5-2012

A Comparison of the Visual Branding of the University of Tennessee to the University of Minnesota and Clemson University

Jasmine Au
jau@utk.edu

A Comparison of the Visual Branding of the University of Tennessee to the University of Minnesota and Clemson University

Jasmine L. Au

Faculty Thesis Advisor: Cindy Raines

College of Business Administration – Department of Marketing & Logistics

Global Leadership Scholars – Class of 2012

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

THESIS ADVISOR SIGNATURE APPROVAL PAGE

TO THE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP SCHOLARS PROGRAM:

As GLS Thesis Faculty Advisor for _____,

I have read this paper and find it satisfactory.

_____

GLS Thesis Faculty Advisor

_____

Date

ABSTRACT

The report compares the visual branding of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to the University of Minnesota and Clemson University to determine whether or not there are any significant branding trends that differentiate the latter two schools and help them achieve *US News* Top 25 rankings. The paper includes a literature review of historical branding practices in higher education and definitions of commonly used terms, as well as statistical analysis of the survey tool used to identify any potential trends among the schools. Though no significant patterns were detected by the survey in regards to academic, athletic, and social life associations of each school's logo set, this research can help campus leadership know that visual branding choices are not something that needs to be entirely reworked in the University of Tennessee's quest for Top 25 status. However, as visibly evident in the research tool itself and as discussed by external marketing firm Lipman Hearne, the University must work to create a more cohesive set of brand images that reflect the goals as the state's flagship, public research university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

With today's constant availability of information and the increasing cost of higher education, the competition among colleges for admissions and donations has become fiercer than ever. Schools are turning to revamped advertising and branding campaigns to set themselves apart, but gauging the success of these campaigns can be tricky. Without attracting the best performing students, the future of the university can be at risk.

The University of Tennessee is especially cognizant of this risk, as it battles for recognition on a national scale. In January 2010, former Tennessee governor Phil Bredesen challenged Chancellor Jimmy Cheek to turn UT Knoxville into a *US News* Top 25 public research university, and the Chancellor's Office is actively working towards achieving this goal. Part of this endeavor includes exploring the branding of the University; in order to better understand this sphere, UT's Office of Creative Communications brought in marketing firm Lipman Hearne in April 2010 for a more objective view on the topic.

This paper will expound on their findings by comparing the visual branding of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK) to the University of Minnesota (U of M) and Clemson University. These schools were recognized by the Chancellor's Office as peer institutions in their preliminary research, as they've both moved into the *US News* Top 25 in the past five years (Cheek, 2011). In order to effectively compete among these schools and others, every facet of university ranking must be analyzed; perhaps if UTK can alter their branding efforts to better match the strategies of their peers, they can more rapidly rise to the Top 25.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This review covers the history of research in significant branding practices in higher education as well as definitions for commonly used operational terms.

Historical Overview

Research in the branding of higher education has picked up only recently, as universities have recognized the need for more consistent communication to be competitive (Chapleo, 2010). Areas that have already been explored include visual identity, brand reputation, corporate brand management, and integrated marketing communication applications (Alessandri, Yang, & Kinsey, 2006; Priporas and Kamenidou, 2011; Balmer, Liao, & Wang, 2010; Edmiston-Strasser, 2009). The studies that most reflect the aims of this one are "An Integrative Approach to University Visual Identity and Reputation" by Alessandri, Yang, and Kinsey (written about Syracuse University), and the "Branding UTK" presentation prepared by UT Creative Services based on the findings of external firm Lipman Hearne.

A different study by Lipman Hearne (as cited in Edmiston-Strasser, 2009) exposes the vast difference in marketing spending in public versus private universities. Their 2007 report found that "only 10% of public [institutions of higher education] spend $1 million or more on their marketing and communications budget (compared to 16% for private [institutions of higher education])". This discrepancy helps explain the difference in high levels of brand equity of private universities (e.g. Harvard, Stanford) compared to most public institutions.

Because this paper is focusing on the University of Tennessee, the research completed by UT Creative Services must be acknowledged. Their assessment found that UTK's brand strengths are a "large brand awareness… sense of belonging and tradition,… [growing] research, [and a] student-focused culture;" weaknesses included the "identity [of the UT] system, decentralized marketing structure…, 'volunteer identity'…, [and thematically defining] research" (UT Creative Services, 2011). After discussing UT's mission and positioning, the firm defined its personality as, "the tireless Volunteer, ready to stand up for what's right" with the payoff as "I am a force to be reckoned with" (UT Creative Services, 2011). The report touched on a few visual branding aspects, such as UT-themed color palette and sample typography.

As the flagship campus, the Creative Communications Office in Knoxville manages the branding of the entire UT system. They describe that the "only logo approved to represent the University of Tennessee, apart from athletic symbols, is the stylized treatment of the letters 'U' and 'T' incorporating the shape of the state in the crossbar of the 'T'" and that "the UT logo, wordmark, seal, and official athletic symbols are the only graphics approved to represent the university" (University of Tennessee, 2011). Though such stringent rules exist regarding branding permissions, the UT brand is still cluttered with unofficial products and confused with the powerful athletic communications.

Terms

As the market for higher education becomes more competitive, universities must utilize branding to distinguish themselves from competitors. However, many schools are

affected by their years-old reputations, which may conflict with the brand promoted on campus and beyond. The variables involved in this interaction are the brand, visual identity, and university reputation. Each will be discussed as individual variables in the paragraphs below.

According to Lencastre and Corte-Real, a brand is "composed of three interrelated pillars, each one with its own mix of elements: (1) the identity pillar with its mix of signs and covered brands, (2) the marketing pillar with its mix of products and marketing actions and (3) the response pillar with its mix of markets and various kinds of cognitive, affective and behavioral responses" (2010).

