First and Goal:

A Proactive Academic and Career Development

Program for Student Athletes

at the University of Maryland

by

Kenneth Craig Baron

A Seminar Paper Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

_____ _____

Advisor Date

_____ _____

Chairperson, Counseling and Personnel Services Date

Recorded:_____

By:_____

College: College of Education
Department: Counseling and Personnel Services
Major: College Student Personnel

The University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
1989

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Working as an academic advisor at the University of Maryland for the past year I have interacted with a diverse cross section of the undergraduate student body. Included in this diverse cross section of students have been student athletes. Developing academic programs with these students has been both challenging and enjoyable. What has become evident to me in these interactions, though, is a peculiar mystique which surrounds the student athlete. Indeed, the members of this special student population seem to receive inordinate attention on campus, in local community, and, sometimes, throughout the entire country.

The glamour, tradition, and excitement of intercollegiate competition have been an integral part of higher education in the United States ever since the first football games were played between ivy league schools such as Harvard and Princeton in the late eighteen-hundreds (Brasch, 1970). Today, intercollegiate athletic competition is a topic of controversy among college officials, students, athletes, and the media.

Issues regarding drug testing, recruiting practices and admissions standards are now receiving much more attention, thus generating pressure on institutions to examine how they treat their student athletes. In the advent of this re-examination of student athletes, this intense focus of attention can generate considerable insight about how student affairs professionals affect the development of special student populations. This paper will focus upon many of the recent changes in athletic academic support programming and the impact which such programming has upon the personal, academic and career development of student athletes.

Aspects of Participation in Intercollegiate Athletics on Student Well-Being

College athletics are performance driven. As the level of competition increases, so does the emphasis on practicing, conditioning and winning (Blann, 1985). As the

expectations and pressures on student athletes increase, their ability to formulate mature, appropriate educational and career plans often becomes impeded (Chartrand & Lent, 1987). Moreover, it has been found that sports participation over an extended period of time can create dysfunctions among student athletes (Brown, 1968).

According to observations made on male scholarship athletes of Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), Yiannakis (1981) noted that athletes were preoccupied with competition, practice, winning, and the next competition. Renick (1974) contended that these students were not as attentive to their educational and career goals as other students. In addition, Renick observed that meeting the academic, personal, and career needs of student athletes may be considered secondary to the desire of some universities to have successful athletic teams. Few researchers have examined the relationship between a college student's involvement in sports and the developmental implications for that student's college experience (Bayless, Mull, & Geller, 1977).

Identity and the College Student Athlete

One problem examined in those studies comparing collegiate athletes and non-athletes, is identity foreclosure. Identity foreclosure occurs, according to Marcia (1976), when individuals do not engage in exploratory behavior related to education and career, yet make commitments to an occupation or ideology. Researchers have found the following: (a) athletes have a lack of autonomy and intraception (Ogilvie & Tutko, 1971), (b) some athletes display low moral development (Malmisur, 1976), (c) many student athletes have high authoritarian thinking (LeUnes & Nation, 1983; Petitpas, 1981), (d) many student athletes have unrealistic educational and career goals (Blann, 1985; Sowa & Gressard, 1983), and (e) many student athletes display high conventional thinking (Schendel, 1965), stereotyped sex role expectations (Hirt, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1983) and low career maturity (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987).

New Interventions with Troubled Athletes

According to Chartrand and Lent (1987) the past role of sports psychologists, counselors, and administrators has been designed almost entirely around making reactive interventions with troubled athletes (i.e. waiting for trouble to occur followed by attempts to minimize the consequences of those actions for all parties concerned). Students, athletes, teams, coaches, and athletic departments now recognize this after-the-fact intervention as an unsuccessful approach to athletic programming (Renick 1974). Academic athletic professionals are re-evaluating their perceptions of the student athlete experience. As a result of the re-evaluation, a new, innovative approach to academic athletic programming is evolving. These new approaches maintain as an underlying goal the fostering of personal, academic, and career development of student athletes.

Psychoeducational Approaches

In the psychoeducational model, the problems and developmental issues of athletes are addressed without labeling athletes as a symptomatic group. This model emphasizes (a) the individual's desire for acquiring skills; (b) his or her capacity to learn; (c) the counselor's role as a teacher who demonstrates, models, and provides opportunities for practicing desired behaviors; and (d) the applicability of acquired skills to a broader repertoire (Guerney, Stollack, & Guerney, 1970, 1971). Psychoeducational approaches to academic athletic programming such as those advocated by Chartrand and Lent (1987), Danish and Hale (1981), and Guerney, Stollack, & Guerney (1970, 1971) may significantly increase the personal, academic, and career development of student athletes.

Considering all that has been written about the development of student athletes, this author contends that an academic athletic programming approach should consider the developmental stages of student athletes in addition to emphasizing the following tenets: (a) student athletes' desire for acquiring skills, (b) his or her capacity to learn, (c) the programmer's role as educator who demonstrates, models, and provides opportunities for

practicing desired behaviors, and (d) the applicability of acquired knowledge and skills toward broader situations (Guerney, Stollack, & Guerney, 1970; 1971). Such a program will help promote the intellectual and ethical development of student athletes according to Perry's scheme (1970), (Petitpas & Champagne, 1988).

