

**SPORT MANAGEMENT INSTRUCTORS' ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF
STUDENTS AND STUDENT-ATHLETES**

A Thesis Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Alaina Catherine Stem

May 2023

ABSTRACT

To investigate the attitudes that sport management instructors hold toward students and student-athletes, an adapted version of the Situational Analysis Scale (SAS) was completed by 247 faculty members across the United States at institutions of varying size, scale, and classification. The results indicated that sport management instructors held significantly different negative attitudes toward male revenue-generating student-athletes compared to female revenue-generating student-athletes and general population students. The findings hold implications for individuals working in sport management programs, academic services for athletics as well as general student affairs. In particular, a more relational approach to the faculty and student-athlete relationship may be necessary to bridge the gap between parties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND TOPIC RELEVANCE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Topic Relevance.....	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH QUESTION	4
Faculty Attitudes Toward Student-Athletes.....	4
Student Attitudes toward Student-Athletes.....	6
Sport Management Education.....	6
Research Question	9
CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS	10
Measure.....	10
Procedures.....	11
Participants.....	12
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	13
Results.....	13
Discussion.....	15
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Conclusions.....	18
Recommendations.....	19

REFERENCES	21
VITA	27

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND TOPIC RELEVANCE

Introduction

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has identified a pressing issue with faculty and student-athlete relationships, particularly with respect to how student-athletes are viewed by faculty (Eitzen, 2009; Gerdy, 2006; NCAA, 2005). This relationship has been of utmost importance since the inception of college athletics and its integration with academics. The importance of creating a purposeful and intentional relationship between faculty and student-athletes is paramount to a fully operational and successful athletic department and for complying with NCAA academic guidelines, to the extent that some schools have entire athletics compliance departments to address this topic (Carrillo, 2016). The NCAA has received substantial scrutiny, as critics have long voiced concern about there being too much of an emphasis on athletics rather than academics, causing the NCAA to put in place numerous guidelines affecting the eligibility requirements for student-athletes (NCAA, 2005). An example of these guidelines includes the Academic Progress Rate (APR), which holds institutions accountable for both the eligibility and retention of student-athletes (NCAA, n.d.). Specifically, the APR is a standard that “holds institutions accountable for the academic progress of their student-athletes through a team-based metric that accounts for the eligibility and retention of each student-athlete for each academic term” (NCAA, n.d.). The NCAA also has put in place guidelines that affect student-athletes’ initial eligibility with a university as well as continuing guidelines, to ensure that the student-athlete experience is one that balances both academics and athletics.

Despite the NCAA's efforts, many individuals still hold negative opinions toward student-athletes' academic competence, which can include faculty opinions of athletes. Due to individual prejudices and external experiences, research has documented that faculty members often have a more negative attitude toward student-athletes than the general population of students (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom et al., 1995). In addition, stereotypes with respect to race and gender may further contribute to prejudices that affect the student-athlete experience (Comeaux, 2011). Due to the fundamental nature of this relationship to all athletic departments, it is paramount to study this relationship further and in different contexts.

Sport management is a growing major within the United States, with nearly 16,000 degrees awarded in 2019 (DataUSA, 2019). In addition, employment in sport occupations is projected to grow 13% between 2021 and 2031, faster than many other occupational fields (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022). With this growth, it is understandable that more student-athletes may be entering this degree field, as it corresponds with their out of class interests and experiences in sport. Many of the faculty members in sport management programs have connections with athletic departments, as they may have previously worked in athletics and/or invite members of the athletics department to serve as guest speakers in class. In addition, many faculty members foster relationships with individuals in the athletic department knowing that their students will need to gain hands-on experience working in athletics to obtain full time employment when they graduate. Internships within the sport management major are considered cooperative education, which helps to integrate what is learned in the classroom with actual real-world experiences (Sutton, 1989; Wallace, 2020). Given the great impact that internships have on the learning experience, they have been recommended to be included in all sport management programs, both at the undergraduate and graduate level (Sutton, 1989; Wallace, 2020), making it

particularly important for sport management faculty members to have connections with practitioners in athletics. Given this background on sport management as a whole, the current study investigated whether there is a difference in the attitudes sport management faculty members hold toward student-athletes compared to students in general.

Topic Relevance

The current study contributes to the sport management sector and those working in student-athlete academic support, as it provides useful insight into obstacles that student-athletes may face in the classroom. Research into the student-athlete experience has indicated that student-athletes are viewed more negatively than their general population peers, leading them to potentially feel marginalized at certain institutions (Comeaux, 2011b). While there have been numerous studies examining the overall student-athlete experience, researchers have not investigated sport management faculty members' attitudes toward student-athletes. Previous research found that faculty members, as a group, often view student-athletes differently than the general population of students, students themselves have negative opinions of student-athletes, and that faculty attitudes toward revenue generating student-athletes were more negative than toward their non-revenue generating peers (Comeaux, 2011b, Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1989). Non-revenue sports are defined as anyh sport that does not generate positive revenue for a school's program, while a revenue generating sport is one that does generate positive revenue for a school's program (Bowens, 2019). Given this background, the current study provides relevant insight about whether sport management faculty members' connections to and knowledge of athletics may lead them to hold attitudes toward student-athletes that are different from those of faculty members in general.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH QUESTION