Applied to the discussion of university brand management, the 'mix of products' can mean the mix of academics, athletics, and alumni relations that belong to a school; a university brand can also be designed to represent the student experience. Bennett and Ali-Choudhury define a university brand as "a manifestation of the institution's features that distinguish it from others, reflect its capacity to satisfy students' needs, engender trust in its ability to deliver a certain type and level of higher education, and help potential recruits make enrollment decisions" (2009). The same article goes on to list the following items as visual, tangible symbols of the university brand: "name, logos, typefaces, color schemes, stationery, forms, ...vehicles, and premises" (Bennett & Ali-Choudhury, 2009).

To manage brands and reputations, schools are beginning to use corporate branding methods (Balmer, Liao, and Wu, 2010). "By auditing the gaps between brand identity and brand reputation, managers can identify strategies to minimize incongruency and develop more powerful brands; it is concluded that brand reality is an important

aspect of branding" (de Chernatony, 1999). Managers must learn to work with the reality of their university in order to capitalize on its brand.

A huge part of a university's brand is its visual identity to the public. Schools have historically used different visual representation for their academic and athletic spheres (Alessandri et al., 2006), as "a university's image is likely to differ among groups, since 'images are thought to be related to members' and non-members' affective and behavioral responses to the organization'" (Treadwell & Harrison, 1994; Alessandri et al., 2006). This difference is key in the implications of this paper, as the research tool will determine the strength of academic versus athletic and social associations of visual media.

Though brand design devices have already been listed above, visual identity differs as it's composed of "the complete set of architectural, audiovisual, ceremonial, sartorial, print, and promotional artifacts that symbolically identify schools, colleges and universities" (Masiki, 2011). These various visual representations are important, as they become symbols for the intangible value of a college experience (Bennett & Ali-Choudhury, 2009).

Universities are going beyond the classroom to develop a reputation now, as school is "a place where students can go not only to learn, but also to live well… Conceptually, a university's identity is its strategically planned and purposeful presentation of itself in order to gain a positive image in the minds of the public" (Alessandri et al., 2006). However, reputations created by non-university personnel can have more powerful effects than thousands of dollars spent on brand management.

SURVEY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Tool

This study explores the link between visual branding and association with academics, athletics, and social life. In order to study this relationship into its effect on the *US News* Top 25 rankings, this paper used a survey to compare the University of Tennessee to the University of Minnesota and Clemson University. This research tool included four logos for each school and asked respondents about the degree of their agreement with how each was associated with academics, athletics, or social life. Each school's group of logos included their official seal and at least one symbol typically used with athletics. The survey also asked respondents if they were students at each university, as well as collecting demographic data about gender, age, and education level. The full survey tool can be found as an attachment to this document.

The advantage of this research tool lies primarily in its ease of use. From a researcher's perspective, it is easy to design a list of questions that specifically pertain to the issue at hand. Using the internet also makes it easy to seek out a sample through email and social media. Finally, collecting the results of an online survey is simple through download into analytics software. Surveys are also convenient for the sample, since they can be completed quickly (compared to data collection methods like interviews and focus groups); utilizing an online survey is also expedient for the sample as it can be completed at any time within a specified window.

Though easy to use for both researcher and sample, surveys can be disadvantageous by quickly oversimplifying things. The straightforward questions in the

research tool used may not cover the exact feelings of the sample, or they may not even touch of any relevant topics at all. The sample may also fill out the survey without enough concern for validity or completeness, which can skew the results in ways that don't match the actual opinion of a population.

Sampling Criteria

The research tool was presented and distributed online to the sample. Because of their understanding of the importance of marketing research, the link for the survey was provided to sections of Consumer Behavior and Marketing Analytics classes at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The online link was also provided to a wide audience via Facebook, presented as an event to attend while the survey was available for data collection. All distribution outlets were geared towards students who have completed some college (at least) and are likely to be most familiar with the University of Tennessee's brand identity.

RESULTS

Sample Defined

Seventy-five survey results were collected between November 2, 2011 and November 5, 2011; most respondents completed the survey in its entirety, while others only completed a few sections. Because the tool was segmented by university images, the incompletion will not affect the conclusions of the separate schools. The following describes the demographics of the surveyed respondents (using valid percentages):

- Student status
  - 90.7% were students at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville
  - 0% were students at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
  - 0% were students at Clemson University

- Gender
  - 45.2% male
  - 54.8% female

- Age
  - 77.4% age 18-21
  - 21.0% age 22-25
  - 1.6% age 26-30

- Education level
  - 9.7% had a High School diploma or GED
  - 72.6% had completed some college
  - 1.6% had obtained a 2-year college degree
  - 12.9% had obtained a 4-year college degree
  - 3.2% had obtained a Master's degree
  - 0% had obtained a Doctoral or professional degree

General Survey Output

The survey data is included in its entirety in the appendix (shown through frequency tables in Figure Set 1). In order to determine the level of association of each logo with academics, athletics, or social life, the summed valid percentages of "agree"

and “strongly agree” are listed for each variable below. The highest percentage association has been boldfaced.

School/Logo	Academic Association	Athletic Association	Social Life Association
University of Tennessee			
System Logo	**63.5%**	39.2%	27.0%
Power T	12.2%	**98.7%**	56.7%
University Seal	**93.2%**	12.2%	5.4%
Volunteer Symbol	0.0%	**70.2%**	14.9%
University of Minnesota			
Block M	11.1%	**44.4%**	7.9%
Block M/Goldy Gopher	3.2%	**50.7%**	22.3%
University Seal	**79.4%**	1.6%	0.0%
University Wordmark	**71.4%**	0.0%	0.0%
Clemson University			
Wordmark	**51.6%**	14.5%	12.9%
Tiger Paw Print	6.4%	**53.2%**	27.4%
University Seal	**58.0%**	0.0%	1.6%
Wordmark with Paw Print	35.5%	**43.5%**	25.8%

As shown in the chart, the set of UTK logos have the strongest associations (with the Power T’s athletic association being the highest of the entire data set). All three schools have two logos highly associated with academics and two highly associated with athletics; none of the logos were highly linked with social life.

