on campus for all students.

Reviews of the written comments by the respondents provided the information that the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the programs were similar in tenet. Twenty-three (40.35%) of the respondents stated the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the programs were to provide maximum opportunities for the attainment of academic success and personal development by student-athletes. Twenty (35.08%) of the respondents wrote that the philosophies, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the programs were to provide opportunities for student-athletes to attain a college degree, and 2 (3.50%) of the programs had outcomes that were to increase the graduation rates of the student-athletes. Three (5.26%) of the respondents provided the information that an outcome of their program was to provide the best possible college experience for the student-athletes. Twelve (21.05%) of the respondents noted that the programs served as resource centers for the student-athletes and/or the program personnel were advocates or acted as liaisons between the student-athletes and the academic community. Eight (14.03%) of the respondents stated that the
purpose of the athletic academic support programs was to provide a normal college experience for student-athletes, what one individual called "college in the mainstream." Six (10.52%) of the people responded that the services they provided were available for all student-athletes. Two (3.50%) individuals stated that the student-athletes were responsible for their own academic success.

From the written comments of the respondents, a list of 10 services that were available for student-athletes through the athletic academic support service units, and the number and percentage of respondents who indicated that the services were available was compiled (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring academic progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College survival skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring athletic eligibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for at-risk student-athletes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study table</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen student-athlete orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling of classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The printed materials and written comments from the respondents provided information on the philosophy, goal(s), and/or mission statement(s) of the athletic
academic support service programs. Some respondents also listed services available for student-athletes at various institutions.

In summary, the descriptive results provided demographic and descriptive information regarding the athletic academic advising/counseling programs included in this study. In addition, the results provided information about the titles of the heads of the programs, where the programs were housed, and to whom the representatives reported on campus. Also, the descriptive information provided insights into how the directors of athletic academic support service programs imagined the services should be provided for student-athletes and how the NCAA academic enhancement fund monies were spent at the responding institutions. Lastly, respondents provided printed materials or written comments that described their athletic academic support service programs in terms of philosophy and/or goals or provided information about the support services available for student-athletes.

**Statistical Results**

The chi-square test of independence was used to test hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Fifty-one chi-squares tests of independence were analyzed. It should be noted that some tables have an "n" less than 183 due to some respondents not completing the question or providing written comments only. Some tables have an "n" larger than 183 due to respondents having more than one response option on the questionnaire.
H₁: The availability of student support services provided by the athletic department for student-athletes is independent of gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

Athletic departments provided 17 services to the student-athletes independent of gender and independent of membership on a revenue/non-revenue sports team (Table 9). The services were either available to all student-athletes, regardless of gender and team membership, or the services were not available through, or provided by, the athletic department for revenue or non-revenue sports team members of either gender.

No statistical significance was found at the .05 level for the 17 support services the athletic departments provided for student-athletes and an athlete’s gender or team membership. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was retained.

Most services, 12 of 17, were offered equally to revenue and non-revenue sports teams and equally to males and females. These 12 services were as follows:

- Yearly orientation for all student-athletes
- Career counseling
- Academic counseling
- Personal counseling
- Personality assessment
- Continuous skills testing
- Seminars
- Workshops
- Classes specific for student-athletes
- Athletic eligibility checks
- Compliance checks
- Exit counseling/seminar/interview
Table 9. Support service(s) available through the athletic department or other campus department by sports team membership and by gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>Calculated Value of Chi-square</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>Other Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically at risk</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen student-athlete orientation</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly orientation all student-athletes</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of study skills</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic counseling</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic monitoring</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete scheduling/advising</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality assessment</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>7.448*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous skills testing</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes specific for student-athletes</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic eligibility check</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance check</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit counseling/seminar/interview</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant

n = 183  Degrees of Freedom = 1  α = .05
Institutional representatives responding to the AAASSQ question that asked program directors to check which services were provided for their student-athletes added additional services under the "other" category that their unit provided but were not options on the questionnaire. The services added to the list included: tutoring (listed by 15 institutions), priority registration (1 institution), monitored study halls (5 programs), "Student-athlete Special Needs Program" which taught "at-risk" students "voluntary relaxation techniques, guided imagery, and other academic performance enhancement tools" (1 institution), book loan programs (1 institution), computer labs and drug prevention programs (1 institution each). Three institutions mentioned being involved with the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, and 3 respondents mentioned their involvement with financial aid assistance. The respondents at 7 institutions indicated that some or all of the services listed were provided by other academic areas on campus, but were overseen or monitored by athletic department representatives.

H₂: The availability of student support services provided by a department on campus other than athletics for student-athletes is independent of gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

Sixteen of the 17 student support services provided by a department on campus other than athletics for student-athletes were available to the athletes independent of gender and team membership on revenue or non-revenue sports teams (Table 9). There was one service, personality assessment, which was
dependent on gender and membership on revenue or non-revenue sports teams. The remaining 16 services were available for all students, including student-athletes, regardless of gender and team membership or the services were not available through a campus department for any student-athletes. There were no respondents who listed additional services in the "other" category provided after the list of the 17 services.

There was statistical significance obtained at the .05 level for the service of personality assessment. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Personality assessment provided by a department on campus other than by the athletic department was available to men's revenue sports teams at 68.4% of the responding institutions. Personality assessment was made available by 50.4% of the institutions to women's revenue sports teams. There were 31.6% of the institutions that provided personality assessment for men's non-revenue sports teams while 49.6% provided it for women's non-revenue teams. The observed and expected frequencies show that when a campus department other than the athletic department administered the personality assessment service, men's revenue and women's non-revenue sports teams had greater access to the assessment than either the men's non-revenue or the women's revenue sports teams. See Table 10 for a summary of the findings.
Table 10. Observed and expected frequencies of availability of personality assessment provided by a campus department other than through the athletic department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Revenue</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Non-revenue</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Revenue</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Non-revenue</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected frequencies may be computed for each cell of a contingency table using the following equation. The row total times the column total divided by the grand total is equal to the expected frequency value for each cell within a contingency table (Sanders, 1990, p. 420). The expected values used in calculating chi-square are the values that would be expected if the variables are independent (Norusis, 1990, p. 256).

H₃: The availability of support services provided for male student-athletes when travelling for sport related purposes is independent of whether male athletes are members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

While travelling for sport related purposes, male student-athlete's access to an advisor/counselor and a proctored study table depended on him being a member
of a revenue sports team (Table 11). If a member of the men's revenue team, they had access to 2 of the 5 possible services, and if the male was a member of a non-revenue sports team they had less access or no access to the 5 services.