The Proposed Study

The author will support the contention that psychoeducational approaches to academic athletic support programming will foster higher developmental growth in student athletes as well as higher levels of career maturity. Specifically, the authors contends that such psychoeducational approaches to academic athletic support programming could be measured for effect of treatment by use of the Student Development Task Inventory-2 (SDTI-2) (Winston, Miller & Prince, 1979), which is primarily concerned with the assessment of Chickering's vectors of developing autonomy, developing mature interpersonal relationships, and developing purpose, and the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) (Crites, 1973). Program evaluation would entail an analysis of the pretreatment levels of intellectual/ethical and career maturity development of student athletes and a comparison group in a nonequivalent control group setting (Petitpas & Champagne, 1988).

The comparison group would be comprised of non student athletes matched with student athletes based on age, sex, major, race, and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores (Petitpas & Champagne, 1988). Related to this, every matching variable has been shown to be associated to the cognitive development of college students according to Knefelkamp, Widick, & Parker 1978. Finally, post-testing of the two groups could be administered on a yearly basis terminating at graduation (Petitpas & Champagne, 1988). This paper suggests that the teaching and modeling elements of these psychoeducational approaches are significant factors in the development of male student athletes. It has been well documented that this population comes into the academic arena suffering from deficient academic background preparation (Purdy, Eitzen, and Hufnagel 1982). In addition, this paper argues

that the implications of the proposed study may provide valuable insight for use in programming for student athletes, and for other special student populations as well. Since many minority and foreign students may enter institutions with deficient academic background preparation it may be feasible to suggest that psychoeducational approaches to programming for these populations might also yield positive results.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Examining the literature pertaining to academic, personal, and career development of young student athletes, one soon realizes that these individuals represent a student population with special needs. Much of the research conducted on student athletes describes how this student population is different from other student populations. This chapter contains a specific review of studies relating to the academic and career development of student athletes.

Academic and Career Development Programs for Student Athletes

To create a successful academic or career development program for any student population, a clear sense of that populations' specific concerns must be recognized as crucial in its formation. Chartrand and Lent (1987) state that counselors responding to the unique needs of student-athletes must be cognizant of the diversity that characterizes this population. Chartrand and Lent's article focuses on how future sports counselors and administrators can be proactive in the development of student athletes. They offer observations and recommendations in reaction to the current role of the counselor involved in athletic academic counseling, who they feel is only called upon to intervene with student athletes when difficulties arise. Chartrand and Lent analyze the two most common issues of concern to student athletes, and describe several models that may be useful in guiding proactive interventions. They also suggest avenues of research needed to enhance understanding of the needs of student athletes.

Chartrand & Lent Model

Much of what Chartrand and Lent present in this article is relevant to the development of the "First and Goal" program. Since this article is a survey of what has been determined about the relevant issues concerning student athletes, portions of this literature review section will reflect on the major discoveries observed about the academic and career development of

student athletes, in addition to some of the programs already existing and some of which being proposed.

Chartrand and Lent (1987) contend that two concerns often emerge as potential counseling issues for student-athletes. First, a student-athlete may experience role conflict from being both an athlete and a student in a university setting. Second, student-athletes often experience distress when intercollegiate participation ends and they must take on new life and career goals. Chartrand and Lent describe a psychoeducational model for promoting student-athlete growth based on Danish and Hale (1981) who recommend an educational-developmental framework for enhancing athletic and personal development. Such a perspective focuses on the individual as a whole person, rather than focusing on athletic endeavors alone. The authors argue that needs and skills of individuals and athletes change over time and in different situations. Chartrand and Lent provide the following description of the psychoeducational model:

> **"In the psychoeducational model, the problems and developmental issues of athletes are addressed without labeling athletes as a symptomatic group. This model emphasizes (a) the individual's desire for acquiring skills; (b) his or her capacity to learn; (c) the counselor's role as a teacher who demonstrates, models, and provides opportunities for practicing desired behaviors; and (d) the applicability of acquired skills to a broader repertoire (Guerney, Stollack,& Guerney, 1970, 1971). The psychological practitioner's role is one of 'teaching personal and interpersonal attitudes and skills which the student can apply to solve present and future psychological problems and to enhance his [or her] own and other's satisfaction with life'" taken from (Guerney et al., 1970, p.100).**

What is significant about this psychoeducational model is that it offers many distinct advantages over counseling models which are reactive in nature. The psychoeducational model: (a) focuses on the potential strengths of an athlete, (b) shifts the responsibility for goal setting and problem solving away from the counselor, and (c) avoids the connotations associated with remedial models. This psychoeducational model represents a

new way of approaching athletic academic programming. Shifting responsibility, choices, and skill development behaviors to the athlete helps to shape a more self-confident and self-reliant individual who can cope successfully in the long run for the athlete. Counselors, coaches, and administrators in a developmental program act more like teachers than enforcers.

Addressing Chartrand and Lent's (1987) suggested research agenda for the future of sports counseling and programming, recommendations were made to expand the knowledge base of student-athlete development. Specifically, more research regarding role conflict and athletic retirement could serve professionals in the field with more insight toward how to prevent these issues from becoming problematic. Chartrand and Lent (1987) also suggest that it would be valuable to study environmental factors such as: excessive practice demands, lack of support for the student role which can place student-athletes at risk for adjustment difficulties, as well as identifying those who may be most vulnerable to certain developmental barriers, like those with career indecision.

Chartrand and Lent's current assessment of sports counseling and its effect on the development of the student-athlete provides a foundation from which a prospective athletic programmer can use to his or her advantage. They provided a recent survey of relevant studies, counseling techniques, and strategies for athletic academic programs which is instrumental to the development of the proactive counseling programs which the authors hope will ensue.