Specific Survey Output - Statistical Analysis

This research project aims to explore the trends of the visual branding of Top 25 universities compared to the University of Tennessee, so the following questions were posed to determine if any significant opinion patterns exist.

- Is the average opinion of the University of Tennessee's separate logos different depending on whether or not the respondent is a student at UT?
    - Null hypothesis: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$
    - Alternative hypothesis: $\mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$
    - Assume α (significance level) = .05
    - To answer the research question, an independent sample t-test was used to compare the means of the survey output. The only logo associations that were significantly different based on whether the respondent was a UT student or not were the athletic association of the UT system logo and the athletic association of the Power T. Full statistical output can be found in Figure Set 2 in the appendix.

- Is the average athletic association of each university's primary athletic logo (Power T for the University of Tennessee, Block M with Goldy Gopher for the University of Minnesota, and the paw print for Clemson University) independent of gender?
    - Null hypothesis: μ of athletic associations of UT 2, UM 2, and C2 are independent of gender variable
    - Alternative hypothesis: μ of athletic associations of UT 2, UM 2, and C2 are dependent of gender variable
    - Assume α (significance level) = .05
    - A chi-square test of independence was used to determine the existence of a relationship between athletic association and gender. All three significance values were greater than α, so the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no significant dependence between athletic association and gender. However, if α was set at .10, there would be a significant relationship for Clemson University's paw print. Full statistical output can be found in Figure Set 3 in the appendix.

- Is the average association (academic, athletic, or social) about any of the different logos dependent on age of respondents?
    - Null hypothesis: μ of all separate associations of all logos are independent of age
    - Alternative hypothesis: μ of all separate associations of all logos are dependent of age
    - Assume α (significance level) = .05
    - After running a chi-square test of independence, the following logo associations were found to be significantly dependent on age: UTK Volunteer association with athletics, U of M Block M with Goldy Gopher association with social life, U of M Wordmark association with social life, and the Clemson paw print association with social life. Full statistical output can be found in Figure Set 4 in the appendix.

CONCLUSIONS

After examining the frequency tables and running statistical analysis on the survey output, there do not seem to be any substantial differences between the visual branding of the University of Tennessee and its higher-ranked, peer institutions. Though this research study has not isolated any trends that set the Top 25 schools apart from UTK in terms of logo usage, it does suggest that visual branding is not something that must be reworked to achieve a higher ranking.

Though there are not any overarching trends identified by this paper, a few nuances of the visual branding of the peer schools are worth mentioning. As previously stated, all three schools have two logos highly associated with academics and two highly associated with athletics. One of the University of Minnesota's logos highly associated with academics is its wordmark that features the brand message "Driven to Discover." The university website states that it uses this message to identify its brand because

> "it captures our search for knowledge and our drive to share that search with students and the larger community. 'Discover' is used here in the broadest sense. It includes not only the findings of scientists, but also the innovations of engineers and designers, and the self-discovery of artists and community leaders" (University of Minnesota, 2011).

These statements not only effectively describe the ambition of everyone involved with U of M, but they also encapsulate all the different types of academic achievement that the university encourages. To balance out the strong athletic associations of University of Tennessee logos, a clearly defined brand message like 'Dream to Discover' could make the academic sphere of the school more prominent. UT Creative Services proposed the

following taglines for the university in their "Branding UTK" presentation: Beacon Shining Bright (taken from the Alma Mater), The Power of T (a play on words of the athletic symbol), Big Orange, Big Ideas (a nod to the bold school color), and Inspire, Imagine, Invent (2011). Because of the strong athletic associations with the Power T and color orange, 'Beacon Shining Bright' or 'Inspire, Imagine, Invent' would suggest a more academic brand than the other taglines.

As the University of Tennessee seeks to emphasize its role in higher education rather than athletics, it may want to emphasize the University Seal as it received such a high academic association. However, the system-wide policy is to only use it "only for formal and official communications, such as diplomas, certificates, legal documents and communications from the Board of Trustees" (University of Tennessee, 2011). Perhaps, if the policy were eased to extend the seal's use to other outlets, it would be more visible and make academics more resonant with the UTK brand. However, extended use of the symbol might diminish the felt importance of the official documents and correspondence it currently marks.

Though not asked about explicitly in the survey tool, it is visibly evident that both the University of Minnesota and Clemson University have more cohesive visual branding compared to the University of Tennessee. This fact was touched on in the Lipman Hearne assessment, as the university's current messaging includes "a variety of individual messages, taglines, and branded initiatives within units, few of which ladder up to a larger university brand that expresses UTK's ethos, achievements, and goals" (2011). Though current leadership may cite the university's large size and breadth of offerings as a deterrent in managing a cohesive brand, their peer institutions have succeeded despite

their size; in order to better compete with these schools and others, UTK must "create the desired 'branded house' versus a 'house of brands' (Lipman Hearne, 2011).

LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

The main challenges of this research study were the small sample of existing material on the topic and the reach of the survey tool. The branding of higher education has just recently been explored by campus leadership and external firms, as evidenced by the list of referenced material within the past twenty years. Due to the limited scope of academic research on this specific issue, many articles on the similar topic of institutional and corporate branding were consulted.