There was statistical significance found at the .05 level for men on revenue sports teams for the services of an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table when the sports teams were travelling for sport related purposes. No other services (computer use, administration of tests, or tutors) obtained statistical significance for revenue or non-revenue sports teams. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 11. Support services provided by the athletic department for male student-athletes while travelling for revenue/non-revenue sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>Calculated Value of Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisor or counselor</td>
<td>17.577</td>
<td>** 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer use</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td>9.782</td>
<td>** 0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>4.859</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom = 4</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Statistically significant.
Academic Advisor/Counselor

Academic advisors/counselors were available at away contests for male revenue team members at 16.8% of the responding institutions. Academic advisors/counselors were available at conference games at 5.3% of the institutions. At tournament contests the availability of an academic advisor/counselor was provided at 8.6% of the institutions. When the coaches provided the academic advisor/counselor, the teams received the service at 11% of the institutions. Lastly, 58.4% of the institutions did not provide the service of an academic advisor/counselor for men's revenue sports teams while they travelled for sport related purposes (Table 12).

Table 12. Percent of institutions who provided an academic advisor/counselor to male student-athletes while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All Away Contests</th>
<th>Conference Contests</th>
<th>Tournament Contests</th>
<th>Coach Provides</th>
<th>Do Not Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the observed and expected frequencies (Table 13) provided the information that male revenue sports teams had an academic advisor/counselor available while travelling on the road more consistently than expected at away
contests at 10 of the institutions, for conference contests at less than three institutions, for tournament games at less than four of the institutions, and when the coaches provided the service, at less than two of the institutions. Men’s revenue sports teams were provided the availability of an academic advisor/counselor when the service was available more often than was expected when travelling. Male non-revenue sports teams were not provided the service more often than expected and less often than expected whenever an academic advisor/counselor was provided when the teams were travelling for sport related purposes.

Table 13. Observed and expected frequencies of academic advisors/counselors provided to male student-athletes while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All Away Contests</th>
<th>Conference Contests</th>
<th>Tournament Contests</th>
<th>Coach Provides</th>
<th>Do Not Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 183

Proctored Study Table

There were 16.5% of the responding institutions that provided a proctored study table at away contests for male revenue team members. A proctored study
was provided at 6.7% of the institutions for conference games. At tournament contests men’s revenue teams had the service of a proctored study table available at 8.5% of the institutions. When the coaches provided the proctored study table, men’s revenue sports teams received the service at 31.3% of the institutions. A proctored study table for men’s revenue teams was not provided at 37.1% of the institutions (Table 14).

Table 14. Percent of institutions who provided a proctored study table to male student-athletes while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All Away Contests</th>
<th>Conference Contests</th>
<th>Tournament Contests</th>
<th>Coach Provides</th>
<th>Do Not Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 183

The observed and expected frequencies (Table 15) provided the information that when travelling for sport related purposes, men’s revenue sports teams had access to a proctored study table more often than expected for all away contests at less than six of the institutions, for conference contests at less than three institutions, for tournament games at less than three of the institutions, and when the coaches provided a proctored study table, at five institutions. Men’s non-revenue sports teams were not provided the service of a proctored study table.
more often than expected. When the non-revenue teams were travelling they were
provided a proctored study table less often than was expected.

Table 15. Observed and expected frequencies for a proctored study table provided
to male student-athletes while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All Away Contests</th>
<th>Conference Contests</th>
<th>Tournament Contests</th>
<th>Coach Provides</th>
<th>Do Not Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical significance was obtained for men’s revenue sports teams when
their institutions made available an academic advisor/counselor and provided a
proctored study table. The other three services (computers, administration of tests,
and tutors) were not found to be statistically significant. No respondents listed
additional services under the "other" section of the question.

H₄: The availability of support services provided for female student-
athletes when travelling for sport related purposes is independent of
whether female athletes are members of revenue or non-revenue
sports teams.
The availability of 5 support services provided to female student-athletes while travelling for sport related purposes was independent of whether female athletes were members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams (Table 16). No respondents listed additional services under the "other" option of the question. There was no statistical significance found at the .05 level for females of either revenue or non-revenue sports teams; therefore, hypothesis 4 was retained.

The 5 services listed as being provided when sports teams were travelling were an academic advisor/counselor, computer usage, administration of tests, proctored study table, and tutors. The respondents were asked if the services were available at away contests, at conference games, at tournaments, whether the coaches provided the service(s), or the service(s) were not available or provided when women were travelling for sport related purposes.

Table 16. Support services provided by the athletic department for female student-athletes while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>Calculated Value of Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisor or counselor</td>
<td>4.198</td>
<td>0.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer use</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td>6.083</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 183</td>
<td>Degrees of freedom = 4</td>
<td>α = .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Frequencies and percent of student-athletes who were not provided services while travelling for sports related purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Revenue Frequency</th>
<th>Revenue %</th>
<th>Non-revenue Frequency</th>
<th>Non-revenue %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising/Counseling</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Use</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Tests</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored Study Table</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 183

Statistical significance was not obtained for any of the services available for women student-athletes when travelling for sport related purposes.

H5: The program directors' perceptions of whether or not an athletic academic support service program has improved academic classroom performance are independent of student-athletes' gender and being members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

An academic support service program with student-athletes' gender and membership on revenue or non-revenue sports teams were not statistically significant for improved academic classroom performance. Therefore, hypothesis 5 was retained (Table 18). However, the directors of athletic academic support
service programs perceived that by providing a program the student-athletes' academic classroom performance was enhanced.

Table 18. The directors' of athletic academic support service programs perceptions that an athletic academic support service program improved academic classroom performance of male and female revenue and non-revenue sports team members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Calculated Value of Chi-square</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/Not sure/No</td>
<td>4.956</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 169</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom = 6</td>
<td>( \alpha = 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The person completing the AAASSQ had a choice of responding yes, not sure, or no as to whether the athletic academic support service program had improved the academic classroom performance of male or female, revenue or non-revenue sports team members. There were 11 respondents who choose not to answer the question. There were three respondents who instead of completing the question wrote the following comments: "Many variables have an impact on academic performance. It is a joint effort of advisors, coaches, faculty, administration, and [others]." Another institutional representative said it was "difficult to assess in general terms [the improvement of academic classroom performance] [sic], many records we keep now were not available prior to beginning the program." The last comment from a respondent was, "We have not measured
or evaluated any individual or group. But, I know I have improved individual athletes' performance. This has been accomplished by using peer tutoring and study group - and sending individuals to the study skills office."

At 79.3% of the institutions, the respondents' perceptions were that athletic academic support programs had positively influenced academic classroom performance for men in revenue sports, while 78.6% of the directors of programs responded that the women in revenue sports also had improved their academic classroom performance through the provision of an athletic academic support service program. The directors of athletic academic support services (or their designees) responded that the academic classroom performance of both men and women who were members of non-revenue sports teams were also positively enhanced by having an athletic academic support service program. At 73.4% of the institutions, the respondents said that men's non-revenue sports teams had improved academic classroom performance. Women who were members of non-revenue sports teams had increased academic classroom performance due to an athletic support program at 72% of the responding institutions (Table 19).