Examining developmental factors of athletic programming, Petitpas and Champagne, (1988) state that student-athlete support programs based on sound developmental theory, intelligent implementation plans, and strong leadership can succeed and gain acceptance from both athletic and academic constituencies. Petitpas and Champagne (1988), address the following topics: (a) developmental dynamics, (b) a rationale for specific services for

athletes, (c) suggested psychoeducational programming, and (d) implementation and evaluation considerations.

With respect to developmental dynamics, Petitpas and Champagne attempt to explain the development of student athletes by applying the theories of Erikson, Marcia, and Crites to their behavior and attitudes. The authors maintain that even though research using developmental dynamics as an orientation has been limited, this research offers some hope for clarity for those creating programs for athletes. Applying Erikson's theory (1959), the developmental task of elementary school through high school is to construct a sense of industry and is seen by other researchers as even more important than academic achievement (Coleman, 1961).

According to Erikson, as students move into late adolescence, the developmental task becomes a need to establish a personal identity. This need for identity involves two activities (Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1966). First, students should actively explore various alternative possibilities of adult life. Second, students should freely choose commitments to the ideological and occupational alternatives which are consistent with their personal needs, values, interests, and skills. Critical to all subsequent personal and career development, the exploratory behavior of late adolescence, or lack thereof, can explain, according to several researchers (Crites, 1969; Erikson, 1959; Jordaan, 1963; Marcia, 1966; Super, 1957) why student athletes may have difficulty with personal and career development issues (Petitpas & Champagne, 1988).

It seems that this need for active questioning and exploratory behavior may not occur in an athletic system which demands structure, conformity, and tremendous amounts of physical and psychological energy (Petitpas & Champagne 1988). Indeed, with the kind of regimentation, discipline and scheduling restraints which participation in intercollegiate competition places on student athlete, it is not hard to understand why they may develop at a slower rate than non-athletes socially, academically, or with respect to career

development. Moreover, the student athletes' earlier experiences in high school may also hinder the exploratory behaviors which are imperative for young people to engage in if they are going to progress towards higher levels of development.

High School Athletic Programs

High school sports programs encourage prevalent community values and life-styles as opposed to providing young athletes with opportunities to question existing norms or explore alternatives (Schafer, 1971). This growth inhibiting process is further compounded during college (Hurley & Cunningham, 1984). Many college policies have been identified which promote segregation rather than furnish athletes with a forum for exploratory activities and experiences (Leerksen & Cuccio, 1982; Pease, 1971). In addition, such findings are particularly significant with respect to black athletes (Leach & Conners, 1984). In summary, much of this research suggests that athletes be considered victims of a system that creates an environment in which they are overprotected, depersonalized, and misconceived (Remer, Tongate, & Watson, 1978).

Chickering's Vectors of Development for Young Adults

In Education and Identity (1969) Arthur Chickering proposes a model of student developmental sources of influence. Chickering's model was derived from a longitudinal study of thirteen colleges and drew on the theoretical constructs of Erikson, R.W. White, and Nevitt Sanford (Delworth and Hanson, 1980). Chickering offers seven vectors which comprise identity development in young adulthood. Using the term "vector" in place of "stage", Chickering points out that "vector" connotes both direction and magnitude. Chickering is careful to explain that the vector's direction is not necessarily linear but may be more appropriately described as a spiral (Delworth and Hanson, 1980). For the purposes of this study the following three vectors will be described and documented: Developing Autonomy, Clarifying Purposes and, Freeing Interpersonal Relationships.

Developing Autonomy: Chickering defines autonomy as "the independence of maturity" and views the maturely autonomous person as "secure and stable," coordinating behaviors to personal and social ends. Maturity requires (1) emotional and instrumental independence and (2) recognition of interdependencies (Delworth and Hanson, 1980).

Clarifying Purposes: This vector requires formulating plans and a set of priorities that integrate the following three areas: (1) avocational and recreational interests; (2) vocational plans and aspirations; and (3) style of life. Such an integration allows life to have both direction and meaning (Delworth and Hanson, 1980).

Freeing Interpersonal Relationships: The major emphasis of this vector involves developing a tolerance for a wider range of individual and ideological differences. The student's tasks are first to recognize differences, then to tolerate them, and finally to appreciate their existence, as reflected in mature intimate relationships (Delworth and Hanson, 1980).

Developing Autonomy

Sowa and Gressard (1983) investigated the relationship between participation in varsity athletics at the collegiate level and the achievement of developmental tasks. One-hundred and fifty students were randomly selected from varsity athletes and non-athletes at a major southern university and were mailed the Student Developmental Task Inventory (SDTI) (Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1979); ninety-six students, or 60% of the sample, returned the survey. Forty-eight athletes and forty-three non-athletes were represented in the sample. Of the athletes, thirty were male and eighteen were female. The athletes had attended an average of 2.6 years of college and averaged 19.8 years of age. The non-athlete group included 15 males and 28 females. This group had attended an average of 2.9 years of school and had a mean age of 20.9 (Sowa & Gressard 1983).

The instrument administered to the subjects was the Student Developmental Task Inventory (SDTI) which was designed to measure progress toward achievement of

developmental tasks. The SDTI designates scores on three major scales: developing autonomy, developing purpose, and developing mature interpersonal relationships. The analysis procedures which were based on a 2 x 2 design comparing athletes to non-athletes and males to females revealed significant differences between athletes and non-athletes on three subscales: educational plans, career plans, and mature relationships with peers. No significant differences were found between the responses of males and females, nor were interactions between sex and athletic participation found on any developmental subscale.