The other challenge of this project was the reach of the survey tool—in both number of respondents surveyed and types of questions asked. As stated earlier, most respondents were students at UTK, making them far more exposed and biased to their alma mater's brand associations. Being current college students, the majority of the respondents fell in the 18-21 age range and the 'some college' education level. The significant dependence between age and some of the logo associations can be attributed to the single older respondent, which skewed the output to suggest a trend that was merely based on an outlier.

The other issue with reach was the specificity of the survey questions themselves. Though designed to make the survey easy and quick to respond to, the actual output was fragmented and difficult to analyze (as there weren't any direct comparison-type questions to look at).

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The topic of branding higher education will continue to be more relevant in the future, as competition for students, funds, and attention becomes even tougher. Due to this trend, further research is necessary to continued development as new issues arise. Improvements to this project and suggestions for future research lie in the research tool itself.

While a literature review was helpful for framing the subject, the survey itself was most important to the actual findings of the project. If run again, it should be distributed more widely (to a more diverse crowd in terms of age, education level, and geography) to better gauge the opinion of as many of the separate schools' stakeholders as possible. Focus groups or interviews may also prove helpful in addition to the survey tool, as Lipman Hearne found them useful when developing their plan of action for UTK.

REFERENCES CITED

Alessandri, S., Yang, S., & Kinsey, D. (2006). An integrative approach to university visual identity and reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *9*(4), 258-270. doi:10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550033.

Balmer, J. T., Mei-Na, L., & Wei-Yue, W. (2010). Corporate brand identification and corporate brand management: how top business schools do it. *Journal Of General Management*, *35*(4), 77-102.

Bennett, R., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2009). Prospective students' perceptions of university brands: an empirical study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *19*(1), 85-107. doi:10.1080/08841240902905445.

Chapleo, C. (2011). Exploring rationales for branding a university: Should we be seeking to measure branding in UK universities?. *Journal Of Brand Management*, *18*(6), 411-422. doi:10.1057/bm.2010.53

Cheek, J. (2011, Feb.). Advancing the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to the top 25 [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://www.utk.edu/volvision-top25/resources/top-25-board-presentation.pdf

de Chernatony, L. (1999). Brand management through narrowing the gap between brand identity and brand reputation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *15*(1-3), 157-179.

Edmiston-Strasser, D. M. (2009). An examination of integrated marketing communication in U.S. public institutions of higher education. *Journal of Marketing For Higher Education*, *19*(2), 142-165. doi:10.1080/08841240903423166

Fombrun, C.J. and Van Riel, C.B.M. (2003) *Fame & Fortune: How Successful Companies Build Winning Reputations*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ. Print.

LeBlanc, G. & Nguyen, N. (1996). Cues used by customers evaluating corporate image in service firms: An empirical study in financial institutions. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7(2), 44-56.

Lencastre, P., & Côrte-Real, A. (2010). One, two, three: A practical brand anatomy. *Journal of Brand Management*, *17*(6), 399-412. doi:10.1057/bm.2010.1.

Masiki, T. (2011). Academic Visual Identity (AVI): an act of symbolic leadership. *Journal Of Marketing For Higher Education*, *21*(1), 85-105. doi:10.1080/08841241.2011.569591

Priporas, C., & Kamenidou, I. (2011). Perceptions of potential postgraduate Greek business students towards UK universities, brand and brand reputation. *Journal Of Brand Management*, *18*(4/5), 264-273. doi:10.1057/bm.2010.40

Treadwell, D.F. & Harrison, T.M. (1994). *Conceptualizing and assessing organizational image: Model images, commitment, and communication,* Communication Monographs, v. (March).

University of Minnesota. (2011, Oct. 27). Our brand: how to convey it. Retrieved from http://www1.umn.edu/brand/requirements-and-guidelines/discover/index.php

UT Creative Services. (2011). Branding UTK [Powerpoint slides].

University of Tennessee – Graphic Standards Committee. (2011). Graphic identity standards: the university seal. Retrieved from http://www.tennessee.edu/identity/seal.html

University of Tennessee – Graphic Standards Committee. (2011). Graphic identity standards: UT logo. Retrieved from http://www.tennessee.edu/identity/logo.html

APPENDIX

FIGURE SET 1

Frequencies

Statistics

		UT 1 academics	UT 1 athletics	UT 1 social life	UT 2 academics
N	Valid	74	74	74	74
	Missing	1	1	1	1
Mean		5.55	4.58	4.08	3.58
Median		6.00	5.00	5.00	3.00
Mode		6	5[a]	5	5
Skewness		-1.583	-.464	-.306	.017
Std. Error of Skewness		.279	.279	.279	.279
Kurtosis		2.458	-.988	-1.234	-1.325
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.552	.552	.552	.552

Statistics

		UT 2 athletics	UT 2 social life	UT 3 academics	UT 3 athletics
N	Valid	74	74	74	74
	Missing	1	1	1	1
Mean		6.77	5.43	6.57	2.61
Median		7.00	6.00	7.00	2.50
Mode		7	6	7	1
Skewness		-1.752	-1.262	-2.411	.483
Std. Error of Skewness		.279	.279	.279	.279
Kurtosis		2.182	2.251	6.715	-.695
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.552	.552	.552	.552

Statistics

		UT 3 social life	UT 4 academics	UT 4 athletics	UT 4 social life
N	Valid	74	74	74	74
	Missing	1	1	1	1
Mean		2.91	2.65	5.91	4.01
Median		3.00	2.50	6.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	7	5
Skewness		.366	.322	-1.413	-.269
Std. Error of Skewness		.279	.279	.279	.279
Kurtosis		-.881	-.925	1.993	-.636

