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(ABSTRACT)

This study was conducted to determine the current state of athletic academic advising in college athletics and to see what changes have occurred since 1981. All NCAA Division I institutions which participate in basketball and/or football were surveyed. With slightly over 68% of surveys returned, it was found that athletic academic advising had improved a great deal since 1981 but still had room for improvement. More universities have programs which offer a greater number of services with better trained counselors. Most programs however, still need additional full time staff and need to offer more services. This can only occur with the moral and financial support of the academic community. The sacrifices athletes make and the benefits they bring, both financially and in terms of publicity, should be compensated through academic support.

Ideally, every university should have an athletic academic support program with enough full time staff to adequately support all athletes with a wide range of support programs. This study shows NCAA athletic academic advising programs in Division I are not yet at this point. They are considerably closer however, than they were in 1981.
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Chapter One
Introduction

Introduction

In the last 10 years pressure has been put on university presidents and in turn on athletic departments to "clean up" their act and put emphasis back on the "student" in student-athlete. This has required a revolution in the thinking of many athletic department coaches and their staffs and the establishment of new academic advising programs. In 1981, Gurney, Robinson and Fygetakis (1983) of Iowa State, conducted a comprehensive review of the staffing, training, and services offered in athletic academic advising programs within Division I institutions. Gurney et al. (1983) only achieved a forty three percent return of their survey instrument. They suggested that the poor response rate was due to the fact that many universities did not have academic advising programs. This thesis replicates the earlier study, allowing analysis of changes which have occurred in academic advising over the last ten years.

Purpose

A replication of the study conducted by Gurney et al. in 1981 was important considering the effect Propositions 42 and 48 have had on universities and the current pressure athletic programs are under from university presidents to ensure student-athletes graduate.
Problem Statement

It is important for institutions ensure their athletic academic advising programs are providing student-athletes with the best possible support. The best way to do this is for an institution to compare their program to programs of peer institutions. Although many athletic academic advising programs, which offer some unique service, have been written about in the literature, no comprehensive study of all Division I institutions has been conducted since the Iowa State study in 1981. This research attempts to provide a comprehensive study of the staffing, training, and services offered by institutions which participate in NCAA Division I football and/or basketball and provides academic advising programs with a benchmark for comparison to peer institutions.

Delimitations

Distribution of the instrument was limited to universities which have NCAA Division I football and/or basketball programs.

Only questions from the Iowa State study in 1981 were used for this research. This delimitation was imposed in order to make an accurate comparison of the results in 1990 to the results obtained in 1981.
Limitations

Data analysis was limited to surveys returned. The response rate in 1981 was forty three percent.

Assumptions

The responses to the instrument are accurate and honest.

The instrument used by Gurney et al. (1983) in 1981 is a valid instrument and can be used in a replication of their 1981 study without further development.

Research Hypotheses

These hypotheses reflect the assumption that many institutions have added or improved their academic advising programs for student-athletes since 1981 when this questionnaire was first distributed. The first three hypotheses deal with comparisons of staff training and levels in 1981 and 1990.

**Hypothesis One:** The average number of full time academic support staff members in athletic academic programs will be greater in 1990 than in 1981.
Hypothesis Two: The training of the principle athletic academic advisor will reflect more of a professional background and there will be fewer with a coaching background.

Hypothesis Three: The percentage of principle academic advisors whose highest earned degree is a doctorate will be greater in 1990 than it was in 1981.

Hypotheses four through six deal with changes in services offered from 1981 to 1990.

Hypothesis Four: The percentage of universities allowing direct student-athlete academic scheduling by athletic academic advisors in 1990 will be lower than in 1981.

Hypothesis Five: There will be more academic support services offered to student-athletes in 1990 than there were in 1981.

Hypothesis Six: The percentage of universities offering the services identified in the 1981 study will increase for all services except direct student-athlete academic scheduling.
Summary

With this research, an investigation of student-athlete academic advising program staffing, training and services offered by NCAA Division I institutions which compete in football and/or men's basketball is completed. This was accomplished by replicating a study completed at Iowa State in 1981. This present study was important to investigate changes which have occurred over the last ten years, especially in light of Propositions 42 and 48 and the current pressure to graduate more student-athletes. It was expected that the results of the present study would show more institutions offering academic advising programs with more services offered and better trained counselors than in 1981.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This section is presented in four parts. First, there is a general overview of the history of academic advising of student-athletes. Then the need for academic advising of student-athletes is presented followed by the effects Propositions 48 and 42 have had on the need for academic advising of student-athletes. Finally, some current student-athlete academic advising programs which offer unique services are reviewed.

Background of Academic Advising

The origin of academic advising centers can be traced to the early 1970's when athletic departments began hiring advisors in addition to the standard practice of hiring tutors (Whiddon, 1989). The main purpose of this was for the advisors to make sure male football and basketball players remained eligible for athletic competition. Unfortunately, the main emphasis of these programs often became keeping the players academically eligible and not the general welfare or degree attainment of the student-athlete. Universities are switching the supervision of their academic programs from the athletic department to the university academic administration to increase the integrity of their programs and eliminate potential abuse of the student-athlete due to conflict of interest (Whiddon, 1989).
Soon after the start of academic advising centers for football and basketball teams, most schools extended this service to all male sports. Female athletes were included in 1978 when the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women permitted tutoring (Whiddon, 1989). Currently, a number of universities offer some form of academic advising. However, the extent of the programs vary greatly. Programs such as those at the Universities of Florida, Wisconsin, Nevada at Las Vegas, Texas at Austin, Georgia, Nebraska and Louisiana State include services which support the total person (Whiddon, 1989). These programs often operate in conjunction with university counseling and career advisement centers to provide student-athletes with more than just academic support. The size of the programs and the support they receive also varies greatly. For instance, the academic advisement budget at Virginia Tech barely approaches $100,000 (J. W. Via, personal communication, February, 1990) while the program at Penn State had a budget of over $600,000 in 1988 (Oberlander, 1988).

Need for Academic Advising Programs

"The dumb athlete whose professors carry him like a sack of flour for four years has passed from joke to scandal..." ("The best", 1989). There are many stories of student-athletes recruited with lofty dreams of using college as a stepping stone to the pros. Then after being abused academically, the student-athlete leaves four years later without a degree and no future. Three examples follow in which student-athletes were recruited for their athletic ability although they had limited academic potential and were exploited by the university they attended.
In 1984, Chris Washburn, after being recruited by 150 schools to play basketball enrolled at North Carolina State University. Washburn had a score of 470 on the SAT which is only 70 points higher than the lowest possible score and only ten points higher than a purely random marking of the test would achieve. Kevin Ross played three years on full scholarship at Creighton University even though he could neither read nor write beyond the second grade level. A law suit was brought by eight black athletes against California State University, Los Angeles, which alleged that: (1) one athlete who scored 450 on the SAT was credited with a score of 900 because a surrogate retook the test in his name; (2) one athlete majored in criminology for four years but never took a criminology course, having been counseled to take such courses as badminton, rugby, and backpacking instead; (3) because of easy courses and surrogate test takers, some athletes who could be classified as functionally illiterate were on the Dean's List with 3.5 and higher grade point averages (Eitzen & Purdy, 1986).