Where differences were discovered, athletes scored significantly lower than non-athletes with regard to accomplishment of developmental tasks as stated by Chickering (Sowa & Gressard, 1983). Moreover, the authors suggest that because athletes may differ from students not participating in sports, educators working with athletes should realize that these may be students with special needs. The authors recommend that special programs for athletes should be created which can provide a systematic method of evaluating the developmental stages of the student. In addition, academic and personal counseling should also be included to avoid the omission of developmental steps that may create serious problems in the athlete's future (Sowa & Gressard, 1983).

In the discussion section of this article the authors acknowledge questionable implications from their study. First, the authors admit that variables such as the socio-economic status, academic achievement, and academic ability, all of which could be related to developmental task accomplishment, were not collected in this study (Sowa & Gressard, 1983). Second, the significant difference exhibited on the subscale, mature relationship with peers, may be a result of the SDTI. Since the SDTI defines a mature relationship with peers as a shift toward greater independence and individuality, such criterion may be inappropriate when considering the "team" building component which is essential to the athletic environment (Sowa & Gressard, 1983). Finally, the authors contend that the time

spent in sports-related activities on the high school level may curtail the development of career and educational planning skills. Therefore noting that student athletes may be coming into the university environment with deficiencies, regarding skills when compared to non-athletes who may have attained such skills during high school (Sowa & Gressard, 1883).

Clarifying Purposes

Dimick and Kennedy (1987) examined career maturity and professional sports expectations of college football and basketball players as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory (Crites, 1978). Crites defines career maturity as the degree to which an individual possesses the career information and the planning and decision-making skills necessary to make realistic and wise educational and career decisions.

Eighty athletes and eighty non-athletes were compared in the study; of the 80 athletes assigned to the sample 60 were White (75%) and 20 were Black (25%). The comparison group participants (non-athletes) were selected from a list of all undergraduate course in session during the 1984-85 academic year at a midwestern university of approximately 18,000 students. In the comparison group, two students (3%) were Black and 78 students (97%) were White, which represents a flaw in the sampling procedure and a limitation in this study. All basketball and football players (N=122) were given surveys regarding professional sports expectations and were tested for career maturity development. Although for the purposes of this study, only 80 were randomly selected and then matched on the basis of class standing to the participant of the comparison group (Kennedy & Dimick 1987).

The instrument administered to assess career maturity in both the group of student athletes and non-student athletes was the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) (Crites, 1973) which was devised to measure the critical levels of attitudinal maturity and competency which exist in career decision making. The CMI is actually made up of two major subtests: the Attitude scale and Competency scale, and for the purposes of this study the Attitude scale was chosen as the outcome instrument (Kennedy & Dimick 1987). A t-test was calculated to

compare the athletes' group mean CMI score with that of the comparison group (non-athletes). The results of this analysis indicated that comparison group members (non-athletes) scored significantly higher (X=36.84) than did the athletes (X=33.15) on measures of career maturity [t(158)=4.84, p,<.001] (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987).

A chi-square was calculated to assess the realism of the athletes' expectations about professional sports. The results of this analysis indicated that significantly more athletes than expected had plans to enter professional sports; as opposed to the anticipated level of 2%, a total of 48% (58 of 122) of the athletes stated that they expected to play professional level sports (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987). Finally, of the Black athletes, 25 (66%) stated expectations to enter professional sports, as compared to 33 (39%) of the White athletes who stated that they expected to play professional level sports. Therefore, such findings seem to indicate a tendency for Black athletes to be more unrealistic than White athletes concerning expectation of reaching professional level sports (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987).

Finally, it should be pointed out that a flaw in the sampling procedure may be attributed to the fact that only of the comparison group used in the study (N=80) only two of the students were Black (3%). This inordinately small number of Black students used in the comparison group poses a threat to external validity. The specific problem is non-representativeness, since the prospective results from different subtypes within a population would differ (less Black students in comparison group than in experimental group of student athletes). Such a limitation in the sampling procedure is significant since Black student athletes who play intercollegiate Basketball and Football represent a much higher percentage than only 3%.

Freeing Interpersonal Relationships

Hirt, Hoffman, and Sedlacek (1983) used the Situational Attitudes Scale (Shueman and Sedlacek 1977) to study differences between male varsity athletes and male non-athletes on the basis of their attitudes toward sex roles. Participants in this study included 54 male

varsity athletes (representing four major sports) and 54 male non-varsity undergraduates. Both groups resided in the same all-male, high-rise dormitory and were used in the study to control environmental variables in campus housing such as coeducational halls, and smaller residences (Hirt, Hoffman & Sedlacek, 1983). The instrument administered to the participants was the Situational Attitude Scale Women-4 (SASW-4), which outlines seven personal-social and vocational-career situations and asks participants to respond to the total situation using seven 5-point semantic differential scales (Hirt, Hoffman and Sedlacek, 1983). There are two forms included in the instrument: Form A places males and females in nontraditional sex roles, and Form B places males and females in traditional sex roles. The only difference between the two forms is in the sex of the individuals depicted in each role within a given situation.