Statistics

		UT 3 social life	UT 4 academics	UT 4 athletics	UT 4 social life
N	Valid	74	74	74	74
	Missing	1	1	1	1
Mean		2.91	2.65	5.91	4.01
Median		3.00	2.50	6.00	4.00
Mode		2	2	7	5
Skewness		.366	.322	-1.413	-.269
Std. Error of Skewness		.279	.279	.279	.279
Kurtosis		-.881	-.925	1.993	-.636
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.552	.552	.552	.552

Statistics

		UM 1 academics	UM 1 athletics	UM 1 social life	UM 2 academics
N	Valid	63	63	63	63
	Missing	12	12	12	12
Mean		3.97	5.13	3.95	3.19
Median		4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		4	6	4	4
Skewness		-.237	-.368	-.616	.079
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.302	.302	.302
Kurtosis		.359	-.212	.540	-.554
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.595	.595	.595	.595

Statistics

		UM 2 athletics	UM 2 social life	UM 3 academics	UM 3 athletics
N	Valid	63	63	63	63
	Missing	12	12	12	12
Mean		5.35	4.43	6.11	2.71
Median		6.00	4.00	7.00	3.00
Mode		6	4	7	4
Skewness		-.316	.064	-1.761	.422
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.302	.302	.302
Kurtosis		-.593	-.187	3.815	-.146
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.595	.595	.595	.595

Statistics

		UM 3 social life	UM 4 academics	UM 4 athletics	UM 4 social life
N	Valid	63	63	63	63
	Missing	12	12	12	12
Mean		2.76	6.00	2.73	3.06
Median		3.00	6.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		4	7	4	4
Skewness		.029	-.761	.032	-.332
Std. Error of Skewness		.302	.302	.302	.302
Kurtosis		-1.233	-.944	-1.360	-1.129
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.595	.595	.595	.595

Statistics

		C 1 academics	C 1 athletics	C 1 social life	C 2 academics
N	Valid	62	62	62	62
	Missing	13	13	13	13
Mean		5.48	4.16	4.05	3.18
Median		6.00	4.00	4.00	3.00
Mode		6	5	4	4
Skewness		-.059	-.366	-.278	.257
Std. Error of Skewness		.304	.304	.304	.304
Kurtosis		-.993	-.527	-.020	-.682
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.599	.599	.599	.599

Statistics

		C 2 athletics	C 2 social life	C 3 academics	C 3 athletics
N	Valid	62	62	62	62
	Missing	13	13	13	13
Mean		6.32	4.61	5.63	2.82
Median		7.00	5.00	6.00	3.00
Mode		7	4	6	4
Skewness		-1.282	-.613	-.428	-.039
Std. Error of Skewness		.304	.304	.304	.304
Kurtosis		.981	.568	-.777	-1.101
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.599	.599	.599	.599

Statistics

		C 3 social life	C 4 academics	C 4 athletics	C 4 social life
N	Valid	62	62	62	62
	Missing	13	13	13	13
Mean		3.47	4.92	5.26	4.42
Median		4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
Mode		4	5	5	4
Skewness		-.326	-.252	-.273	-.305
Std. Error of Skewness		.304	.304	.304	.304
Kurtosis		-.736	-.472	-.311	-.151
Std. Error of Kurtosis		.599	.599	.599	.599

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Frequency Table

UT 1 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.7	2.7	2.7
	Disagree	4	5.3	5.4	8.1
	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.4	9.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	2	2.7	2.7	12.2
	Agree Somewhat	18	24.0	24.3	36.5
	Agree	29	38.7	39.2	75.7
	Strongly Agree	18	24.0	24.3	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 1 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	8.0	8.1	8.1
	Disagree	7	9.3	9.5	17.6
	Disagree Somewhat	12	16.0	16.2	33.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	3	4.0	4.1	37.8

	Agree Somewhat	17	22.7	23.0	60.8
	Agree	17	22.7	23.0	83.8
	Strongly Agree	12	16.0	16.2	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 1 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	10.7	10.8	10.8
	Disagree	14	18.7	18.9	29.7
	Disagree Somewhat	5	6.7	6.8	36.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	8	10.7	10.8	47.3
	Agree Somewhat	19	25.3	25.7	73.0
	Agree	16	21.3	21.6	94.6
	Strongly Agree	4	5.3	5.4	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 2 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	10	13.3	13.5	13.5
	Disagree	17	22.7	23.0	36.5
	Disagree Somewhat	11	14.7	14.9	51.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	3	4.0	4.1	55.4
	Agree Somewhat	24	32.0	32.4	87.8
	Agree	7	9.3	9.5	97.3
	Strongly Agree	2	2.7	2.7	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 2 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.4	1.4
	Agree	15	20.0	20.3	21.6
	Strongly Agree	58	77.3	78.4	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 2 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.7	2.7	2.7
	Disagree	1	1.3	1.4	4.1
	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.4	5.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	11	14.7	14.9	20.3
	Agree Somewhat	17	22.7	23.0	43.2
	Agree	28	37.3	37.8	81.1
	Strongly Agree	14	18.7	18.9	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 3 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.4	1.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	2	2.7	2.7	4.1
	Agree Somewhat	2	2.7	2.7	6.8
	Agree	18	24.0	24.3	31.1
	Strongly Agree	51	68.0	68.9	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	

Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 3 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	20	26.7	27.0	27.0
	Disagree	17	22.7	23.0	50.0
	Disagree Somewhat	19	25.3	25.7	75.7
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	9	12.0	12.2	87.8
	Agree Somewhat	8	10.7	10.8	98.6
	Agree	1	1.3	1.4	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 3 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	16	21.3	21.6	21.6
	Disagree	18	24.0	24.3	45.9
	Disagree Somewhat	13	17.3	17.6	63.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	15	20.0	20.3	83.8
	Agree Somewhat	8	10.7	10.8	94.6
	Agree	4	5.3	5.4	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 4 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	16	21.3	21.6	21.6
	Disagree	21	28.0	28.4	50.0
	Disagree Somewhat	17	22.7	23.0	73.0