There were 20.1% of the heads of athletic academic programs who were not sure if the academic support service programs improved the academic classroom performance of men's revenue sport team members. Respondents were not sure at 20.8% of the institutions if women's revenue sport team members' academic classroom performance improved due to an athletic academic support service program. Respondents at 26.6% of the institutions were not sure if classroom
Table 19. Frequencies and percent of respondents who indicated the athletic academic support service program improved the student-athletes' academic classroom performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-revenue</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 169

* One respondent less for men's teams.

performance improved due to an athletic academic support service program for non-revenue men's sports team members. The respondents at 27.4% of the institutions were not sure if having an athletic academic support service program improved the academic classroom performance of women's non-revenue sports team members (Table 19).

Respondents seldom chose the response that academic support service programs had not improved academic classroom performance. There were .06% of the institutional representatives who indicated that the program had not helped the
academic classroom performance of student-athletes on revenue or non-revenue sports teams. Men and women in revenue sports and women of non-revenue sports teams had one institution each indicate that the athletic academic support service program did not help academic classroom performance. No respondents indicated that men non-revenue sports team members did not have improved academic classroom performance (Table 19).

The chi-square test of independence was not significant at the .05 level. However, it would appear that respondents perceived that athletic academic support service programs did improve male and female revenue and non-revenue sports team members' academic classroom performance.

**Summary**

In this chapter, the descriptive data and information were analyzed. The statistical tests were described and explained. Included in the chapter were the null hypotheses and the results of the data analyses pertaining to the hypotheses.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 5 summarized the purpose, methodology, and results of the study. Conclusions were drawn from the results of the analyses of the data. Recommendations for further research are suggested.

Summary

In this section an overview of the study, the purpose, and the methodology is presented. A summary of the results is briefly described.

The design of the study was descriptive research. A survey instrument was developed and used to collect the descriptive and statistical data.

The purpose of the study was to compare, describe, and analyze the support services provided to male and female participants of revenue and non-revenue sports teams at Division I institutions across the United States. The purpose was achieved by describing and comparing the services provided for student-athletes as reported by the directors of athletic academic support service programs.

The sample consisted of directors of athletic academic support service programs, or their designees. The group was surveyed with the Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire (AAASSQ) during Spring semester or
quarter, 1993. Data were scored at the University of Wyoming and the University of Northern Colorado Information Technology Center.

These data were researched and analyzed through the use of a survey questionnaire and through the statistical analyses of data using chi-square tests of independence. There were 51 chi-square tests computed and each computation was tested at the .05 level of significance. By chance alone, one would expect between 2 and 3 of the computed chi-square values to reach statistical significance. In this study 3 significant results for chi-square were found, and it was not determined as part of this study whether any of the significant findings were due to chance alone. Therefore, the reader is cautioned to not read too much into the significant findings.

The descriptive results provided information obtained from the survey questionnaire and from the printed materials returned by the respondents. The respondents also supplied information about their athletic academic support service program and the services that were available and provided for Division I student-athletes. Other information that was obtained from the AAASSQ indicated the areas of spending of the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund monies and the philosophy and/or goals of the Division I programs.

The statistical results provided information also obtained from the survey questionnaire. There were five null hypotheses tested using chi-square tests of independence. A brief summary of the results of the five hypotheses follows.
The results of the findings for hypothesis 1, the availability of a range of 17 support services provided for student-athletes by the athletic department, indicated there was no statistical significance between the services provided for men and women revenue and non-revenue sports team members and whether the athletic department provided a range of 17 support services for the student-athletes. The 17 services were either available for student-athletes or the 17 services were not available through or provided by the athletic department for any student-athlete regardless of gender and team membership. Hypothesis 1 was retained.

The findings obtained from the data for hypothesis 2, the availability of a range of 17 support services provided to student-athletes by a campus department other than through the athletic department, indicated that there was dependency obtained between one of 17 services, personality assessment (an inventory measuring personality traits and interests), and men's revenue sports team members. The service, personality assessment, was not equally available for men's or women's non-revenue sports teams, or women's revenue sports teams. Personality assessment was most often available for men's revenue sports teams, then next most often available for women's revenue teams, closely followed by women's non-revenue sports teams and least often available for men's non-revenue sport teams. Hypothesis 2 was, therefore, rejected.

The results obtained from the analysis of the data for hypothesis 3, the availability of five support services provided for men's revenue and non-revenue sports teams while travelling for sport related purposes found there was a statistical
significance between the availability of an academic advisor/counselor, the provision of a proctored study, and men's revenue sports teams. The five services were as follows: (1) an academic advisor/counselor, (2) computer use, (3) administration of tests, (4) a proctored study table, and (5) tutors. The five services were provided more often for revenue teams at away contests, at conference contests, at tournaments, and when the coaches provided an academic advisor/counselor for the men's revenue teams than for the men's non-revenue teams. Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4, the availability of five support services provided for women's revenue and non-revenue sports teams while travelling for sport related purposes were found to be independent of whether women were members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams. The five services were as follows: (1) an academic advisor/counselor, (2) computer use, (3) administration of tests, (4) a proctored study table, and (5) tutors. The results indicated that the services were available at away contests, at conference games, at tournaments, or when the coaches provided the service, or the services were not provided for women of revenue and non-revenue sports teams. When the data were analyzed, it was found that the services were offered slightly more often for revenue teams but this finding was not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was retained.

An academic support service program with student-athletes' gender and membership on revenue or non-revenue sports teams did not have statistical significance for improved academic classroom performance. Therefore, hypothesis 5
was retained. However, the directors of the programs perceived that by providing a program the student-athletes' academic classroom performance was enhanced.

This section provided a brief overview of the study, the purpose, and the methodology. The statistical results of the study were briefly highlighted.

Discussion and Conclusions

The study was designed to compare, describe and analyze the support services provided to student-athletes and to determine if relationships existed between the available services and gender and/or sports team membership at Division I institutions. The following discussions and conclusions have been derived from the descriptive and statistical data.

The response rate from the directors or designees was 66.7%. It is interesting to note that one third of the respondents (33.3%) did not participate in the study. This observation leads to the conclusion that the results of this study must be kept in perspective and cannot be used to generalize Division I institutions beyond the reach of this study.

It is also important to speculate why the respondents at 33.3% of the institutions did not participate. The finding that Division I-A institutions were more represented than Division I-AA and Division I-AAA institutions may be explained by the following: (a) Division I-A institutions have larger football programs than Division I-AA, and Division I-AAA do not sponsor football teams; (b) the size of the football program is often indicative of the overall budget of the
athletic department; and (c) the size of the department's budget may in turn influencer the size of an athletic academic support service program and the services provided and/or available for student-athletes. If this were the case, then more respondents would be expected to be from Division I-A programs. Division I-AA and I-AAA have smaller budgets and may have had smaller athletic academic support service programs or no programs at the time of the study. If the lack of responses was due to the lack of services for student-athletes, then representatives of the department may not have wanted to participate because they might not be using the $30,000 from the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund for the enhancement of academic services for student-athletes. The lack of responses could also have been due to the lack of personnel in the smaller programs or a lack of interest in participating. Replication of this study should be undertaken comparing the results obtained from each of the Division I classifications to determine what services and types of programs are offered at Division I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA institutions.