These are just three of many stories that could be related about the abuse of student-athletes at collegiate universities. Universities have been found guilty of changing test scores, doctoring academic records, giving credit for classes not taken and many other abuses. Currently the Universities of Oregon, Arizona State, San Jose State, New Mexico, Southern California, Nevada-Reno, Maryland, South Carolina, San Francisco, Florida, and Georgia as well as Tulane, Southern Methodist, Baylor, North Carolina State, and Oklahoma Universities have received publicity for these types of actions (Whidden, 1989).
Recruiters often take advantage of a student-athlete's dreams to play professionally. The odds, however, of playing professionally for a student-athlete playing football, basketball or baseball in high school are approximately 837 to one and only one percent of college football players have any hope of turning professional (Whiddon, 1989). Recruiters and coaches play on these dreams to encouraged students to take minimal credit hours in passable courses and channel their efforts to the playing field. These student-athletes receive little guidance in degree attainment and career preparation (Whiddon, 1989). This is where our athletic departments fail most miserably. In the words of syndicated columnist George Will:

The worst scandal does not involve cash or convertibles. It involves slipping academically unqualified young men in the back door of academic institutions, insulating them from academic expectations, wringing them dry of their athletic-commercial usefulness, then slipping them out the back door even less suited to society than they were when they entered. They are less suited because they have spent four years acquiring the idea that they are exempt from normal standards (Eitzen, 1987, p. 15).

In addition to protecting student-athletes and universities against abuse, academic advisement programs are needed because the student-athletes recruited are often economically and academically disadvantaged and the hours required for practice make it hard to adjust to college life, classes and tests. A recent survey found that college student-athletes tend to score lower on scholastic entrance exams and have lower grade point averages than the general student body (Lederman, 1988). The same study showed that the situation is even worse in big time successful athletic
programs. Student-athletes in these programs were more likely to find courses too difficult, receive incomplete grades and were placed on academic probation. Unfortunately, this has resulted in poor academic performance of many student-athletes and a high number of student-athletes failing to graduate.

Some past documented examples of poor academic performance of student-athletes include the following. Virginia Tech reported that 68 percent of its scholarship football players had GPAs of less than 2.0 (Vance, 1983). Between 1973 and 1983 only 6 of 58 male basketball players at Memphis State graduated (Brownlee & Linnon, 1990). The University of Minnesota graduated only 9 percent of its basketball players from 1978-1983 (Eitzen, 1987). From 1970 to 1979 only 21 percent of the football players and 28 percent of the basketball players graduated from the University of New Mexico (Eitzen, 1987). At the University of Texas-Austin, only 18 percent of the basketball players who entered between 1975 and 1981 graduated, compared to 54 percent for the student body (Eitzen, 1987). Although, some programs like Notre Dame, Penn State and Duke claim to graduate nearly 100 percent, too many resemble Memphis State.

While this makes the academic situation at Division I institutions look bad, there are some positive aspects. In the most recent NCAA annual survey of graduation rates, it was found that student-athletes entering school in 1983 graduated at a higher rate than the general student body over the course of five years (47.4 to 47.2 percent) (Lederman, 1990). This good news is tempered, however, by the finding that student-athletes participating in football and men's basketball, especially at public institutions, continued to graduate at rates far below the general student body.
(Lederman, 1990). At Division I public universities between 1983 and 1988, student-athletes participating in football had a graduation rate of 37.5 percent and student athletes participating in men’s basketball had a graduation rate below 25 percent (Lederman, 1990). This shows that progress is being made in the academic achievement of student-athletes compared to previous years, but those sports with big-time exposure and revenue generating capability continue to lag behind other sports in the graduation of student-athletes.

In addition to the special academic needs of many student-athletes, the time requirements of participating in collegiate athletics also makes it hard to perform well academically. While the time requirements seem to be decreasing, a student-athlete participating in a major collegiate sport still spends more time practicing than studying. In 1984, it was estimated that during the season basketball players spend 50 hours and football players spend as much as 60 hours per week participating in their sport (Edwards, 1984). In a recent NCAA survey conducted for the Presidents’ Commission, it was found that the time football and basketball players spend in practice had been reduced to around 30 hours per week but this was still more than the 25 hours per week they averaged attending and preparing for class (Lederman, 1988). Football and basketball players especially, reported that it was harder to make their academic work a top priority and acquire the grades that reflected their capability (Lederman, 1988).

If universities are going to use the abilities of athletes, they have the moral obligation to see student-athletes have the best possible chance of attaining a
degree. Academic advisement programs are an important and integral part of this obligation.

Another important advantage of an effective academic advising program that cannot be overlooked is the effect it will have on the attrition rate of the student-athletes. An effective academic advising program will increase the academic preparedness of student-athletes. This will help decrease the number of student-athletes failing out of school thereby increasing the experience they contribute to their team and decreasing turnover. A good academic advisement program will benefit everyone, student-athletes, coaches and the university.

The Effects of Propositions 48 and 42

Recognizing the rampant abuse of student-athletes and the damage to the integrity of their institutions, the university presidents, in 1985, adopted Proposition 48 which severely tightened the academic requirements for student-athletes to enter college and remain eligible to participate in athletics. NCAA by-law 515 (Proposition 48) requires a student-athlete to achieve a grade-point average of at least 2.0 in a core curriculum of 11 subjects, plus a minimum score of 700 on the SAT or 15 on the ACT ("Race", 1989). A core subject is defined as an academic course that prepares a student for college level work. Core courses include at least three years of English, two of math, two of social sciences, and two of natural and physical sciences, including at least one laboratory course if offered by the high school (Ostro, 1987). Under Proposition 48, if the student-athlete does not meet the requirements, they can receive athletically based financial aid but cannot practice
or participate with the team in any manner during their freshman year and they lose a year of eligibility. Although it was assumed that the passage of Proposition 48 would cause student-athletes admitted to colleges and universities in the Fall of 1986 to be better prepared academically and that they should be capable of making satisfactory progress towards their degree and graduating within five years (Underwood, 1986), this has not necessarily been the case. There are still many situations where student-athletes meet the requirements but come from high schools which have not adequately prepared them for college (Underwood, 1986).

Proposition 42, passed in 1989, modifies Proposition 48 to eliminate partial qualifiers. Under this rule student-athletes who only meet one of the qualifications and have been allowed to keep their scholarships under Proposition 48 would be denied an athletic scholarship from the university. Proposition 42 has not yet been implemented. If it had been implemented in 1989, Proposition 42 would have affected approximately 600 students who would have normally received athletic scholarships under Proposition 48 (Sanoff, 1989).