	Neither Disagree nor Agree	13	17.3	17.6	90.5
	Agree Somewhat	7	9.3	9.5	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 4 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	3	4.0	4.1	4.1
	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.4	5.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	4	5.3	5.4	10.8
	Agree Somewhat	14	18.7	18.9	29.7
	Agree	22	29.3	29.7	59.5
	Strongly Agree	30	40.0	40.5	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UT 4 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	6.7	6.8	6.8
	Disagree	11	14.7	14.9	21.6
	Disagree Somewhat	8	10.7	10.8	32.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	18	24.0	24.3	56.8
	Agree Somewhat	21	28.0	28.4	85.1
	Agree	8	10.7	10.8	95.9
	Strongly Agree	3	4.0	4.1	100.0
	Total	74	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.3		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 1 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	4.0	4.8	4.8
	Disagree	8	10.7	12.7	17.5
	Disagree Somewhat	3	4.0	4.8	22.2
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	32	42.7	50.8	73.0
	Agree Somewhat	10	13.3	15.9	88.9
	Agree	5	6.7	7.9	96.8
	Strongly Agree	2	2.7	3.2	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 1 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.6	4.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	19	25.3	30.2	34.9
	Agree Somewhat	13	17.3	20.6	55.6
	Agree	21	28.0	33.3	88.9
	Strongly Agree	7	9.3	11.1	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 1 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Disagree	8	10.7	12.7	15.9
	Disagree Somewhat	2	2.7	3.2	19.0
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	35	46.7	55.6	74.6
	Agree Somewhat	11	14.7	17.5	92.1
	Agree	5	6.7	7.9	100.0

	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 2 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	5.3	6.3	6.3
	Disagree	18	24.0	28.6	34.9
	Disagree Somewhat	11	14.7	17.5	52.4
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	24	32.0	38.1	90.5
	Agree Somewhat	4	5.3	6.3	96.8
	Agree	2	2.7	3.2	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 2 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	1.3	1.6	1.6
	Disagree Somewhat	1	1.3	1.6	3.2
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	17	22.7	27.0	30.2
	Agree Somewhat	12	16.0	19.0	49.2
	Agree	20	26.7	31.7	81.0
	Strongly Agree	12	16.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 2 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	6.7	7.9	7.9
	Disagree Somewhat	5	6.7	7.9	15.9

	Neither Disagree nor Agree	28	37.3	44.4	60.3
	Agree Somewhat	11	14.7	17.5	77.8
	Agree	11	14.7	17.5	95.2
	Strongly Agree	3	4.0	4.8	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 3 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	1.6	1.6
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	8	10.7	12.7	14.3
	Agree Somewhat	4	5.3	6.3	20.6
	Agree	18	24.0	28.6	49.2
	Strongly Agree	32	42.7	50.8	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 3 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	20.0	23.8	23.8
	Disagree	16	21.3	25.4	49.2
	Disagree Somewhat	9	12.0	14.3	63.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	20	26.7	31.7	95.2
	Agree Somewhat	2	2.7	3.2	98.4
	Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 3 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	14.7	17.5	17.5
	Disagree	19	25.3	30.2	47.6
	Disagree Somewhat	10	13.3	15.9	63.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	20	26.7	31.7	95.2
	Agree Somewhat	3	4.0	4.8	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 4 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither Disagree nor Agree	12	16.0	19.0	19.0
	Agree Somewhat	6	8.0	9.5	28.6
	Agree	15	20.0	23.8	52.4
	Strongly Agree	30	40.0	47.6	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 4 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	20.0	23.8	23.8
	Disagree	15	20.0	23.8	47.6
	Disagree Somewhat	9	12.0	14.3	61.9
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	20	26.7	31.7	93.7
	Agree Somewhat	4	5.3	6.3	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

UM 4 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	9	12.0	14.3	14.3
	Disagree	14	18.7	22.2	36.5
	Disagree Somewhat	9	12.0	14.3	50.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	26	34.7	41.3	92.1
	Agree Somewhat	5	6.7	7.9	100.0
	Total	63	84.0	100.0	
Missing	System	12	16.0		
Total		75	100.0		

C 1 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither Disagree nor Agree	12	16.0	19.4	19.4
	Agree Somewhat	18	24.0	29.0	48.4
	Agree	22	29.3	35.5	83.9
	Strongly Agree	10	13.3	16.1	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 1 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	1.6	1.6
	Disagree	6	8.0	9.7	11.3
	Disagree Somewhat	11	14.7	17.7	29.0
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	17	22.7	27.4	56.5
	Agree Somewhat	18	24.0	29.0	85.5
	Agree	9	12.0	14.5	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 1 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Disagree	7	9.3	11.3	14.5
	Disagree Somewhat	7	9.3	11.3	25.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	25	33.3	40.3	66.1
	Agree Somewhat	13	17.3	21.0	87.1
	Agree	7	9.3	11.3	98.4
	Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 2 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	10	13.3	16.1	16.1
	Disagree	14	18.7	22.6	38.7
	Disagree Somewhat	10	13.3	16.1	54.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	16	21.3	25.8	80.6
	Agree Somewhat	8	10.7	12.9	93.5
	Agree	3	4.0	4.8	98.4
	Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 2 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Neither Disagree nor Agree	4	5.3	6.5	6.5
	Agree Somewhat	5	6.7	8.1	14.5
	Agree	20	26.7	32.3	46.8
	Strongly Disagree	33	44.0	53.2	100.0