The undergraduate population of the surveyed institutions ranged from 1,300 to 56,000 students. A way to obtain additional information about athletic academic support programs and services provided for student-athletes would be to compare the size of the institution with the athletic academic support program and services for student-athletes. This comparison would be useful in determining a model of support that would work for a student-athlete population consistent with the size of the student body. Who provides the services, who receives the services, and the
availability of the services by gender and team membership could provide some
guidelines for athletic academic support services at Division I institutions, as well as
the impact of the size of the institution on the size of the athletic academic support
service program and the services provided for student-athletes.

Over 90% of the programs were institutionally recognized. The athletic
academic support service programs being recognized by the academic institutions
supports the literature of Coleman & Barker (1991) and Gurney (1990). They
stressed the importance of enabling student-athletes to be both students and
athletes. The need for special services being provided for Division I student-
athletes supports Berg (1989b), Coleman and Barker (1992), Cone and Rosenbaum
(1990), and Gurney and Johnson (1990). They emphasized that student-athletes do
need athletic academic support services.

The year that academic support programs began to be recognized was 1967.
The median year for recognition for all institutions included in the study was 1984.
These findings were consistent with the findings of Underwood (1984) and Whiddon
(1989) who said that prior to 1972 less than 40% of Division I institutions had
athletic support programs.

There was a large increase in the number of programs that were established
between the years 1983 and 1988. Sixty-seven programs were implemented between
those dates. Two explanations for the rapid growth of programs are: (a)
Proposition 48 was initiated in 1983 and implemented in 1986; and (b) there were
numerous articles written in the early 80's about the abuses and improprieties in
intercollegiate athletics (Coakley, 1990; Hurley & Cunningham, 1984; Telander, 1989; Underwood, 1980). It would be assumed that the number of programs established during those years was in response to National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) legislation and in response to public outcries.

The greatest number of programs (18) were established in 1991, which was the first year the NCAA academic enhancement funding was provided to all Division I institutions. In 1992 11 more programs were established. Presumably the monies were used by institutions to start programs and to provide services for student-athletes.

The average number of full-time persons working in the programs surveyed was less than 2 people per program. Almost every program had part-time individuals employed to assist in various areas. Graduate assistants and volunteers also assisted in many programs. The number of employees in a program was dictated by the program budget and the type of services provided for all or some student-athletes. These data were similar to the finding of Swann (1989) who found that the size of the staff was a central issue in the literature. A study that provides information about the number of people needed to implement a program or run an existing program would be helpful in deciding the type of program to have, and the services that could be offered for student-athletes through the athletic department or through existing campus services. In times of having to justify where, how, and why special programs should be implemented or would need to be supported, a study that described numerous program models offered through the athletic
department or through some other department on campus, the type of operating budget needed, and the number of staff necessary for the model to operate would be valuable in the field of athletic academic support programs.

Athletic academic support services were located in and reported to two main areas on campus: athletic departments and student affairs/academic affairs offices. Most program directors reported to someone within the athletic department and were located in athletic facilities. Gurney (1990) suggested that programs report to areas outside of athletics because of the importance of input from different student service areas and for the increased intellectual and social development of student-athletes. Lottes (1991) found that where a program was housed depended more on the physical layout of the campus than any other factor.

The majority of respondents reported that there was a need for the same services to be provided for all student-athletes regardless of team affiliation and gender. Over half of the respondents added personal comments to the responses checked on the survey instrument. Seventy-four respondents expressed strong opinions that services should be equally provided for all athletes. Many responses were that the services were equally available for men and women, revenue and non-revenue student-athletes. These findings supported the conclusions drawn by Serrano (1987) that men and women do receive equal services and also supported the comments by Hurley and Cunningham (1984) and Willoughby et al. (1991) that student-athletes (regardless of gender and team membership) should be provided services that enhance educational and personal development. The comments from
the respondents make one wonder how big the gap is between what actually is available for all student-athletes and what should be available for all student-athletes. Both of the articles cited above were concluded prior to the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund and Bylaw 16.3 mandating services only for recruited student-athletes.

The existing literature was more focused toward graduation rates, grade point averages, as noted by Purdy et al. (1985), and comparing student-athletes' academic performance to non-athletes' academic performance as reported by Funk (1991). The existing literature is more in line with what the NCAA mandates for Division I support services for recruited student-athletes (Bylaw 16.3) (NCAA Manual, 1993-94), but perhaps there is a need for studies to compare the services available for all student-athletes and to what extent the services are being made available for men and women, revenue and non-revenue sports team members.

If athletic academic advisors/counselors think there is a need for the same services to be provided for all student-athletes, regardless of an athlete's recruitment status, then the advisors need to lobby through their national organization, the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A), and change mandated NCAA legislation (Bylaw 16.3) or accept the realities of what is required of them as opposed to what they want to provide in the way of services for all Division I student-athletes; the two realities may be different realities, between "must provide" and "want to provide." Advisors need to decide if the
reality of what they want to provide for student-athletes is or can be realistically provided for all student-athletes.

The respondents were asked to indicate how and where the NCAA academic-enhancement annual monies were usually spent and how and where the monies were spent in the past year. It is interesting to note that 31 respondents did not answer this question on the AAAASSQ. Also interesting was that 5 respondents did not know how the monies were spent or had not heard of this funding. One respondent asked, "What money?" Another person wrote, "I have worked for two weeks to get this information - with no luck. It is best said - it is earmarked for no specific purpose." One individual responded, "I am not aware of this money." Another replied, "I am completely unaware of how this money is spent and cannot be privy [sic] to this information." Seven respondents wrote that they had services but the monies had not been made available to the athletic academic support office. On a more positive note, one respondent commented, "In terms of major budget cutbacks [in the athletic department], our budget has not been cut because of this money." A respondent who specifically requested not to be identified by name or institution responded, "Prior to this year, we used the monies as indicated [on the AAAASSQ]. This year the President's Office decided to take the monies and fold them into the Athletic Department budget. Since there were no NCAA restrictions to prevent that, our hands were tied." The above comments provide important reasons why the NCAA should establish some specific criteria with regard to the spending of the academic enhancement fund monies.
Bylaw 16.3, entitled "Academic and Other Support Services" in the NCAA Manual, mandates that academic counseling and tutoring be made available to all recruited student-athletes through either the athletic department or through nonathletic student support services on campus. Permissible, but not mandatory, services include: (a) tutoring expenses, (b) drug rehabilitation program expenses, (c) eating disorder treatment expenses, (d) campus student development and career counseling, (e) future professional career counseling, (f) necessary expenses that relate to a student-athlete's eligibility, (g) computer and typewriter usage, and (h) the cost of a required field trip (NCAA Manual, 1993-94, p. 197). The above mandatory and permissible services are the intended uses of the enhancement funding. A study that compares and analyses the intended uses with the actual uses of the NCAA funding would be beneficial to the NCAA, and the results of the study could lead to the establishing of regulations for the spending of the money. A study would also help establish basic equity in athletic academic support services. This researcher believes that the services should be available to all student-athletes, not just recruited student-athletes. If a student-athlete is good enough to be part of the team, the student-athlete is good enough to be provided any and all available services.