There has been opposition to Proposition 42 because the full effects of Proposition 48 are still not known. It appears, however, that Proposition 48 is working well and does not need to be modified. In a survey of all Division I-A football schools conducted by the Ann Arbor News, it was found that 79% of students admitted under Proposition 48 were still in school in 1988 (Murphy, 1988). This casts doubt on the use of standardized test scores as predictors of student potential to succeed in college.
These new rules have greatly increased the need for academic advisement programs in universities. It is now harder for student-athletes to be admitted to college and then remain eligible once they arrive. Advisement centers are needed to provide the support necessary for these student-athletes to succeed academically. Universities which allow students to enter their doors under Proposition 48 would be foolish not to provide these student-athletes with help in adjusting to college life and in studying for their classes.

Academic advisement centers are also important for internal and external scrutiny of athletic programs. University administrations and faculty senates are scrutinizing the academic records of athletic programs. Also, the NCAA is, in the near future, requiring the publication of graduation rates. Athletic academic advising centers are important to improve these figures as well as collect and report them.

These new rules have also made academic advisement an important recruiting tool. Parents will look more favorably toward a university which has a strong advisement center, especially if their child must enter as a Proposition 48 partial qualifier. A study has shown that varsity college student-athletes were more influenced in their college selection by the academic characteristics of the university than by the athletic aspect of the athletic program (Mathis and Gurney, 1985). All of a sudden, with academic accountability strengthened, selling the positive aspects of athletic programs like advisement centers has become an important recruiting tool.
Review of Academic Advisement Programs

In 1981, Gurney, et al. (1983) completed a comprehensive survey of Division I athletic academic advising programs. A summary of the results of this study is presented here since no comprehensive review of athletic academic advising for student-athletes has been done since. The return rate for this study was forty three percent.

The most frequent number of staff members in athletic departments responsible for athletic academic support was zero as nearly forty five percent of the responding athletic departments had no academic advising program for athletes (see appendix A, Table 1). Of those athletic departments which did have at least one full-time staff member responsible for athletic academic advising, the background of the principle athletic academic advisor was most frequently professional counseling (30.6%). A large percentage also came from a coaching background (27.4%) (see Appendix A, Table 2).

In a review of the services offered by responding athletic departments with an athletic academic advising program, over fifty percent of the programs offered traditional services like academic monitoring, academic advising, tutoring, study table, and direct student-athlete scheduling. Other services were offered less frequently (see Appendix A, Table 4).

Sixty eight percent of the responding athletic departments engaged in pre-screening of high risk student-athletes using the traditional measures of high school rank,
college admission tests, interviews, and high school transcripts. There was no identifiable pattern reported as to the use of these tests (Gurney et al., 1983).

In the 1981 study, Gurney et al. found that 41.2 percent of responding athletic departments offered a formalized test assessment program. Of these programs, 72.7% offered these tests routinely. The most frequently used reading test was the Nelson/Denny Reading Test. The most frequently used career assessment tests were the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory and the Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, DD. There was no clear pattern to the use of any particular instrument for test assessment in the areas of study skills, learning disabilities, or personality.

The percentage of athletic academic advising programs offering psychological services was not reported in the 1981 study. The percentage of athletic departments responding which offer specific psychological support programs was reported with the most frequent service being 9.6% of the athletic departments offering interpersonal communication support (see Appendix A, Table 5).

There are at least six commonly known factors which influence the academic performance of student-athletes (Kramer, 1986):

First, number of hours athletes practice and train daily.

Second, the degree of inflexibility of the coach's demands regarding time and location of practices.
Third, general fatigue resulting from or accompanying stringent practice routines.

Fourth, the athletes' participation - in addition to practice time - in other "study" aspects of the sport (for example, studying plays, creating routines, or analyzing past performances).

Fifth, practice schedules which either preclude, or severely hinder, the pursuit of certain academic majors (courses of study with extensive laboratory time are one example).

Sixth, the athlete is challenged to strike a reasonable balance between effort expended and results obtained in both athletic and academic arenas (p. 67).

Academic advisors must be aware of these factors and work with student-athletes and coaches to overcome any negative influences this may cause.

Research has shown the major services which have an impact on the academic performance of student-athletes are effective orientations, quality academic advising, an early warning system, academic support and increased informal communication with faculty (Mayer, 1989). These findings can be used to off-set the negative effects of the preceding factors.

Certain inferences for academic advising can be drawn from the literature on student-athletes (Gordon, 1986):
Athletes from highly competitive programs may be experiencing environments which are detrimental to their personal development.

Academic advisors working in these institutions must be aware that some academically high-risk students could also be falling behind on developmental tasks pertaining to young adulthood as well.

Students who are successful academically may fall behind in personal development.

Advisors should be well trained in developmental theory and advising techniques.

While academic development is paramount, student personal development must also be recognized as an integral part of an advising program for athletes (pp. 84-85).

Athletic academic advisors are in the perfect position to assess the personal growth of student-athletes and assist them in all facets of personal as well as academic development. It has been this realization which has led to the establishment of total person programs (Gregory, 1987).

While no overall study of academic advising at Division I institutions has been completed since 1981, some programs have been written about for their unique services or success. The University of Kentucky has a Center for Academic and
Tutorial Services which provides student-athletes with soundproof rooms for studying and tutoring, and career planning services. Two unique features of Kentucky's program are that the center is open 24 hours a day and there are four graduate students who meet daily with student-athletes and are responsible for reporting weekly the progress of each student-athlete to the academic director (Whiddon, 1989).

In addition to a solid academic advising program, UCLA also provides student-athletes with two innovative programs. Through Athletes for Academics, UCLA professionals are available to talk to and advise student-athletes on career related issues (Whiddon, 1989). The University also takes an important step toward fulfilling their moral obligation to see student-athletes graduate through a Final Score Program. This program extends all academic services to former student-athletes who no longer have eligibility left but are still in school working toward their degree (Whiddon, 1989).

At Louisiana State University (LSU), the academic advising program includes preventative aspects. Their academic personnel work with athletic recruiters to recruit only student-athletes who show a reasonable chance of success. Study halls are then required for all freshmen and all athletes with a GPA less than 2.5 (Whiddon, 1989). This cut-off point is set higher than most other programs which only require a GPA of 2.0. LSU's program is administered by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs instead of the athletic department. Many programs are being shifted away from the control of the athletic department. The University of Florida (Whiddon, 1989), Penn State University (Oberlander, 1988),
and Virginia Tech are other universities which have given control of their student-athlete academic advising to the university administration instead of the athletic department.

The student-athlete support personnel at Penn State University are trying to do more education and less crisis management by not concentrating their efforts solely on student-athletes who are having trouble in classes. Penn State advisors are focusing efforts on student-athletes when they are freshman and then closely monitoring their academic progress (Oberlander, 1988). In an innovative step, the advisors at Penn State are trying to take their support out of the office and spend more time at the practice fields talking to players on their own "turf" (Oberlander, 1988).