	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 2 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Disagree	3	4.0	4.8	8.1
	Disagree Somewhat	3	4.0	4.8	12.9
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	21	28.0	33.9	46.8
	Agree Somewhat	16	21.3	25.8	72.6
	Agree	14	18.7	22.6	95.2
	Strongly Agree	3	4.0	4.8	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 3 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree Somewhat	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	10	13.3	16.1	19.4
	Agree Somewhat	14	18.7	22.6	41.9
	Agree	19	25.3	30.6	72.6
	Strongly Agree	17	22.7	27.4	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 3 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	14.7	17.7	17.7
	Disagree	15	20.0	24.2	41.9

	Disagree Somewhat	14	18.7	22.6	64.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	18	24.0	29.0	93.5
	Agree Somewhat	4	5.3	6.5	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 3 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	5.3	6.5	6.5
	Disagree	12	16.0	19.4	25.8
	Disagree Somewhat	11	14.7	17.7	43.5
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	22	29.3	35.5	79.0
	Agree Somewhat	12	16.0	19.4	98.4
	Agree	1	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 4 academics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	2.7	3.2	3.2
	Disagree Somewhat	6	8.0	9.7	12.9
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	15	20.0	24.2	37.1
	Agree Somewhat	17	22.7	27.4	64.5
	Agree	16	21.3	25.8	90.3
	Strongly Agree	6	8.0	9.7	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 4 athletics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	1	1.3	1.6	1.6
	Disagree Somewhat	2	2.7	3.2	4.8
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	14	18.7	22.6	27.4
	Agree Somewhat	18	24.0	29.0	56.5
	Agree	17	22.7	27.4	83.9
	Strongly Agree	10	13.3	16.1	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

C 4 social life

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	1.3	1.6	1.6
	Disagree	4	5.3	6.5	8.1
	Disagree Somewhat	6	8.0	9.7	17.7
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	25	33.3	40.3	58.1
	Agree Somewhat	10	13.3	16.1	74.2
	Agree	15	20.0	24.2	98.4
	Strongly Agree	1	1.3	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	82.7	100.0	
Missing	System	13	17.3		
Total		75	100.0		

FIGURE SET 2

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	
		F	Sig.
UT 1 academics	Equal variances assumed	4.657	.034
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 1 athletics	Equal variances assumed	11.162	.001

	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 1 social life	Equal variances assumed	3.078	.084
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 2 academics	Equal variances assumed	3.683	.059
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 2 athletics	Equal variances assumed	.884	.350
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 2 social life	Equal variances assumed	3.046	.085
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 3 academics	Equal variances assumed	4.750	.033
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 3 athletics	Equal variances assumed	.034	.853
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 3 social life	Equal variances assumed	.177	.675
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 4 academics	Equal variances assumed	.062	.804
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 4 athletics	Equal variances assumed	2.456	.121
	Equal variances not assumed		
UT 4 social life	Equal variances assumed	2.193	.143
	Equal variances not assumed		

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means			
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
UT 1 academics	Equal variances assumed	-1.927	72	.058	-1.085

	Equal variances not assumed	-1.310	6.490	.235	-1.085
UT 1 athletics	Equal variances assumed	2.363	72	.021	1.725
	Equal variances not assumed	4.931	18.350	.000	1.725
UT 1 social life	Equal variances assumed	1.608	72	.112	1.173
	Equal variances not assumed	1.960	8.190	.085	1.173
UT 2 academics	Equal variances assumed	-.015	72	.988	-.011
	Equal variances not assumed	-.012	6.717	.991	-.011
UT 2 athletics	Equal variances assumed	-3.137	72	.002	-.535
	Equal variances not assumed	-2.794	6.979	.027	-.535
UT 2 social life	Equal variances assumed	-.610	72	.544	-.320
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.034	11.713	.322	-.320
UT 3 academics	Equal variances assumed	-1.498	72	.139	-.469
	Equal variances not assumed	-1.002	6.470	.352	-.469
UT 3 athletics	Equal variances assumed	.215	72	.830	.117
	Equal variances not assumed	.233	7.610	.822	.117
UT 3 social life	Equal variances assumed	.174	72	.862	.104
	Equal variances not assumed	.200	7.872	.847	.104
UT 4 academics	Equal variances assumed	.770	72	.444	.388
	Equal variances not assumed	.758	7.261	.472	.388
UT 4 athletics	Equal variances assumed	-1.373	72	.174	-.684
	Equal variances not assumed	-.984	6.562	.360	-.684
UT 4 social life	Equal variances assumed	.229	72	.819	.143
	Equal variances not assumed	.318	9.112	.758	.143

FIGURE SET 3

UT 2 athletics * Gender Crosstabulation

Count

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
UT 2 athletics	Agree	6	4	10
	Strongly Agree	22	30	52
Total		28	34	62

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.060[a]	1	.303		
Continuity Correction[b]	.466	1	.495		
Likelihood Ratio	1.057	1	.304		
Fisher's Exact Test				.326	.247
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.043	1	.307		
N of Valid Cases	62				

a. 1 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.52.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

UM 2 athletics * Gender Crosstabulation

Count

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
UM 2 athletics	Disagree	1	0	1
	Disagree Somewhat	1	0	1
	Neither Disagree nor Agree	7	9	16
	Agree Somewhat	6	6	12
	Agree	9	11	20
	Strongly Agree	4	8	12
Total		28	34	62

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	3.233[a]	5	.664
Likelihood Ratio	4.001	5	.549
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.303	1	.254
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 4 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .45.