In reviewing all of the possible spending areas the following information was obtained. In 11 of the 16 possible areas, more programs increased their spending within the past year over the usual spending patterns. Also, more programs than usual spent NCAA academic enhancement money in four areas that were not
intended uses for the money. These areas were scholarships, facilities, conferences, and memberships in professional organizations. The areas that saw an increase in the numbers of programs spending money in intended ways for student-athletes were workshops, study areas, start-up costs, tutoring, computers, and personnel. Office supplies was an area that could be an intended use or a non-intended use depending on what constituted office supplies.

Three of the 16 areas of spending remained unchanged over the usual spending patterns. The three areas were academic programs, guest speakers, and athletic research.

The remaining two areas which were less supported last year as opposed to usual spending patterns in previous years were athletic banquets and the maintenance of some part of the athletic support program. Neither of these areas appears to be intended uses of the NCAA fund money.

The information supplied by the respondents regarding academic enhancement funding points out the lack of guidelines provided by the NCAA regarding spending areas. Bylaw 16.3 does not request, demand, or suggest that the funding be applied toward academics or other support services. The Manual also does not provide regulations for the NCAA Academic-Enhancement Fund. With all the bylaws and rules that are supplied and updated yearly, it would be beneficial to have rules about the annual enhancement funds supplied to each Division I institution regarding permissible and non-permissible spending areas.
The NCAA has a one-page sheet that institutions fill out every year which asks what the money was spent on and the amount of money that was spent. The form also requests a list of projected spending areas and the amount to be spent for the upcoming year. If scholarships are not an intended use, according to Keith Martin, director of accounting at the NCAA, why would the number of institutions have increased over the past year (by one institution) when Mr. Martin said that institutions who have spent monies toward scholarships in the past would have been told not to spend enhancement funds in this area? The only plausible explanations are that the funds are not monitored, nor are the institutional representatives responding to the responses from the NCAA. It appears that the money can be spent however the person who oversees the money wants the money to be spent. Research should be undertaken that establishes specific guidelines for spending areas and penalties for repeated improper use of the funds. Currently there are no literature reviews available that address the academic enhancement funding, and there should be. These current findings are the ones that give college athletics a bad reputation.

The last descriptive analysis reviewed the printed materials returned with the AAASSQ and written comments on the returned AAASSQ regarding the philosophy and/or goals of the athletic academic support service programs. There were six clusters of philosophies and/or goals that revolved around the themes of providing support to student-athletes to assist them in obtaining a degree and toward assisting the student-athletes in their academic, athletic, and personal development. These
findings support the findings of Lottes (1991), Ferrante and Etzel (1991), Coakley (1990), and Denson (1992), who stated the importance of providing athletic academic support service programs with philosophies that enhance the student-athlete's development.

After reviewing the printed materials, a list of 30 support services was generated. The two most frequently listed services were "monitoring academic progress" and "tutoring." The same two services were listed in the same order in the respondents' written comments. These two services parallel the mandates of Bylaw 16.3 in the NCAA Manual.

The descriptive results provided demographic and descriptive information about the athletic academic support services and programs included in this study. Findings, discussions, and conclusions were drawn from the analyses.

Statistical data were obtained from the results generated from the AAASSQ. The data were analyzed through chi-square test of independence.

There was no statistical significance or relationships obtained for hypothesis 1 between 17 support services made available through the athletic department and male and female student-athletes in revenue or non-revenue sports. Five of the services were not equally available for student-athletes. These 5 services were provided between 1 and 4% more often to male revenue sports team members. The 5 services were (1) testing of student-athletes identified as academically "at-risk" (low GPA from high school, low SAT/ACT scores or subscores, or known documented learning disabilities); (2) freshmen orientation for
student-athletes (a summer orientation or class or seminar during the first semester on campus which deals with university and/or athletic issues); (3) assessment of study skills (looking at class notes, tests, examinations, evaluating strengths and weaknesses, and designing an individualized plan to enhance strengths and diminish weaknesses); (4) academic monitoring (progress reports from professors, meeting with the academic advisor/counselor); and (5) student-athlete scheduling/advising (assisting with course selection and determining progress toward a degree). The statistical results showed that three of the five services offered more frequently to men's revenue sports team members agreed with Kirk's study (1991) of 80 Division I institutions that found the same three services provided to all revenue student-athletes primarily through the athletic departments. The three services were academic monitoring, academic advising, and academic assistance. However, his findings were for both men's and women's revenue sports teams and not just for men's revenue sports teams. Since this study was reported in 1991, the research was probably conducted prior to Bylaw 16.3 being implemented which mandated the services for all recruited student-athletes.

The remaining 12 services (of the 17) were available through the athletic department for male and female members of revenue and non-revenue sports teams or the services were not provided by the athletic department for student-athletes. The 12 services were services that Whidden (1989), Jordon and Denson (1990), and Sanders (1992) reported to be available and to be provided by many institutions' programs for all student-athletes.
When the same 17 services were provided by a department on campus other than the athletic department (hypothesis 2), the data shows that one service, personality assessment (an inventory of personality traits and interests), was more available for men's revenue sports team members than for any other group. There is no explanation for this finding, nor was there any literature to support this finding.

When travelling for sport related purposes, 2 of 5 services were available for men's revenue sports teams more often than for any other sports teams. Providing an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table at away contests, at conference contests, at tournament games, or when the coaches made the services available was dependent on the men being members of revenue sports teams (hypothesis 3). Computer use, administration of tests, and tutors being available at all away contests, at conference contests, at tournament games, or when the coaches provided the services were independent of whether the men were members of revenue or non-revenue sports teams.

It is interesting to note that an academic advisor/counselor was available for the men's revenue sports teams at all away contests at 10 more institutions than were expected and at 10 fewer institutions than were expected for men's non-revenue sports teams. The data generated from the findings for hypothesis 3 may indicate perceptions by the directors of athletic academic support services that an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table were needed for the men's revenue sports teams while travelling for sport related purposes due to the
amount of time the student-athletes were away from classes. Some men’s basketball conferences play basketball games on Thursdays and Saturdays during the season. Therefore, the teams may leave campus on Wednesday for games and the teams miss a lot of class time. The findings of the availability of an academic advisor/counselor and a proctored study table for men’s revenue sports teams supports the conclusions of Rhatigan (1984) that men’s basketball teams were required to be absent from class a minimum of 17.3% of the time. The findings of Telander (1989), Funk (1991), and Sailes (1993) concluded that men’s revenue sports teams had different needs and demands than do other groups of student-athletes.

Most non-revenue sports teams will schedule week long trips prior to school starting in the fall or during the institutions’ scheduled holidays or official breaks. Otherwise, most contests are on weekends and perhaps the perception of not needing the services for the men’s non-revenue teams while travelling for sport related purposes was because the scheduling does not conflict with attending classes.