Summary

Academic advising has gained tremendously in importance over the past ten years. Programs have evolved from a way to keep student-athletes eligible at any and all costs to a support network to make sure the student-athlete has all the necessary advantages needed to progress toward a degree despite the pressures and time commitments of athletic competition. Academic advising will continue to grow in importance in the future as the push to eliminate the exploitation and abuse of student-athletes grows stronger. Propositions 48 and 42 are just the beginning of a revolution which won't end until the goal of every institution is to see student-athletes graduate instead of having the attitude of winning at all costs. Programs around the country are trying new and innovative ways to help student-athletes and
they are having good success. The NCAA Presidents Commission has made it plain that they will no longer tolerate actions which jeopardize the integrity of their institutions. They are determined to put the emphasis back on student in student-athlete and they will succeed.
Chapter Three
Methodology

Subjects

The subjects for this study were the principle academic advisors at all National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) member institutions which participate in Division I football and/or men's basketball. These institutions were identified and their addresses obtained from the NCAA Directory published by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was the same instrument used in 1981 by Gurney et al. (1983) in their survey of Division I institutions. The instrument (see Appendix B) used in 1981 was obtained from Dr. Gurney at the University of Maryland. He gave his permission to use his instrument in this replication of their 1981 study (see Appendix C). The instrument consisted of 13 questions which were used to analyze the staffing, training and support services offered by academic advising programs at Division I institutions. The instrument was coded to allow easy identification of subjects who did not respond and needed follow up letters. Coding also allowed easier identification of subjects who requested a copy of the results.
Procedure

The instrument was sent to the principle academic advisors at every NCAA Division I member institution which has a football and/or men's basketball program. The names and addresses of all academic advisors who are members of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (N4A) were obtained from Dr. Richard McGuire, the President of the N4A (personal communication, July 24, 1990). The list of N4A member institutions was cross referenced with the NCAA list of all member institutions with Division I football and/or men's basketball. The survey for academic advisors at institutions which are not members of the N4A was sent to the athletic director of those institutions. The athletic director was then asked to forward the survey to the principle academic advisor (see Appendix D).

The cover letter (see Appendix D) asked for the instrument's return within a two week period. In 1981, Gurney et al. (personal communication, July 13, 1990) asked the participants to return the instrument within one week. By giving more time, and by sending the letter directly to the principle academic advisor, it was hoped that a better response rate would be achieved than obtained in 1981 (43 percent).

According to Dillon (1978), three follow-up mailings should take place. The first one week after the initial mailing, the second three weeks later and the third seven weeks later. Due to the prohibitive cost of this strategy, only one follow up mailing was used in this study. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) was sent along with another copy of the survey instrument (see Appendix B) to subjects who had not yet responded. In the follow-up letter the
subjects were asked to please fill out the questionnaire if they had not already done so. If they had already returned the survey, they were thanked for their assistance in this study.

The addresses for all academic advisors were entered into a database which allowed them to be imported into a Microsoft Word file containing the letters which were sent. This allowed each letter to be personally addressed to each academic advisor. The database was also capable of printing the mailing addresses directly on the envelopes so that each letter was individually addressed as if it were business correspondence and not junk mail. This was done to increase the chance that the survey would be looked at and not thrown away unopened (Dillon, 1978). Each letter was also mailed with first class postage, not metered, because bulk rate postage gives correspondence the appearance of junk mail (Dillon, 1978).

Design

The design of this instrument was based on the literature on academic advising (Gurney et al., 1983). It was designed by Commission I of the American College Personnel Association in order to gather information concerning athletic academic support and psychological services available to student-athletes at athletically competitive institutions.
Data Analysis

Questions one and two on the instrument were used to evaluate hypotheses one, two and three. The information from returned surveys was aggregated and portrayed in frequency graphs. These graphs show the percentage of responding universities which have athletic-academic advising programs, who has oversight responsibility for these programs, the areas in which the principle athletic academic advisors have their highest degree, and what percentage hold a bachelors, masters, or doctorate.

Question three on the instrument was used to evaluate hypotheses four, five and six. A bar graph was used to show the percentage of institutions offering each of the services identified on the instrument. It shows increases and decreases in the services offered in 1990 compared to 1981.

The results from question four were displayed as a pie chart showing which specific individual or office has the responsibility for academic scheduling of student athletes at the responding universities. The results from questions five and six, dealing with pre-screening of student-athletes, were summarized in two bar graphs. The first shows the percentage of universities using each method of pre-screening. The second shows the percentage of universities, for each method, that reported they used the particular method most frequently.

The results from questions seven through nine, dealing with test assessment, were reported in text form. The results from questions ten, twelve and thirteen, dealing
with mental health services are also reported in text form. The results from question eleven, also dealing with mental health services, were summarized on a bar graph showing the percentage of universities offering each of the services.

Pilot Study

When developing and using a questionnaire as an instrument, a pilot study should be conducted to ensure the instrument is valid and will be returned. A pilot study was not a part of this research because the instrument used was already developed, used and reported on in the literature. The assumption was made that the instrument was valid and the results obtained in this study were compared to the results obtained in 1981. Therefore, the same instrument was used and a pilot study was not deemed necessary.

Summary

For this study, an instrument was used which was developed and tested as part of another study conducted in 1981. All academic advisors at Division I institutions with football and/or men's basketball programs were surveyed by mail. In this chapter, the presentation of the data and the relation between questions on the instrument and the research hypotheses were discussed.
Chapter Four

Results

Introduction

In this section the results of the survey on athletic academic advising (see Appendix B) sent to all institutions which participate in NCAA Division I football and/or basketball are reported. First, general results are reported dealing with return and response rates. Then specific results are reported corresponding to the hypotheses tested. Finally, other results are presented which do not relate specifically to any hypothesis but which complete a comprehensive overview of the staffing, training and services offered by athletic academic advising programs in NCAA Division I institutions participating in football and/or basketball.

Return Rate

The total number of surveys mailed was 292. The total number of surveys returned was 201 for a return rate of 68.8%. Fifty (17.1%) of these were returned as a result of the second mailing. Of the surveys returned, eight were not usable. Two universities no longer participate in NCAA Division I, two advisors returned the survey uncompleted saying they did not have the information requested, one survey was returned because the address was not found, one survey was returned uncompleted because the academic advisor was no longer at the university to which it was sent, one advisor returned the survey uncompleted because he did
not have enough time, and one advisor wrote back asking for a letter guaranteeing confidentiality but never returned the survey after this was sent. This left 193 surveys (66.1%) which were usable.

Of the 193 usable surveys, 41 (21.2%) had no athletic academic advising program, 123 (63.7%) had a program under the jurisdiction of the athletic department and 29 (15.0%) had a program under the jurisdiction of the university administration (see Figure 1). This meant 152 (78.8%) of the responding universities had an athletic academic advising program. Therefore, 152 is used as the base for most of the analysis.

Results Pertaining to Hypotheses

Hypothesis one, that the average number of full time academic support staff members in athletic academic programs will be greater in 1990 than in 1981, was supported. In 1981, 44.7% of responding universities had zero full time staff members and 35.1% had only one (see Appendix A, Table 1). In this survey, it was found that less than half of the responding universities had zero or one full time staff members (see Table 1). The most frequent number of full-time staff in athletic academic advising was one (28.0%). More programs had two (15.6%) or three (26.4%) full time staff members than in 1980 (7.9% and 10.5%).