Results of the study, calculated using multiple t-test analyses, indicate that non-athletes were significantly more favorable to the non-traditional sex-role situations than were varsity athletes ($T=2.02$ $p<.05$). There were no significant differences due to athletic status on Form B (traditional sex roles). Comparing responses on Form A to Form B, results showed a significantly more accepting attitude toward Form B (traditional roles) than toward Form A for both groups of participants (varsity athletes, $t=5.79$, $p<.0001$; $t=2.53$, $p=.05$) (Hirt, Hoffman, and Sedlacek, 1983). The authors concluded that the most striking finding in this study was the fairly consistent pattern of male varsity athletes demonstrating a significantly more negative attitude toward nontraditional sex-role behaviors than did non-athletes.

The results derived from this study have limitations with respect to all male athletes. In order to make projections or conclusions about male athletes, researchers would have to incorporate the test scores of male athletes in more than four sports. It may be considered that football players and swimmers have very different orientations toward sex-roles. Incorporating various male sports in a study might produce more externally valid conclusions and projections. In addition, the authors acknowledge that this study does not clarify what

place experiences have had on the development of attitudes in the males used in this study (Hirt, Hoffman, and Sedlacek, 1983).

Developmental Concerns

Foreclosure is defined as a phenomena in which an individual makes a commitment toward a particular occupation or ideology without engaging in exploratory behavior (Marcia 1976). Petitpas and Champagne (1988) explain that of those studies in which differences between collegiate athletes and non-athletes exist, many suggest that athletes demonstrate various characteristics of identity foreclosure. Petitpas and Champagne cite the following studies describing such characteristics: various groups of athletes have displayed low moral development (Malmisur, 1976), high authoritarian thinking (LeUnes & Nation, 1983; Petitpas, 1981), unrealistic educational and career goals (Blann, 1985, Sowa & Gressard, 1983), high conventional thinking (Schendel, 1965), stereotyped sex role expectations (Hirt, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1983), and low career maturity (Kennedy & Dimick, 1987).

Petitpas and Champagne also suggest that the interested reader refer to the following writers, and their descriptive terms, with respect to identity foreclosure: **selective optimization** (Danish, 1983) **suspended maturation** (Gent, 1979), and **over-privileged minority** (Remer et al., 1978). Petitpas and Champagne maintain that while these terms have unique connotations, all of them are consistent with the identity foreclosed theme of over-identification with college athletics. It is this danger of over-identification which creates a specific need for support programs for athletes.

Examining the specific needs of student athletes, Petitpas and Champagne suggest, as Chartrand and Lent did, that programming for student athletes should be rooted in a psychoeducational approach. The following is a selection from Petitpas and Champagne's framework:

> **"In general, students enter college with a stereotyped, rigid world view (Marcia, 1976). A developmental task for any college student is to expand this outlook. Whether process is called exploratory behavior (Erikson, 1959; Super, 1963; Tiedeman & O'Hara, 1963), freeing of**

personal relationships (White, 1975), or multiplistic thinking (Perry, 1970), the college student must take advantage of the diversity of experience presented during a college year" (456).

Petitpas and Champagne's model is based in Perry's (1970) cognitive development approach, yet is consistent with the theories of Erikson (1959), Super (1957), Tiedeman and O'Hara (1963), and several other developmental theorists. The goal of their approach is to stimulate athletes' movement through Perry's (1970) stages of **dualistic, multiplistic,** and **relativistic** thinking to a position where they can make freely chosen **commitments** on their own. Petitpas and Champagne maintain that the commitment level of thinking is usually not recognized until several years after graduation.

Petitpas and Champagne's suggested programming begins at the crucial freshman year and continues through until graduation. Their program which champions a diversity of activities, demands a collaborative effort, coordinated by an athletic counselor, involving student affairs staff, faculty, and athletic administrators. It is Petitpas and Champagne's contention that student-athlete support programs, conceived in developmental theory, with intelligent implementation plans and leadership, can be successful and obtain acceptance from both the academic and athletic communities.

The Petitpas and Champagne (1988) Model

The following section provide a description of Petitpas and Champagne's model-athletic academic program. In the first year of a student-athlete's academic program, the authors feel that the goal of the freshman experience should be self-exploration ultimately leading to multiplistic thinking. A major behavior change resulting from the first year's activities would include the student athlete taking responsibility for his or her own learning. Student athletes are still externally controlled by authority figures in their environment, and may begin to be puzzled by the actions of authority or can begin to question its absoluteness (Petitpas and Champagne 1988).

In the second year the self-exploration process continues and focuses on challenging dualistic thinking and attitudes. Petitpas and Champagne maintain that the goal of the second year should be the implementation of a process of experimentation with new behaviors. Using relativistic thought, student athletes realize the worth of exploratory behavior and the significance of having a variety of options from which to choose (Petitpas and Champagne 1988). This process is crucial for all subsequent cognitive, personal and career development.

The goal of the third year is to reinforce the assets of exploratory behavior and using relativistic thought. This goal would be achieved through the introduction of career exploration and the use of selected alumni, coaches, and professional athletes. Student athletes would be encouraged to interview working professionals, take part in internships, and use available on campus resources related to the career development process. As a result student athletes would expand their understanding of occupations, learn the concept of transferable skills, and ultimately establish a better sense of their own values, needs, interests, and skills (Petitpas and Champagne 1988).

The goal of the fourth year (or fifth if necessary) is to facilitate the transition from college to the real world. Support group focus would shift from career exploration to career implementation. Activities such as developing job hunt strategies and career "shadowing" would be encouraged. In addition, career action plans would be implemented along with formal job hunt activities or professional school application processes. Moreover, the final years of the program would enable upper classmen student athletes to act as role models for younger students (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988).