There was no dependency between the availability of 5 services and being members of women’s revenue or non-revenue sports teams when travelling for sport related purposes (hypothesis 4). The 5 services were (1) an academic advisor/counselor, (2) computer use, (3) administration of tests, (4) proctored study tables, or (5) tutors being provided at away contests, at conference contests, at tournament games, or when the coaches provided the services. The 5 services were
provided for women's team sports, but there was not a strong enough relationship at the .05 level of confidence to establish statistical significance. This finding supports the literature reported by Funk (1991) that women student-athletes tend to perform better academically than do the men student-athletes and, therefore, may not need the services as frequently as other student-athletes. Since the services were minimally offered, it could be concluded that the women's sports teams were provided the service(s) if they were perceived to be necessary and/or the coaches, for whatever reasons, made the service(s) available. The data gleaned from the results of hypothesis 4 may also indicate perceptions by the directors of athletic academic support services that the women student-athletes may not need the availability of the 5 services while travelling for sport related purposes.

There was no statistical dependency found for hypothesis 5, between providing an athletic academic support service program and improved academic classroom performance of men's or women's revenue or non-revenue sports team members. However, over 72% of the respondents perceived that a program did enhance student-athletes' academic classroom performance regardless of gender or sport team membership. Less than 1% of the respondents perceived that student-athletes' academic classroom performance was not improved by athletic academic support service programs. There were 23.7% of the respondents who indicated that they were not sure if an athletic academic support service program improved the classroom performance of student-athletes.
The findings obtained from providing an athletic academic support service program and increased academic classroom performance may indicate a need for further empirical study since respondents assumed a positive benefit from providing an athletic academic support service program and improved academic classroom performance for student-athletes. The literature supports the need for athletic academic support programs for student-athletes. Milburn (in Berg, 1989b) reported that athletic departments would be "educationally irresponsible" if they did not provide services for student-athletes. Perhaps it is time to go beyond looking at the overall programs and to begin to rely on statistical measures to evaluate the programs in reference to improved academic classroom performance for Division I student-athletes. This assumption was also expressed by Meyer (1993) and Whiddon (1989) who reported that there were many support services provided for student-athletes "in hopes" of enhancing academic classroom performance.

The statistical results provided information about the availability of support services for men and women, revenue and non-revenue sports teams. Conclusions were drawn from the findings obtained from analyses of the data from the 5 hypotheses to determine if relationships existed among the availability of services and gender and team membership.
Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations for additional research are suggested:

1. A more detailed survey instrument should be developed that includes, but should not be limited to, the following list of services: tutors hired, trained, and paid through the athletic department; drug/alcohol education programs; mandatory/random drug testing policies; career development workshops or seminars; mentoring programs; internship programs; financial aid services; involvement of athletic academic advisors/counselors for recruiting purposes; and, services and scholarships available for student-athletes who have completed eligibility but have not yet completed degree requirements. A second component of the instrument should look at the percentage of the services that are available for all student-athletes. The data obtained from the study would contribute to a better understanding of what services academic advisors/counselors provide for student-athletes and whether or not advisors/counselors are complying with Bylaw 16.3.

2. Athletic academic support service programs are a relatively new venture. A descriptive study should be conducted obtaining copies of all printed materials detailing the athletic academic support service programs. It would be beneficial to have a national organization such as the N4A or NCAA act as a clearinghouse where such materials could be grouped according to the size of the budget, the size of the institution, and for different Division I classifications of schools. Other
information that could be collected would be the types of facilities provided for
different types of programs; the types of services provided; the philosophy of the
model; the size of the program, department, or institution needed to operate the
model; and the number of people necessary to operate the particular model
selected. The materials should be available to members of the N4A and/or NCAA.

3. A descriptive study using a survey instrument or delphi method should be
undertaken to develop standards for implementing athletic academic support
programs or toward further development of an athletic academic support service
program. The investigation might result in a case study of a selected number of
programs or the use of a selected sample to develop a handbook of standards by
which Division I institutions could operate.

4. A historical study should be conducted to determine where and on what
the NCAA Academic-enhancement funds have been spent and how those
expenditures have assisted student-athletes. Since the funding only began in 1991,
this study could help influence how the money should be spent in the future. The
study should also compare results obtained from institutional representatives with
results obtained from NCAA responses.

5. An empirical data-based evaluation of programs at Division I institutions
should be undertaken toward determining if assisting student-athletes through an
athletic academic support service program does impact academic classroom
performance, and how it impacts the student-athletes. Another variable to consider
would be the impact of a program on graduation rates for student-athletes by
gender and team membership. If the field of athletic academic advising/counseling is to continue to grow, it would be helpful to determine if there is indeed a need for the advisor/counselor and/or a program. If academic support services programs are expected to help bridge the gap between academics and athletics, then it is imperative that empirical data be collected that shows that advisors/counselors do make a difference.

6. A statistical study should be undertaken that compares the extent of, or the differences between, the services provided for recruited scholarship student-athletes, recruited non-scholarship student-athletes, and walk-on team members. One way to accomplish this study would be to survey both the directors of programs and an advisor/counselor within the program and selected student-athletes at selected Division I institutions.

7. A descriptive study should be undertaken that compares athletic academic advisors/counselors’ perceptions of their effectiveness and student-athletes’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the advisor/counselor and then analyze the perceptions of both groups about the effectiveness of the athletic academic support service program. Sometimes advisors think they offer meaningful services, and they think they are doing a good job, but they aren’t statistically sure. Since the student-athlete is the person they are trying to help, it is important to include the student-athlete in the study. The study should include interviews with both groups and a survey questionnaire that is answered by both groups.
8. An exploratory study should be conducted to develop a statistically sound instrument that would be able to evaluate and measure the services provided for student-athletes. Most research conducted in the field of athletic academic advising/counseling programs is descriptive in design. Oftentimes the only form of measurement is through self-developed instruments. It would be a help to professionals who were interested in evaluating services for student-athletes if a reliable and valid instrument existed.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS
Air Force Academy
Akron, University of
Alabama State University
Alabama University
American University
Appalachian State University
Arizona State University
Arizona, University of
Arkansas State University
Arkansas, University of
Arkansas at Little Rock, University of
Austin Peay State University

Ball State University
Baylor University
Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Bradley University
Brigham Young University
Brown University
Bucknell University

California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Long Beach
California, University of
California, Irvine, University of
Campbell University
Central Florida, University of
Charleston (SC), University of
Chicago State University
Cincinnati, University of
Clemson University
Cleveland State University
Colgate University
Colorado State University
Colorado, University of
Cornell, University of

Dartmouth College
Detroit, Mercy, University of
Drexel University
Duke University
East Carolina, University of
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Kentucky University
Eastern Washington University

Fairfield University
Fairleigh Dickson University
Florida State University
Florida, University of
Fordham University
Fresno State University
Furman University