Hypothesis two, that the training of the principle athletic academic advisor would reflect more of a professional background and fewer would have a coaching background, was supported. In this survey, it was found that 63.3% of principle
Figure 1. Reporting responsibility of responding programs (n=193)
Table 1. Staffing levels of academic advising programs (n=152)
athletic academic advisors earned their highest degree in either education or counseling (see Table 2). In 1981, it was reported that 27.4% of the principle athletic academic advisors had a coaching background (see Appendix A, Table 2). In this survey, only 7.9% reported any coaching experience in their background and only one of the 152 responding principle athletic academic advisors was currently involved in coaching.

Hypothesis three, that the percentage of principle athletic academic advisors whose highest earned degree is a doctorate would be greater in 1990 than in 1981, was supported. Of responding programs, 29.6% of the principle athletic academic advisors had a doctorate degree (see Figure 2). In 1981, this percentage was 20.3 (see Appendix A, Table 3). The 1990 percentage with a masters degree as their highest earned was 61.8 and with a bachelors degree, 8.6 as compared to 62.9 and 16.9 in 1981 (see Appendix A, Table 3).

The results pertaining to hypothesis four, that the percentage of universities allowing direct student-athlete scheduling by athletic academic advisors would be lower in 1990 than in 1981, were inconclusive. A conclusive result can not be made because of conflicting responses to two questions. In response to question three, pertaining to services offered, 50.0% of responding advisors said their program offered direct student-athlete academic scheduling (see Table 3). In response to question four, asking who was directly responsible for student-athlete academic scheduling, only 29.6% of respondents said the athletic academic advisor was responsible (see Figure 3). In 1981, it was found that 50.9% of the athletic academic advising programs offered direct student-athlete scheduling
Table 2. Principle advisors' area of highest earned degree (n=152)

- Education: 37.6%
- Counseling: 25.7%
- Psychology: 8.3%
- Sports Administration: 6.4%
- Business: 4.6%
- English: 4.6%
- Personnel Services: 3.7%
- Public Administration: 2.8%
- Biology: 1.8%
- Communication: 1.8%
- Sociology: 0.9%
- Math: 0.9%
- American Studies: 0.9%
Figure 2. Highest earned degree of principle advisor (n=152)
Table 3. Services Offered (n=152)

- Academic Monitoring: 95.4%
- General Academic Advising: 92.1%
- Study Tables: 90.1%
- Tutoring: 88.2%
- Career Counseling: 58.6%
- Personal Counseling: 55.3%
- Test Assessment: 54.6%
- Direct Academic Scheduling: 50.0%
- Remedial Reading: 34.2%
- Group Counseling: 27.6%
Figure 3. Responsibility for student-athlete academic scheduling (n=152)
(see Appendix A, Table 4). Because these results conflict, with one result virtually the same as the 1981 result, a conclusive statement can not be made pertaining to this hypothesis.

Hypothesis five, that more academic support services would be offered to student-athletes in 1990 than were in 1981, was not supported. The support for this hypothesis had to come from question three on the survey. No respondents, however, added any services to the list provided. This list is the same used in 1981, therefore there is no support for the hypothesis that more services are being offered in 1990 than in 1981.

Hypothesis six, that the percentage of universities offering services identified in the 1981 study would increase for all services except direct student-athlete academic scheduling, was partially supported. Evidence for this hypothesis comes directly from question three on the survey. The problem with direct student-athlete scheduling has already been discussed. Looking strictly at question three on the survey, the percentage of programs offering direct student-athlete academic scheduling dropped from 50.9% to 50.0%. The hypothesis was only partially supported because the percentage of programs offering the various services listed in question three increased for all services except one, remedial reading. The percentage of programs offering remedial reading services decreased from 44.7% in 1981 to 34.2% in 1990. The percentage of programs offering all other services increased from 1981 to 1990 (see Table 3 and Appendix A, Table 4).
Other Results

Questions five and six on the survey dealt with pre-screening methods to identify high risk students. It was found that 88.2% of the responding athletic academic advising programs conducted some form of pre-screening. The usual methods of pre-screening, college admission tests, high school rank, high school transcripts, and personal interviews, were all used (see Table 4). Over 90% of all responding programs which conducted pre-screening (n=134) reported they used college admission tests and high school transcripts. The most commonly listed methods under the category "other" were university placement exams and reading and writing tests. Responding programs which used pre-screening reported that they used college admission tests and high school transcripts the most frequently. College admission tests were used most frequently by 50.0% of programs conducting pre-screening while 47.8% reported they used high school transcripts most frequently (see Table 5).

Questions seven through nine dealt with testing to identify at risk students. Of responding programs, 54.6% reported that they tested to identify at risk students. Of these programs, 71.0% reported the tests were administered routinely while the rest reported the tests were only administered in specific cases. The most common form of reading assessment test used was the Nelson Denny Reading Test. Other tests used by more than one program were the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test/Blue and the Woodcock Johnson Psychological Educational Battery. The most common form of career assessment test used was the Strong
Table 4. Pre-screening methods used (n=134)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT, SAT</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Transcripts</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Rank</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Most frequently used pre-screening methods (n=134)

ACT, SAT 50.0%

H.S. Transcripts 47.8%

Interviews 19.4%

H.S. Rank 14.2%
Campbell Interest Test. Other tests used for this purpose by more than one program were the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator, Self Directed Search, SIGI-Plus, COPS, and Discover.

A number of various tests were listed for writing assessment. The only method listed by more than one university was the use of writing sample analysis. In the general study skills assessment area the only test listed by more than one program was the LASSI. The only test listed by more than one program in the personality assessment area was the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. There were no learning disabilities assessment tests used by a great number of programs. The only tests used by more than one program were the Woodcock-Johnson Psychological-Educational Battery and the Weschler Intelligence Scale R. A few programs reported that they used their own in house battery of tests for comprehensive assessment of all these areas.

Questions 10 through 13 dealt with mental health services. While many of the responding programs reported that mental health services were available to the student body and hence to the athletes as well, only 22.4% reported that mental health services were offered specifically to student-athletes as part of the academic advising program. Of these programs which offered mental health services (n=34) the most frequently offered services were stress management (82.4%), conflict management (70.6%), inter-personal communication (67.6%), mental rehearsal imagery (58.8%), and progressive muscle relaxation (55.9%) (see Table 6).
Table 6. Mental health services offered (n=34)

- Stress Management: 82.4%
- Conflict Management: 70.6%
- Interpersonal Communication: 67.6%
- Mental Rehearsal Imagery: 58.8%
- Progressive Muscle Relaxation: 55.9%
- Hypnosis: 26.5%
- Meditation: 26.5%
- Bio-Feedback: 20.6%
Of the 34 programs indicating that they offered mental health services, 33 of them reported they offered the services to both male and female athletes. One program only offered these services to the men’s football team. Twenty eight of the programs offered these services equally to male and female athletes. Two programs reported the mental health services were available to men 75% of the time and women 25%. Two programs reported the available time was split 60% available to women and 40% to men and one program reported the available time was split 60% for men and 40% for women.