Addressing concerns about implementation and evaluation of athletic academic support programming, Petitpas and Champagne suggest that considerable effort be placed on educating the college community about who athletic counselors are. Specifically, athletic counselors must build credibility with (a) athletes, (b) coaches and athletic staffs, and (c)

faculty and academic administrators. Ideally, such individuals should come to be recognized not as "shrinks" or "babysitters", but as student development professionals instead (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988). In addition, it is critical that coaches and athletic administrators be perceived as allies and not enemies. Since coaches are recognized as influential figures by student athletes, it is essential that to have their support before a program is initiated (LeUnes & Nation, 1983). To foster the credibility building process, coaches should be encouraged to take initiative in informing student athletes about the availability of support services (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988).

Building credibility with faculty and academic administrators can provide a challenge as well. This process necessitates that the athletic counselor construct a network of academic supports which can be facilitated by the following activities: (a) educating the college community about the unique challenges faced by student athletes, (b) collaborating on research with faculty and student affairs staff, and (c) updating the college community on the effectiveness of programming through an on-going evaluation process (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988). Moreover, knowledge of developmental theory and counseling skills, student programming, and research are needed to accomplish these objectives (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988).

Finally, evaluation, a crucial part of any kind of program implementation is examined. Psychoeducational programming represents an attempt to foster the intellectual and ethical development of student athletes using Perry's (1970) scheme as a means by which to measure growth or change. Therefore, program evaluation would require an analysis of the pretreatment levels of intellectual and ethical development of student athletes and of a comparison group in a nonequivalent control group design (Petitpas and Champagne, 1988). Petitpas and Champagne suggest that the comparison group be composed of students matched with student athletes with regard to age, sex, major, race, and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. Research has indicated that each matching variable has been shown to

be related to cognitive development of college students (Knefelkamp, Widick, & Parker, 1978).

Measurements could be determined via the post-testing of both groups annually through the senior year. For assessment purposes, Petitpas and Champagne suggest the use of the following instruments: the Measurement of Intellectual Development (Mines, 1982), the Student Development Task Inventory-2 (Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1979), the Career Maturity Inventory (Crites, 1973), the Freshman Transition Questionnaire (Baker & Siryk 1986), or the Social Support Inventory (Brown, Brady, Lent, Wolfert, & Hall, 1987).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects for this study would be selected from a student population at a large, public, eastern, predominantly white institution (N=35,000 undergraduates). Within this population subjects would be randomly selected from two sub-populations: Division I NCAA male student athletes; and a student population consisting of male non-student athletes. A total of 150 students (75 student athletes & 75 non-student athletes) would be matched on the basis of the following variables: sex, age, major, and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores and race.

Treatment

For the purposes of this evaluative study, the treatment in this case would consist of the actual psychoeducational approach incorporated within the administration of the academic athletic programming. An academic athletic support program based on the psychoeducational approach to programming as espoused by Guerney, Stollack, & Guerney, 1970, 1971. would be administered. The following is a synopsis of a psychoeducational model according to Guerney et. al 1970, 1971:

> **"This model emphasizes (a) the individual's desire for acquiring skills; (b) his or her capacity to learn; (c) the counselor's role as a teacher who demonstrates, models, and provides opportunities for practicing desired behaviors; and (d) the applicability of acquired skills to a broader repertoire. The psychological practitioner's role is one of 'teaching personal and interpersonal attitudes and skills which the student can apply to solve present and future psychological problems and to enhance his [or her] own and others' satisfaction with life'" (Guerney et al., 1970, p.100).**

First & Goal Program at the University of Maryland

The "First & Goal" academic support program would be implemented at the University of Maryland Athletic Department. Conceptually, the psychoeducational programming format would incorporate the services and assistance already existing at the campus. Representatives from the following centers and offices would be solicited to contribute a staff member whom would work with student-athletes for a designated period of time (8 hours a week) for the length of a given semester. The Career Development Center, Learning Assistance Services, Intensive Educational Development Services, Experiential Learning Programs, and the Office of Minority Student Education (OMSE) could all contribute, collectively, a total of 40 hours a week toward programs, workshops, encounter groups, and individual counseling for student athletes. These contributions from various resources throughout the campus would be coordinated and supervised by a "Student Athlete Development Director".

The main objective of the "First & Goal" would be to proactively facilitate student growth in student athletes with specific respect to intellectual self concepts and career maturity. Wholistic goals and objectives for the First and Goal program would set by the Student Athlete Development Director who would then delegate tasks to program members in such a manner that "integration" between offices and centers would be fostered. An important theme to be encouraged and presented as essential to both the First & Goal staff and the student athletes participants is that of unity. Ideally, First & Goal staff members would work collectively toward facilitating growth, enlightenment, skill development, and self-knowledge via a linking format. The linking programming strategy would be to emphasize the fact that the information and programs being offered are interrelated; for example, experiential learning is directly related to career development. It would be anticipated that student athletes would begin to observe the educational process as less of a fragmented collection of requirements

and obligations and more of a coordinated opportunity to learn and realistically prepare for the future.