Georgia, University of
Georgia Southern University
Georgia Tech

Hartford, University of
Houston, University of

Illinois at Chicago, University of
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Iowa, University of

Jacksonville, University of

Kansas State University
Kansas, University of
Kent State University
Kentucky, University of

Lafayette College
La Salle University
Lehigh University
Liberty University
Louisiana State University
Loyola College, (MD)

Maine, University of
Marquette University
Marshall University
Maryland, Baltimore County, University of
Maryland, Eastern Shore, University of
McNeese State University
Memphis State University
Mercer College
Miami, University of
Miami Ohio, University of
Michigan State University
Middle Tennessee State University
Minnesota, University of
Mississippi State University
Mississippi, University of
Missouri, Columbia, University of
Missouri, Kansas City, University of
Monmouth College
Montana State University
Montana, University of
Morgan State University
Mount St. Mary's College
Murray State University

Nebraska, University of
Nevada, Reno, University of
New Hampshire, University of
New Mexico State University
New Orleans, University of
North Carolina, University of
North Carolina, Charlotte, University of
Northeastern Illinois
Northern Arizona University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Iowa University
North Texas, University of
Northwestern University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Notre Dame, University of

The Ohio State University
Ohio, University of
Oklahoma, University of
Old Dominion University
Oregon, University of
Pacific, University of the
Penn State University
Pennsylvania, University of
Portland, University of
Princeton University
Purdue University

Radford University
Rhode Island, University of
Rice University
Richmond, University of
Rider College
Robert Morris College
Rutgers, The State University of NJ

Samford University
Sam Houston State University
San Francisco University
San Jose State University
Seton Hall
South Carolina, University of
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southeast Missouri State University
Southern California, University of
Southern Methodist University
Southern Mississippi, University of
South Florida, University of
Southwestern Louisiana, University of
Southwest Texas State University
Stanford University
Stephen F. Austin State University
St. Joseph’s University
St. Louis University
St. Peter’s College
Syracuse University

Temple University
Tennessee State University
Tennessee at Chattanooga, University of
Tennessee at Knoxville, University of
Tennessee Tech University
Texas A & M University
Texas, San Antonio, University of
Texas Christian University
Texas, Pan American, University of
Texas Tech University
Toledo, University of
Towson State University
Tulsa, University of

U.S. Military Academy
Utah State University
Utah, University of

Vanderbilt University
Vermont, University of
Villanova University
Virginia Military University
Virginia Tech University

Wake Forest University
Washington State University
Weber State University
William & Mary, College of
Western Carolina, University of
Western Kentucky University
Western Michigan University
Wichita State University
Wisconsin, Green Bay, University of
Wisconsin, Madison, University of
Wisconsin, Milwaukee, University of
Wyoming, University of

Xavier University

Yale University
Youngstown State University

* One respondent requested that the name of the person and the institution not be named or listed anywhere in the study
APPENDIX B

ATHLETIC ACADEMIC ADVISING SUPPORT SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE
ATHLETIC ACADEMIC ADVISING
SUPPORT SERVICES QUESTIONNAIRE
(AAASSQ)

Cory Schwartz
Athletic Counselor
U of Wyoming
Athletic Dept.

University Station
Box 3414
Laramie, WY 82071
307-766-5385

PLEASE NOTE: NO PERSON PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY WILL BE IDENTIFIED BY NAME OR BY INSTITUTION.

PLEASE CHECK IF YOU WOULD LIKE AN ABSTRACT OF RESULTS

1 Name of Institution: ____________________________________________

2 Football classification: I-A ___________ I-AA ___________ I-AAA ___________

3 Undergraduate enrollment: ______________________________________

4 Do you have an established, institutionally recognized athletic academic support services program? Y _______ N _______
   If checked yes, please answer all questions.
   If checked no, please go directly to question 12.

5 What year was the program institutionally recognized? ______________

6 The title of the person in charge of the athletic academic support program: ______________________________________

7 Name of the person in charge of the athletic academic support program: ________________________________

8 How many full-time (FTE) athletic academic advisors/counselors are currently employed in the program: ________________________________

9 Which institutional department do you report to? ______________________________________

10 Where is your department housed? ______________________________________

11 Number of department members who belong to the N4A? ________________________________
For each service listed below, please check the group(s) of student-athletes who receive the service(s) provided by the athletic department on a regular basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>All athletes receive service</th>
<th>Major male sports teams</th>
<th>Major female sports teams</th>
<th>Minor male sports teams</th>
<th>Minor female sports teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing of student-athletes identified as academically &quot;at-risk&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen student-athlete orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly orientation all student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete scheduling/advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous skills assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes specific for student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath eligibility check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit counseling/seminar/interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each service listed below, please check the group(s) of student-athletes who receive the service(s) provided by a campus department other than by the athletic department on a regular basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>All athletes receive service</th>
<th>Major male sports teams</th>
<th>Major female sports teams</th>
<th>Minor male sports teams</th>
<th>Minor female sports teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing of student-athletes identified as academically &quot;at-risk&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen student-athlete orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly orientation all student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of study skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete scheduling/advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous skills assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes specific for student-athletes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath eligibility check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit counseling/seminar/interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Please circle all services that your department provides for athletic advisors/counselors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff training</th>
<th>Staff research</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Please check all services that the athletic academic support services program provides for men's major teams when they are travelling for sport related reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic advisor/counselor</th>
<th>Conference contests</th>
<th>Tournament contests</th>
<th>Coach provides</th>
<th>Do not provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers for student use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Please check all services that the athletic academic support services program provides for women's major teams when they are travelling for sport related reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic advisor/counselor</th>
<th>Conference contests</th>
<th>Tournament contests</th>
<th>Coach provides</th>
<th>Do not provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers for student use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Please check all services that the athletic academic support services program provides for men's minor teams when they are travelling for sport related reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic advisor/counselor</th>
<th>Conference contests</th>
<th>Tournament contests</th>
<th>Coach provides</th>
<th>Do not provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers for student use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17 (continued)

Tutor(s)

Other, please specify

18 Please check all services that the athletic academic support services program provides for women's minor teams when they are travelling for sport related reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All away contests</th>
<th>Conference contests</th>
<th>Tournament contests</th>
<th>Coach provides</th>
<th>Do not provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisor/counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers for student use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctored study table</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other, please specify

19 Has the athletic academic support program improved the following groups of student-athletes academic performance in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's major sport teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's major sport teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's minor sport teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's minor sport teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To answer questions 20 and 21 please check the response you feel best answers the statements provided:
SA = strongly agree, A = agree, N = neutral, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree

20 There is a need for the same services to be provided to minor sports as for major sports.

21 There is a need for the same services to be provided to women as for men student-athletes.

Please explain your responses in more detail:
22 Please check any areas under both categories in which the NCAA Academic Enhancement $25,000.00 annual monies are spent. Within the last academic year | Usually spend some or all of the $25,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarships</th>
<th>Academic programs (specify)</th>
<th>Academic banquets/awards</th>
<th>Computers</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Guest speakers</th>
<th>Study area (please specify)</th>
<th>Facilities (please specify)</th>
<th>Personnel (please specify)</th>
<th>Start-up costs</th>
<th>Athletic academic research</th>
<th>Professional conference(s)</th>
<th>Professional membership(s)</th>
<th>Maintenance of</th>
<th>Tutoring</th>
<th>Office supplies</th>
<th>Other, please specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23 Please provide all printed material(s) that describe your athletic academic support services program. If no materials are available please describe your program in terms of philosophy, goals, etc.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time & assistance, it is greatly appreciated. Please return the survey & materials in the prestamped, self-addressed envelope to:

Cory Schwartz  
Athletic Academic Counselor  
University of Wyoming

University Box 3414  
Laramie, WY 82071  
307-766-5385
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Dear [Addressee]:

I am an Athletic Academic Counselor at the University of Wyoming undertaking a national study of the services available to student-athletes through Athletic Academic Advising programs at Division I NCAA institutions across the United States.

I have the support of the N4A who are interested in the study. The Association has provided me with a list of Directors of Athletic Academic Advising programs. Hopefully I will present the results at the national meeting in Denver in June of 1993.

Specifically, the purpose of the research is to describe, compare and analyze the services provided through the athletic academic advising programs, for male and female student-athletes in revenue and non-revenue sports. There is little information in the literature that studies the services available for student-athletes at Division I programs.

I am asking you to complete a questionnaire on the services provided and the type of program that you have for your institution's student-athletes. Completing the questionnaire will take between 7 to 10 minutes. All information returned will be treated with confidentiality, no person or institution will be specifically named.

I look forward to your response. The material enclosed in this packet includes the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire and a return self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please return the instrument and any materials by February 21, 1993. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thank you for your time and input, it is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cory M. Schwartz
Athletic Academic Counselor
APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER FOR SECOND MAILING
OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Dear [Addressee]:

I am an Athletic Academic Counselor at the University of Wyoming and a doctoral candidate undertaking a national study of the services provided through the Athletic Academic Advising programs for student-athletes at Division I NCAA institutions across the United States.

I have the support of the N4A who are interested in the study. The Association has provided me with a list of Directors of Athletic Academic Advising programs.

Specifically, the purpose of the research is to describe, compare and analyze the services provided to male and female, revenue and non-revenue sports team members through the athletic academic support service program. There is little information in the literature that studies the services at Division I programs.

According to my records, the first questionnaire that was sent out has not been returned. If you have misplaced it, or were unable to return it at that time, please take 7 to 10 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. All information received will be treated with confidentiality. Your response is important to my study.

The material enclosed in this packet includes the Athletic Academic Advising Support Services Questionnaire and a return self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please return the instrument and any materials by April 30, 1993. If you have any questions, please call me.

Thank you for your time and input, it is appreciated and important.

Sincerely,

Cory M. Schwartz
Athletic Academic Counselor
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER TO DIRECTORS OF ATHLETIC ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICE PROGRAMS
Dear [Addressee]:

I am an Athletic Academic Counselor at the University of Wyoming and a doctoral candidate undertaking a national study of the services available through Athletic Academic Advising programs at Division I institutions across the United States.

I would like to ask your assistance in providing validity for the instrument to be used in the research project. All suggestions and comments will be appreciated and utilized. I have asked 10 Directors of Athletic Academic Support Programs to help in making the instrument valid and as clear as possible.

I have contacted the N4A who have endorsed the study and are interested in the data. Hopefully I will present the results at our national convention in June of '93.

Specifically, the purpose of the research is to describe, compare, and analyze the services available through athletic academic support services for male and female, revenue and non-revenue student-athletes.

As the Director of the Athletic Academic Support Services, I am asking you to complete the questionnaire on the services provided, and the type of program you have for your athletes. To complete the questionnaire should take between 7-12 minutes time. As well, I would appreciate your comments and suggestions to provide validity of the instrument in that it measures what the purpose of the study is purported to measure and that the questions are clear and unambiguous.

I hope you have the time to assist with this study. I look forward to your responses. The material enclosed in this packet includes the Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire and a return self-addressed, prestamped envelope. Please return the instrument by October 26, 1992. If you have questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Cory M. Schwartz
Athletic Academic Counselor
303-766-5385
APPENDIX F

THANK YOU NOTE TO DIRECTORS OF ATHLETIC ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICE PROGRAMS
[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Addressee]:

Thank you for assisting me in establishing the validity of the Athletic Academic Support Service Questionnaire. As I explained to you in an earlier letter I asked 10 directors of athletic academic support services for comments and suggestions to assist toward obtaining validity for the instrument.

Without your help and assistance, I would not have been able to get this project accomplished. I appreciate your time very much!

Many thanks!

Sincerely,

Cory Schwartz
Athletic Academic Counselor
307-766-5385
APPENDIX G

COVER LETTER TO ATHLETIC ACADEMIC ADVISORS/COUNSELORS
[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Addressee]:

I am an Athletic Academic Counselor at the University of Wyoming and a doctoral candidate undertaking a national study of the services available through the Athletic academic advising programs at Division I institutions across the United States.

I would like to ask your assistance in establishing reliability for the instrument to be used in the research project using the test-retest method. Any comments would be appreciated. I have asked 10 Athletic Academic Advisors/Counselors to help in making the instrument as reliable as possible.

I have contacted the N4A who have endorsed the study and are interested in the data. Hopefully I will present the results at our national convention in June of '93.

Specifically, the purpose of the research is to describe, compare and analyze the services available through athletic academic support services for male and female, revenue and non-revenue student-athletes.

As an Athletic Academic Advisor/Counselor, I am asking you to complete the questionnaire on the services provided, and the type of program you have for your athletes. To complete the questionnaire should take between 7-12 minutes time. Then within the next few months I will again send you the instrument and will ask you to complete it and return it to me. I am trying to make sure the questionnaire has internal consistency.

I hope you have the time to assist with this study. I look forward to your responses. The material enclosed in this packet includes the Athletic Academic Advising Support Service Questionnaire and a return self-addressed, prestamped envelope. Please return the instrument by August 26th. If you have questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Cory M. Schwartz
Athletic Academic Counselor
303-766-5385
APPENDIX H

THANK YOU NOTE TO ATHLETIC ACADEMIC ADVISORS/COUNSELORS
[Date]

[Address]

Dear [Addressee]:

Thank you for assisting me in establishing the reliability of the Athletic Academic Support Service Questionnaire. As I explained to you in an earlier letter I am using the Test-Retest method toward obtaining reliability for the instrument.

Without your help and assistance, I would not have been able to get this project accomplished. I appreciate your time very much!

Please return the questionnaire (without materials) by Monday, November 1, 1993 if at all possible. If you have any questions please call me at 303-339-5357.

Many thanks!

Sincerely,

Cory Schwartz