**Summary**

This study was administered to provide a comprehensive study of the staffing, training, and services offered by institutions which participate in NCAA Division I football and/or basketball. Surveys were sent to all 292 NCAA Division I institutions. A return rate of 68.8% was achieved and the results have been summarized in this section. Of the six hypotheses made at the beginning of this study, four were supported, the results pertaining to hypothesis four were inconclusive and hypothesis five was not supported.
Chapter Five

Summary - Conclusions - Recommendations

Introduction

This study was conducted to review the situation in athletic academic advising in NCAA Division I institutions. The results of this study were presented in the previous section. In this section these results will be discussed and viable reasons given for the data obtained. Conclusions will then be drawn to give an accurate portrait of the staffing, training and services offered by athletic academic advising programs. This section concludes with recommendations for further study and how future studies may be improved based upon the work presented here.

Discussion

The results of the study indicate that the state of athletic academic advising has greatly improved since 1981. The percentage of universities offering these services has seen a dramatic increase while the quality of the programs, as measured by the services offered, has also improved.

The first indication that the state of athletic academic advising has improved is the fact that 68.8% of the universities in NCAA Division I returned the survey. The authors of the 1981 survey stated the main reason for their poor return rate
of 44.7% was that most universities did not have programs and did not want to admit it. The return rate of this study indicates not only that many more universities have such programs, but also that they consider these programs are important enough that they took the time to return this survey and request the results.

In the 1981 survey, it was found that 44.7% of all respondents did not have an athletic academic support program. In this survey, with a much greater base of responding universities, it was found that only 22% did not have an athletic academic support program. It is important to mention here that a number of universities do not recognize that athletes have any right to be treated differently than the rest of the student body. These universities, which include the Ivy league, do not recruit students for athletics. They admit students, based solely on academic merit, who then play athletics. Many of the universities in this survey which did not have programs were this type. It was encouraging to see that 78% of all responding universities did offer academic support specifically to student athletes. This is a significant change from the state of athletic academic advising in 1981.

There have also been significant changes in the number of staff members and their training. The number of full time staff hired to work specifically with student-athletes has increased dramatically as has the qualifications of these staff members to provide academic support. In 1981, the most frequent number of full time staff members was found to be zero because most universities did not have any program. In 1990, it was found that the most frequent number of full time staff members was one, closely followed by three. A few programs had four or more full time staff members with the highest number being seven. Also in 1981, 24% of the principle
athletic academic advisors had no formal training for academic advising other than coaching experience. This has dramatically changed in 1990. There were only 12 principle athletic academic advisors that had any coaching background and only one that was currently coaching. All of the principle athletic academic advisors had some form of advanced degree and almost 92% had a masters or doctorate.

A current trend, which showed up in this survey but was not applicable in 1981, was the trend towards moving jurisdiction of athletic academic advising to the university administration. This is happening in an increasing number of universities as presidents strive to bolster the integrity of their athletic programs and gain control of the athletic situation. In this survey, it was found that 15% of the athletic academic advising programs are now reporting directly to the university administration and have been removed from the control of the athletic department.

Comparing the percentage of programs offering specific services in 1981 to 1990, this study shows an increase for all but two services; direct academic scheduling and remedial reading. The decrease in direct student-athlete academic scheduling was less than expected (50.9% to 50.0%). Adding confusion to this result was the fact that the response to question four, which asked who is responsible for direct student-athlete scheduling, showed that only 27% of the athletic academic advisors had this responsibility. This author believes that many of the 50% saying they offered direct academic scheduling, probably offered the service only after the approval of the faculty advisor was gained. This would explain the discrepancy between the responses to questions three and four.
The reduction in the percentage of programs offering remedial reading might seem disturbing. Two possible positive explanations for this result may be the effects of Proposition 48 on recruiting and the increase in other services. As the academic quality of student-athletes admitted increased due to Proposition 48, the need for remedial reading may have lessened. Also, the increase in other services offered may have covered the need for help in this area and reduced the need for specific remedial reading services.

When the frequency profile of services offered by the athletic academic advising programs responding is analyzed, three distinct zones are apparent. The first zone, 88 to 100 percent, contains four services; academic monitoring, academic advising, study tables, and tutoring. The second zone, 50 to 60 percent, also contains four services; career counseling, personal counseling, test assessment, and direct academic scheduling. The third zone, 25 to 35 percent, contains the final two services; remedial reading and group counseling. It is clear that the services in the first zone form the core of any basic program. The services in the second and third zones complement these core services to increase the value of athletic academic programs. Because of the low percentage of programs offering the services in the third zone, one could argue that only the "elite" programs offer these programs. One could also argue that these services are offered by so few programs because they are of limited benefit. This author takes the former viewpoint.

One finding in the 1981 survey that the authors found alarming, was that 50.9% of all responding athletic academic programs were doing direct academic scheduling of their student athletes. The authors stated this was a serious conflict of interest and
made athletes susceptible to abuse by overzealous academic advisors who saw it more important to keep athletes academically eligible than put them in a degree granting program. The current trend has been to return direct academic scheduling to the faculty advisors. Results of this survey partially support this idea. Only 27% of the responding programs reported that they were in charge of scheduling their student athletes. The majority reported faculty academic advisors were responsible for academic scheduling of student athletes.

The rest of the results from this study held no surprises. Over 88% of the programs conduct pre-screening to identify high risk student athletes. This is up from 68% in 1981. The percentage of programs testing to identify at risk student-athletes increased from 41% in 1981 to 54.6% in this study. Finally, only 22.4% of the programs offered mental health services specifically to student athletes (this percentage was not published for 1981).

The results of this study show that the state of athletic academic advising has improved dramatically in the last ten years. The author of this study believes there are two significant contributors to this improvement. They are: 1) the effects of Propositions 42 and 48 on the university athletic community and 2) the effort of university presidents to increase graduation rates and the integrity of their athletic programs. With the passage of Propositions 42 and 48, universities no longer give scholarships to athletes who do not belong in college and exploit them for athletic gain. It is increasingly important for athletic programs to recruit students who are academically able to participate in the university community. Once they are accepted it is important to make sure they remain academically eligible throughout
their four years and conclude their experience with graduation. If a university recruits an athlete with outstanding athletic ability who is academically a high risk student or, under proposition 48 can not participate in athletics during the freshman year, it is important to offer this student academic assistance so the first year scholarship is not wasted. These are two of the main reasons athletic academic support programs have dramatically increased in importance over the last ten years. The results of this survey show that universities are recognizing this.

Conclusions

A number of conclusions can be made from the results of this study. Athletic academic advising appears to be more important within the universities surveyed than it was ten years ago. Programs today are better staffed and trained and university presidents are becoming more involved as they recognize these academic programs as a tool to restore credibility to their athletic programs.

Athletic academic advising, however, is still underfunded and understaffed at many universities. The most frequent number of full time staff in 1990 was one. While this is 100% better than zero, which was the most frequent number in 1981, it is still much too low to adequately handle the academic advising needs of NCAA Division I athletic programs.
There is a core group of services which all athletic academic advising programs seem to offer. Over 88% of the responding programs offered four services forming the basis for their programs.