Instruments

To assess changes in the development and career maturity of students due to the psychoeducational academic support programming used in the study, the following instruments are suggested:

The Student Development Task Inventory

The SDTI-2 (Winston, Miller, and Prince, 1979) is essentially concerned with the assessment of Chickering's (1969, 1974) vectors of developing autonomy, developing mature interpersonal relationships, and developing purpose. To assess the three vectors 140 items are indicated as either "true" or "false" and scored on three subtasks within each of the three developmental categories. The SDTI-2 can be administered individually or in groups and takes approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. The instrument was designed to assess behaviors related to task resolution for individuals between the ages of 17 and 33 years old. The premise is that mastery of the behavioral subtasks will supposedly lead to a favorable resolvement of the basic vectors. The manual indicates two-week test-retest reliability correlations for the scales ranging from 0.85 to 0.93. The alpha coefficients (internal consistency) for the nine subscales ranged from 0.45 to 0.78 indicating that the subscales need to interpreted with caution (Walsh & Betz 1985).

While Mines (1982) states that the SDTI-2 is the best data-based inventory available to assess young adult task development, limitations related to the preclusion of assessment on attitudes and cognitive complexity do exist. In addition, the scales and subscales of the SDTI-2 seem to be related which suggests that the instrument may need further refinement (Walsh & Betz, 1985).

The Career Maturity Inventory

Crites' (1978) Career Maturity Inventory is grounded upon his model of career maturity in adolescence. Crite's career development model is hierarchical; at the top, or most general, level the degree of overall career development which is categorized by four group factors. Two of these group factors describe career choice **content** and two of the group factors describe the **process** of career choices. The instrument is based on the premise that career choice is a process extending over several years and includes many related, yet different attitudes and skills. The **Attitude Scale** includes fifty true-false items. The **Competence Test** includes five parts with twenty items per section (Isaacson, 1985).

Both sections of the CMI are untimed; total estimated time for the completion of the entire test is approximately two and one-half hours. Even though the manual contends that the CMI can be used with college students, norms are not provided beyond grade twelve. Existing norm tables translate raw scores to standard scores and to percentiles. On all sections of the CMI the raw score is based on the number of correct responses. The intercorrelations among the various parts of the **Competence Test** are quite high (range of all coefficients of correlation .45 to .71, range of the means across parts .55 to .68), implying that cognitive ability may be a significant factor in the instrument. Content validity is identified on the basis that 80 percent of expert judges agreed with a majority of twelfth graders on 75 percent of the items (Isaacson, 1985).

In summary, the CMI is a well-constructed instrument that provides a wealth of information regarding both cognitive (competencies) and attitudinal career maturity. The instrument is useful and applicable for a wide variety of counseling and educational purposes.

Procedure

Selected participants included in the study (N1=75 male student athletes & N2=75 male non-student athletes) would be compared on the basis of scores derived on the Student Development Task Inventory and Career Maturity Inventory yearly. The male student athletes

involved in the study could be contacted yearly (every fall semester) via the athletic academic support unit to take the tests. This procedure could be reinforced with the official mandates of team coaches and the academic athletic director. The male non-student athletes involved in the study could be solicited to complete tests every fall semester by offering some kind of prize or incentive. Since the student athletes will be exposed to the proposed psychoeducational academic athletic support programming, it would be expected that significant variations in scores could evolve.

Hypotheses

H:O Student athletes participating in a psychoeducational academic athletic support program will show no statistically significant differences in scores derived from both the Student Development Task Inventory and Career Maturity Inventory when compared to the scores of the control group of non-student athletes.

Design

A Quasi-Experimental Design has been selected for use in this study. More specifically, the design proposed would fall into the Non-Equivalent Control group category (Campbell & Stanley 1963). The researcher would administer both the Student Development Task Inventory and Career Maturity Inventory to both student athletes and non-student athletes (control group) in their freshman year. These results would be recorded before the Psychoeducational Athletic Academic Support programming was administered to the group of student athletes (or experimental group). Afterwards, both of the instruments (SDTI-2 & CMI) would be administered to the groups of student athletes and non-student athletes every year up until graduation.

At the time of graduation for both student athletes and non-student athletes a comparison of test scores on the two instruments would be conducted. To adjust for pre-experimental differences between the groups a repeated measures analysis of covarience would be conducted on the scores obtained from both groups on the instruments taken in

their freshman year. It could be expected that the student athletes who had received the treatment (psychoeducational athletic academic support programming) might display higher growth.

Analysis

Student Development Task Inventory

Analysis procedures would be based on a 2x2 design comparing athletes to non-athletes and blacks to whites. Using a multivariate analysis of variance, the data would be analyzed on the nine subscales of the SDTI. This procedure would provide a comprehensive test of the differences between athletes and non-athletes and between blacks and whites as well as a determination of any interaction between the two independent variables. In addition, a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) would be computed to compare each subscale of the SDTI (Sowa and Gressard, 1983).

Career Maturity Inventory

Analysis procedures would be based on t-tests comparing mean CMI scores of student athletes and non-athletes, as well as comparing mean CMI scores of blacks and whites also (Kennedy and Dimick, 1987).

CHAPTER IV

IMPLICATIONS

If the results of this study indicate that psychoeducational approaches to academic athletic support programming have a significantly positive effect upon the intellectual development and career maturity of college student athletes, such findings could help foster the implementation of other academic athletic support programs grounded in psychoeducational theory and practice. Moreover, the positive results from the study could provide helpful information for student affairs professionals working with various special student populations. It could be reasoned that programs designed to assist foreign and minority students might benefit from psychoeducational programming approaches as well.

REFERENCES

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1986) . Exploratory intervention with a scale measuring adjustment to college. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 31-39.

Bayless, K., Mull, R., & Geller, W. W. (1977) . Student development in intramural sports. In national intra-mural-recreational sports association . Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Conference (pp. 19-30) . Champaign, IL: National Intramural-Recreational Sports Association.