C 2 athletics * Gender Crosstabulation

Count

		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
C 2 athletics	Neither Disagree nor Agree	4	0	4
	Agree Somewhat	3	2	5
	Agree	10	10	20
	Strongly Disagree	11	22	33
Total		28	34	62

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.355[a]	3	.061
Likelihood Ratio	8.903	3	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.816	1	.009
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 4 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.81.

FIGURE SET 4

UT 1 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.066[a]	10	.980

Likelihood Ratio	4.213	10	.937
Linear-by-Linear Association	.218	1	.640
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 1 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.576[a]	12	.401
Likelihood Ratio	12.812	12	.383
Linear-by-Linear Association	.202	1	.653
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 16 cells (76.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

UT 1 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.555[a]	12	.330
Likelihood Ratio	8.183	12	.771
Linear-by-Linear Association	.315	1	.575
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 17 cells (81.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

UT 2 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.458[a]	10	.323
Likelihood Ratio	13.111	10	.218

Linear-by-Linear Association	1.977	1	.160
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 2 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.741[a]	2	.690
Likelihood Ratio	.859	2	.651
Linear-by-Linear Association	.183	1	.668
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

UT 2 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.815[a]	10	.955
Likelihood Ratio	4.686	10	.911
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.132	1	.287
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 13 cells (72.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 3 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.292[a]	8	.726
Likelihood Ratio	5.523	8	.701

Linear-by-Linear Association	.005	1	.946
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 12 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 3 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.862[a]	10	.900
Likelihood Ratio	5.159	10	.880
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.992
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 13 cells (72.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 3 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.325[a]	10	.206
Likelihood Ratio	15.148	10	.127
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.904
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 13 cells (72.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

UT 4 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.170[a]	8	.144

Likelihood Ratio	11.620	8	.169
Linear-by-Linear Association	.154	1	.695
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

UT 4 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	36.385[a]	10	.000
Likelihood Ratio	13.801	10	.182
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.224	1	.136
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UT 4 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.418[a]	12	.493
Likelihood Ratio	10.238	12	.595
Linear-by-Linear Association	.444	1	.505
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 16 cells (76.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

UM 1 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.415[a]	12	.667
Likelihood Ratio	9.823	12	.631
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.561	1	.033

N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 17 cells (81.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

UM 1 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.947[a]	10	.634
Likelihood Ratio	9.453	10	.490
Linear-by-Linear Association	.525	1	.469
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UM 1 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.490[a]	10	.967
Likelihood Ratio	4.506	10	.922
Linear-by-Linear Association	.764	1	.382
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

UM 2 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.774[a]	10	.747
Likelihood Ratio	8.202	10	.609
Linear-by-Linear Association	.363	1	.547
N of Valid Cases	62		

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.774[a]	10	.747
Likelihood Ratio	8.202	10	.609
Linear-by-Linear Association	.363	1	.547
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 15 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

UM 2 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.190[a]	10	.610
Likelihood Ratio	7.701	10	.658
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.015	1	.314
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UM 2 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.829[a]	10	.011
Likelihood Ratio	9.851	10	.454
Linear-by-Linear Association	.014	1	.907
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

UM 3 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.079[a]	8	.929
Likelihood Ratio	4.432	8	.816
Linear-by-Linear Association	.173	1	.678
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UM 3 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.302[a]	10	.335
Likelihood Ratio	10.076	10	.434
Linear-by-Linear Association	.521	1	.470
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

UM 3 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.056[a]	8	.531
Likelihood Ratio	6.450	8	.597
Linear-by-Linear Association	.761	1	.383
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .05.

UM 4 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.422[a]	6	.965
Likelihood Ratio	1.793	6	.938
Linear-by-Linear Association	.015	1	.902
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .10.

UM 4 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.766[a]	8	.362
Likelihood Ratio	8.497	8	.386
Linear-by-Linear Association	.241	1	.623
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

UM 4 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.906[a]	8	.044
Likelihood Ratio	12.850	8	.117
Linear-by-Linear Association	.004	1	.952
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.

C 1 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	6.033[a]	6	.420
Likelihood Ratio	4.458	6	.615
Linear-by-Linear Association	.577	1	.448
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.

C 1 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.873[a]	10	.953
Likelihood Ratio	4.027	10	.946
Linear-by-Linear Association	.993	1	.319
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

C 1 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.964[a]	12	.706
Likelihood Ratio	10.037	12	.613
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.037	1	.081
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 15 cells (71.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

C 2 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.106[a]	12	.236

Likelihood Ratio	15.337	12	.224
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.409	1	.065
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 16 cells (76.2%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

C 2 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.663[a]	6	.588
Likelihood Ratio	4.964	6	.548
Linear-by-Linear Association	.324	1	.569
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

C 2 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.436[a]	12	.033
Likelihood Ratio	9.986	12	.617
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.557	1	.110
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 18 cells (85.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

C 3 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.759[a]	8	.878
Likelihood Ratio	3.506	8	.899

Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.893
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

C 3 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.535[a]	8	.299
Likelihood Ratio	9.322	8	.316
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.606	1	.205
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.

C 3 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.665[a]	10	.564
Likelihood Ratio	8.839	10	.547
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.997
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

C 4 academics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.328[a]	10	.333
Likelihood Ratio	7.067	10	.719
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.282	1	.258

N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 15 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .03.

C 4 athletics * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.710[a]	10	.753
Likelihood Ratio	5.742	10	.836
Linear-by-Linear Association	.927	1	.336
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 14 cells (77.8%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

C 4 social life * Age

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.493[a]	12	.407
Likelihood Ratio	8.906	12	.711
Linear-by-Linear Association	.338	1	.561
N of Valid Cases	62		

a. 17 cells (81.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .02.

The full survey tool is attached as a separate document.