Almost all programs do some type of pre-screening to identify high risk students. This allows the staff of the academic advising program, many of which seem to be understaffed, to know which students need to be paid particular attention. This is an effective preventative way to utilize scarce resources.

Although there is no data on pre-screening from the 1981 study to compare to, it is probable that less emphasis is being put on standardized test scores today than ten years ago. The ACT and SAT scores are still used by almost every program, but the importance being put on them is lower than was expected. Only half the responding programs said these test scores were their most frequently used method of prescreening. Until more resources are put into athletic academic advising programs, test scores will remain the most cost effective way to analyze the academic potential of incoming student athletes. This is disturbing since there have been many charges that these tests are socially discriminatory. The best methods to accomplish prescreening are personal interviews coupled with some form of in house testing.

While it was encouraging to find over 95% of the responding programs conduct academic monitoring as a preventative measure, it was discouraging to only find 54.6% had some form of test assessment program. Academic monitoring is preventative in that one can catch problems in mid semester and correct them before final grades are out. Test assessment, however, is even more preventative
because it allows for the identification of those areas in which a student-athlete is weak before they are put into situations they can not handle. Identification of weaknesses through test assessment allows the academic counselor to strengthen those areas in which the student-athlete is most susceptible to fail before the student-athlete is enrolled in class. It is probable that the low number of programs doing test assessment can be attributed to scarce resources.

Implications

The results of this study have a number of important implications for athletic academic advising programs. The most important is probably that the need for academic advising programs is recognized by a large percentage of universities and those still lagging behind in this respect are doing their student-athletes a disservice. The importance of academics in athletics will only continue to grow now that the university presidents are taking an active role in the governance of the NCAA.

The education of principle academic advisors has increased. To fill this position today it is almost necessary to have a masters degree. More and more programs will be requiring a doctorate in the future. This has implications for athletic academic advising programs looking to hire a principle athletic academic advisor. It also has implications for university degree granting programs in education and sports. Counseling skills should be included in any advanced degree program which is designed to prepare a person to work with student-athletes. Today it seems
principle academic advisors have backgrounds in sports, business, or counseling. The best will have experience in all these areas.

The findings relating to full time staff have implications for all programs. Too many programs have one full time staff member. This is not adequate for the needs of student-athletes today. A large percentage of programs now have three or more full time staff members. Those programs still saying they support academics but only providing resources for one staff member should recognize from this study that they are not current with the direction athletic academic advising is moving.

The findings on services offered provide important implications for universities starting programs or that have small programs looking to expand. The results clearly show specific core services which any program must start with as a base. Then other services can be added as the program expands.

The importance of athletic academic advising programs is going to continue to grow in the future. Those universities which lead the way today will be well positioned to provide the best education and recruit the best athletes in the future. A parent’s concern for the academic welfare of their child should not be underestimated.

**General Recommendations**

It is clear from the results of this study that athletic academic advising has improved over the last ten years. It is also clear that such programs have a long way to go in
the next ten years to be in a position to provide the support athletes deserve in return for the effort they put forth and the revenues they generate for the universities they attend. Universities need to provide increased support for these programs. There seems to be a trend toward hiring counseling professionals in this field. Therefore, a doctorate in some area of counseling should be a requirement for the position of principle athletic academic advisor. Professors need a doctorate to teach classes to the student body. Principle athletic academic advisors have more responsibility in that they must keep track of and provide support for hundreds of athletes in many different areas. They should have at least as much training as the faculty with whom they deal.

In terms of support staff, one full time person is not adequate for athletic academic advising in a Division I institution. Any program providing all students with even the minimal support necessary needs at least three full time staff members. This should be the minimal goal of all athletic support programs.

In terms of services offered, it is clear what services are recommended for any program starting out. The four services, academic monitoring and advising, study tables and tutoring, which over 88% of responding programs currently offer provide a good base to build upon. The key recommendation in this area is that athletic academic advising programs must build upon these core courses, not be content with them.

More resources need to be provided to athletic academic advising programs so they can do the best possible job, not merely the best job possible with scarce resources.
This study shows an over reliance on academic monitoring instead of test assessment and on standardized tests instead of personal interviews and more objective placement testing. The reason for this is a lack of funding to hire the needed staff to administer the more time consuming alternatives.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study provides a look at the state of athletic academic advising today and can be compared to the same survey administered in 1981. A lot of progress has been made. A lot of progress still needs to be made. This study should be repeated in another five years to see, once again, what is the state of athletic academic advising. In five years the NCAA will be requiring university athletic programs to publish their graduation rates of student athletes. This will require the field of athletic academic advising to change rapidly over the next five years. With this in mind, there are a few changes to the survey instrument which would benefit future studies.

The first question caused some confusion because it asks if the athletic department has an athletic academic advising program. Many programs responded saying that no, the athletic department does not have such a program but the university does. Many universities are moving in this direction. The first question should be changed to reflect this. It should be worded to ask if the university has such a program and then a second question should be added asking who has jurisdiction over the program, the athletic department or the university administration.
Question two should be modified slightly to differentiate between those staff members which provide strictly academic support and those which provide other support functions such as financial aid, recruiting and compliance. The question should also differentiate between full time employees and part time and graduate student employees. This may be accomplished by looking at man hours rather than just employees. As more programs move toward services supporting the "total person" this differentiation will be valuable information in future surveys.

Question three should have a line added for "other" services offered so that responding programs are encouraged to add services to the ones listed. Service "I", direct academic scheduling, needs to be better explained or removed from the list so that it does not provide results conflicting with question four.

A question should be added dealing with the source of funding athletic academic advising programs depend on. This would be very helpful to programs trying to expand their budget.

This survey was initially mailed during the first week of August and the second mailing was during the fourth week of August. This is a busy time for athletic academic advisors. Any future surveys should be sent out earlier in the summer, around the end of June and beginning of July. The timing of this study did not seem to hurt the response, but this change would make it easier for athletic academic advisors to provide the information requested.
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APPENDIX A
TABLE (1) Number of Full Time Athletic Academic Counselors Within Each Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Staff Members</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 1: Training Backgrounds of Principals
Athletic Academic Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Professional</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE (3)  Highest Earned Degree Of A Principle Academic Counselor

- B.S.: 16.9%
- M.S.: 62.7%
- Ph.D.: 20.3%
TABLE 4: Athletic Academic Support Programming

- Academic Monitoring: 81.1%
- General Academic Advising: 80.7%
- Tutoring: 72.7%
- Study Table: 71.8%
- Direct Student-Athlete Scheduling: 50.9%
- Career Counseling: 45.6%
- Personal Counseling: 45.6%
- Remedial Reading: 44.7%
- Test Assessment: 41.1%
- Group Counseling: 20.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological Therapy</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypnosis</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biofeedback</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Muscle Relaxation</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Rehearsal Imagery</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Athletic Academic Advisement Survey

Name: __________________________
Institution: ____________________

Staff

1. Does your athletic department have a staff member(s) responsible for student-athlete support and/or psychological services?
   