Blann, F. W. (1985) . Intercollegiate athletic competition and students' educational and career plans. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 115-118.

Brasch, R. (1970) . How did sports begin? A look at the origins of man at play. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Brown, S. R. (1968) . Competitive athletics and character. Journal of Secondary Education, 43, 60-62.

Brown, S. J., Brady, T., Lent, R. W., Wolfert, J., & Hall, S. (1987) . Perceived social support among college students: Three studies of the psychometric characteristics and counseling uses of the Social Support Inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 337-354.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963) . Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Chartrand, J. M., & Lent, W. L. (1987) . Sports Counseling: Enhancing the development of the student-athlete. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 164-166.

Chickering, A. W. (1969) . Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, J. S. (1961) . The adolescent society. New York: The Free Press.

Crites, J. O. (1969) . Vocational psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Crites, J. O. (1973) . Career Maturity Inventory. Monterey, CA: California Test Bureau/McGraw-Hill.

Danish, S. J., & Hale, B. D. (1981) . Toward an understanding of the practice of sports psychology. Journal of Sports Psychology, 3, 90-99.

Delworth, U., & Hanson, G. R. (1980) . Student Services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Erikson, E. H. (1959) . Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. Psychological Issues Monograph, 1. New York: International Universities Press.

Guerney, G. B., Jr., Stollack, G., & Guerney, L. (1970) . A format for a new mode of psychological practice: Or how to escape a zombie. Counseling Psychologist, 2(2), 97-104.

Guerney, G. B., Jr., Stollack, G., & Guerney, L. (1971) . The practicing psychologist as educator- An alternative to the medical practitioner model. Professional Psychology, 2, 276-282.

Hirt, J., Hoffman, M. A., Sedlacek, W. E. (1983) . Attitudes toward changing sex-roles of male varsity athletes versus non-athletes: Developmental perspectives. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 33-38.

Hurley, R. B., & Cunningham, R. L. (1984) . Providing academic and psychological services for the college athlete. In A. Shriberg & F. R, Brodzinski (Eds), Rethinking services for college athletes (New Directions for Student Services. No. 28, pp. 51-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Isaacson, L. E. (1985) . Basics of career counseling. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Jordaan, J. P. (1963) . Exploratory behavior: The formulation of self and occupational concepts. In D. E. Super, R. Starishevsky, N. Matlin, & J. P. Jordaan (Eds.), Career development: Self-concept theory (pp.46-57). New York: CEEB Research Monographs.

Kennedy, S. R., & Dimick, K. M. (1987) . Career Maturity and professional sports expectations of college football and basketball players Journal College Student Personnel, 28, 293-297.

Knefelkamp, L., Widick, C., & Parker, C. A. (Eds.) (1978). New directions for student services: Applying new developmental findings. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Leach, B., & Conners, B. (1984). Pygmalion on the gridiron: The black student athlete at the White university. In A. Shriberg & F. R. Brodzinski (Eds.), Rethinking services for college athletes (New Directions for Student Services, No. 28, pp. 31-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leerksen, C., & Cuccio, J. (1982, September). Jocks: The pampered peons. Newsweek, pp. 31-32.

LeUnes, A., & Nation, J. R. (1983) . Saturday's heros: A psychological portrait of college football players. Journal of Sports Behavior, 5, 139-14944.

Malmisur, M. C. (1976) . Ego development stages of a sample of college football players. Research Quarterly, 47, 148-153.

Marcia, J. E. (1966) . Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.

Ogilvie, B. C., & Tutko, T. A. (1971) . Sport: If you want to build character, try something else. Psychology Today, 5(5), pp. 60-63.

Pease, J. M. (1971) . Separation of athletes from the student body. In E. S. Stietz (Ed.), Administration of athletics in colleges and universities (Vol. 1. pp. 197-204). Washington D.C: American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Perry, W. (1970) . Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Petitpas, A., & Champagne, D. E., (1988) . Developmental programming for intercollegiate athletes. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 454-460.

Petitpas, A. (1981) . The identity development of the male intercollegiate athlete (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 2508A

Purdy, D. A., Eitzen, D. S., & Hufnagel, R. (1982) . Are athletes also students? The educational attainment of college students. Social Problems, 29, 439-448.

Remer, R., Tongate, F. A., & Watson, J. (1978) . Athletes: Counseling the over privileged minority. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 626-629.

Renick, J. (1974) . The use and misuse of college athletics. Journal of Higher Education, 45, 545-552.

Schendel, J. S. (1965) . Psychological differences between athletes and non-participants in athletics at three educational levels. Research Quarterly, 36, 52-67.

Schafer, W. (1971) . Sport socialization and the school. Paper presented at the Third International Symposium on the Sociology of Sport, Waterloo.

Shueman, S. A., & Sedlacek, W. E. Measuring sexist attitudes in a situational context. Research Report 16-77. College Park; University of Maryland, 1977.

Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. F. (1983) . Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 236-239.

Super, D. E., (1957) . The psychology of careers. New York: Harper & Row.

Tiedeman, D. V., & O'Hara, R. P. (1963) . Career development: Choice and adjustment. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Walsh, B. W., & Betz, N. E. (1985) . Tests and assessments. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

White, R. (1975) . Lives in progress (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Winston, R. B., Jr., Miller, T. K., & Prince, J.S. (1979) . Assessing student development. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Yiannakis, A. (1981, April). Manipulative socialization in intercollegiate athletics: Some initial observations. Paper presented at the national convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Boston.