   Yes ___ No ___

2. If so, please identify the titles, major responsibilities, professional training, and degree(s) of each of these staff members:

   Title: __________________________
   Responsibility: __________________
   Training: _______________________
   Degree(s): ______________________

   Title: __________________________
   Responsibility: __________________
   Training: _______________________
   Degree(s): ______________________

   Title: __________________________
   Responsibility: __________________
   Training: _______________________
   Degree(s): ______________________

   Title: __________________________
   Responsibility: __________________
   Training: _______________________
   Degree(s): ______________________

   If you have more than three staff members, please list the rest on a separate sheet.

Programming

3. Circle the letter of the following services which your staff offers to student-athletes:

   A. Structured individual and/or group programming in remedial reading development
   B. Personal counseling (long or short term therapy focusing on individual concerns such as marital, family, or crisis intervention)
   C. Group counseling (long or short term therapy focusing on individual concerns such as sexuality, stress management, assertiveness)
   D. Career counseling (long or short term therapy focusing on individual Career aspiration and/or vocational interest, i.e. having a working knowledge or use of vocational interest inventories, Dictionary of Occupational Titles, occupational outlook handbooks, etc.)
   E. Study Tables (a structured program for regular study periods)
   F. Tutoring (a structured program for regular tutorial sessions)
   G. Academic monitoring (checking with instructors on academic progress in a preventative sense)
   H. General academic advising (checking schedules for possible overloads as opposed to direct student-athlete scheduling)
   I. Direct academic scheduling of student-athletes
4. Who is responsible for student-athlete academic scheduling at your institution? 

5. Do you have an early identification procedure for high risk student-athletes? 
   yes no 

6. If so, please rank order the use of any of the methods below according to their frequency of use (1 = most):
   
   ___ College Admission Test (ACT, SAT)
   ___ High School Rank
   ___ Personal Interviews with Recruits
   ___ High School Transcripts
   ___ Other, Please Specify ____________________________________________

7. Do you have a formalized test assessment program to identify potential student-athlete academic difficulties? 
   yes no 

8. If so, please check how these tests are administered: ______ routinely? ______ specific cases only? 

9. Please specify the testing instruments you have found to be useful for the following general categories:
   
   Reading __________
   Career Assessment __________
   Writing __________
   Study Skills __________
   Learning Disabilities __________
   Personality __________
   Others __________

10. Is there a trained mental health professional employed by your athletic department who works with individual student-athletes, coaches, and/or teams? 
    yes no 

11. If so, does he/she provide any of the following services? 
    yes no
    
    Stress Management
    Hypnosis
    Meditation
    Bio-Feedback
    Progressive Muscle Relaxation
    Inter-Personal Communication
    Conflict Management
    Mental Rehearsal/Imagery
    Others, Please Specify

12. Are these psychological services offered to both male and female athletes? 
    yes no 

13. If so, what percentage of time is offered in each case:
    
    men ________ women ________

Would you like a copy of the final results? 
   yes no
APPENDIX C
July 25, 1990

Dr. Gerald Gurney
The University of Maryland
Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
P.O. Box 295
College Park, MD 20740-0295

Dear Dr. Gurney:

Thank you for sending me a copy of the instrument used in your 1981 study of academic advising at Division I institutions. I will use it to replicate your study and show how academic advising has changed over the last ten years. I think this will be valuable considering the recent pressure NCAA member institutions have come under to increase graduation rates of student-athletes.

This letter is also to acknowledge your permission to use your instrument in a replication of your 1981 study as per our telephone conversation of July 10, 1990. Again, thank you for your help. I will make sure you receive the results of the current study.

Sincerely,

Dale M. Brubaker
Graduate Student
1900 Kraft Drive
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060
APPENDIX D
August 7, 1990

Personalized Address

Dear Academic Advisor/Coordinator:

I am a graduate student in Sports Management at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, VA. As part of my thesis, I am replicating a study conducted in 1981 by Dr. Gurney and Dr. Robinson of Iowa State and Dr. Fygetakis of the University of Rochester on the athletic academic staff and support services offered by NCAA Division I institutions participating in football and/or basketball. I will compare the results I obtain to those obtained in 1981 to show how collegiate academic support services have changed over the past ten years. I hope to then publish the results in a publication dealing with athletic administration some time in 1991.

Please take time to complete this survey. It is coded so that I can keep track of and send follow-up letters to those not responding and keep track of those respondents who request a copy of the results. I will be happy to provide you with a summary of the results if you want one. I would also appreciate the inclusion of any descriptive material about your academic support services you may be able to provide. I would appreciate the return of this survey by August 24.

I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call (703) 231-3501.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Dale M. Brubaker
Graduate Student
1900 Kraft Drive
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060
August 7, 1990

Personalized Address

Dear Athletic Director:

I am a graduate student in Sports Management at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, VA. As part of my thesis, I am replicating a study conducted in 1981 by Dr. Gurney and Dr. Robinson of Iowa State and Dr. Fygetakis of the University of Rochester on the athletic academic staff and support services offered by NCAA Division I institutions participating in football and/or men's basketball. I will compare the results I obtain to those obtained in 1981 to show how collegiate academic support services have changed over the past ten years. I hope to then publish the results in a publication dealing with athletic administration some time in 1991.

Please forward this survey to the principle athletic academic advisor at your institution. The survey is coded so that I will be able to mail follow-up letters to those who do not respond and keep track of respondents who want a copy of the results. I will be happy to provide a summary of the results to anyone who requests one. I would also appreciate the inclusion of any descriptive material about your academic support services you may be able to provide. I would appreciate the return of this survey by August 24.

I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call (703) 231-3501.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Dale M. Brubaker
Graduate Student
1900 Kraft Drive
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060
August 27, 1990

Dear Academic Advisor/Coordinator:

About three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your assistance in a study on the academic advising services offered at Division I institutions competing in football and/or men’s basketball. As of today, I have not yet received your reply.

I am writing to you again because of the significance of each questionnaire to the usefulness of this study. I hope to show that vast differences have occurred over the last ten years in regards to academic advising of student-athletes and provide a profile of the staffing, training and academic support services offered by institutions today. Every response is crucial to the completeness of this study. I hope you will take the time to complete this study and mail it back as soon as possible.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Dale M. Brubaker
Graduate Student
1900 Kraft Drive
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060
Vita

Dale M. Brubaker was born in Lebanon County, Pennsylvania on October 20, 1964. He grew up in Richland, Pennsylvania and graduated from Eastern Lebanon County High School in 1983. He attended Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, participated in the Co-Operative Education Program and graduated cum laude with a Bachelors Degree in Industrial Engineering and Operations Research in 1988. As an intern in the Industrial Engineering Department at Carpenter Technology Steel Corporation in Reading, Pennsylvania, Dale gained 36 months of valuable work experience.

Following graduation in 1988, Dale stayed at VA Tech and enrolled in the graduate program in Industrial and Systems Engineering. It was during this time that Dale decided to enroll in dual majors and completed this thesis in Health and Physical Education. Dale expects to finish his M. S. degree in Industrial and Systems Engineering later this year.