Faculty Attitudes Toward Student-Athletes

A study by Comeaux (2011b), which highlights the importance of the impact faculty can have on student-athletes and their development, provides a central foundation for the current research. Comeaux (2011b) used a Situational Attitudinal Scale (SAS) to investigate faculty attitudes toward student-athletes in conjunction with gender, race, and college affiliation (Comeaux, 2011b). The SAS is a type of instrument intended to measure the attitudes of one group of people toward other groups of people; in Comeaux's (2011b) study, the SAS was adapted to assess faculty attitudes toward students and student-athletes. The SAS also is a measure to test prejudices that may be present from one group to another. Results indicated that there were significant differences in gender, race, and college affiliation as it relates to professors' attitudes toward student-athletes (Comeaux, 2011b). Specifically, faculty members viewed both male and female athletes differently than the general population of students, held prejudices with relation to race, and faculty attitudes toward student-athletes varied greatly between different academic disciplines. Most notable for the current study, faculty members viewed male and female student-athletes more negatively than their general-population peers. Race also affected these attitudes, as the study found that Black faculty members tended to hold more positive attitudes toward student-athletes. In addition, it was found that faculty members in education held the most positive attitudes toward student-athletes out of the surveyed disciplines (Comeaux, 2011b). Comeaux (2011b) suggested future research should focus on multiple institutions, justifying the need for the current study.

In a related study, Comeaux (2011a) examined faculty attitudes toward Division I college student-athletes. Using the same SAS, the research examined whether faculty members' attitudes differed between revenue and non-revenue generating student-athletes. Specifically, results indicated that attitudes of faculty members were more negative toward male revenue generating and non-revenue generating student-athletes as well as female student-athletes than they were toward the general student population (Comeaux, 2011a). Within this finding, however, it was noted that faculty attitudes were more negative overall toward male student-athletes than toward female student-athletes (Comeaux, 2011a). This study is important to the current study because it highlights the attitudinal differences that faculty hold toward student-athletes in comparison to general population students.

Engstrom and colleagues (1995) found that faculty viewed both male revenue generating and non-revenue generating student-athletes in a negative way when dealing with academic competence, special services, and recognition. It was found specifically that differential attitudes were present toward revenue-producing athletes and non-revenue athletes as well (Engstrom et. al, 1995). This study utilized a revised version of the SAS student-athlete survey, with seven out of 10 situations showing significantly different attitudes toward student-athletes than the general student population (Engstrom et. al, 1995). It was also found that there were negative attitudes toward both participants in revenue-generating sports as well as participants in non-revenue generating sports.

Baucom and Lantz (2001) examined faculty attitudes and stereotypes of student-athletes. Results indicated that faculty do hold prejudicial attitudes toward both revenue and non-revenue generating athletes in situations like out of class achievement, university admissions, receiving scholarships, and tutoring for athletes (Baucom & Lantz, 2001). The study built on Engstrom et

al.'s (1995) work, finding that similar prejudices and stereotypes toward revenue and non-revenue generating male student-athletes exist at a smaller Division II school. This research is important to the current study because it shows that faculty members may hold similar negative attitudes toward student-athletes regardless of the NCAA classification of the school.

Student Attitudes Toward Student-Athletes

Engstrom and Sedlacek (1991) also completed a study investigating general prejudices that other students may hold toward student-athletes. It was found in this study, that general population students do harbor negative attitudes toward student-athletes, particularly around academic performance (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991). This study also found that general population students were less tolerant of different privileges and opportunities provided to student-athletes by the athletic department (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991). The information from this study allows us to see that student-athletes may experience negative attitudes both inside and outside of the classroom. Engstrom and Sedlacek (1989) also completed a study investigating general students' opinions toward student-athletes in several situations including a student-athlete driving an expensive car, getting in a fight at a local bar, or being a lab partner (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1989). It was found that general population students were jealous, resentful, suspicious, and indignant – even becoming sad, disapproving, and worried in other situations regarding student-athletes (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1989). This study, like the others, demonstrate, there are overall attitudinal differences that individuals hold towards student-athletes, particularly by general population students.

Sport Management Education

In Comeaux's (2011b) study, he recommends that education for faculty members on the student-athlete experience may allow there to be a better working relationship overall between

student-athletes and faculty. This is the reason for the selection of sport management instructors within this study, as they are likely to already possess meaningful knowledge of the student-athlete experience due to the closeness with the athletic department previously described. If sport management faculty do not hold different attitudes toward student-athletes as they do toward general population students, then it can be assumed that education as described by Comeaux (2011b) study would be beneficial in aiding the student-athlete and faculty relationship. If sport management faculty do hold different attitudes toward student-athletes, however, it can be assumed that education alone may not aid this relationship without other accompanying interventions. Since sport management faculty already hold knowledge about the student-athlete experience, if they do not possess differential attitudes from general faculty, it can be assumed that education alone will bridge the gap between faculty and student-athletes.

In addition to the previous recommendations surrounding education, there is also research discussing sport management professors' attitudes toward students in general. Stokowski and colleagues (2020) identified two main attitudes toward students that sport management faculty hold. Those attitudes included a conservative-autocratic outlook as well as a liberal-democratic outlook (Stokowski et. al, 2020). Conservative-autocratic follows the more traditional thought process of a classroom, with class discipline, "normal" classroom authority, and little autonomy for students (Stokowski et. al, 2020). The second attitude, liberal-democratic, represents the belief that students are individuals and can be responsible for their own learning (Stokowski et. al, 2020). This research helps show us that there is a wide range of teaching styles in sport management, all with different outcomes and influences on students.

Warner and colleagues (2022) examined the mentoring of student-athletes by sport management faculty and associated outcomes. Faculty in this study indicated that they were

more likely to mentor student-athletes with the ideas of acceptance and friendship in mind, and least likely to enter the protection role or feel the need to protect athletes in any way (Warner et. al, 2022). More specifically, faculty participants stated that they were more likely to encourage, affirm, and help build self-confidence, as well as building a professional relationship with the student-athletes, but did not feel the need to defend athletes (Warner et. al, 2022). This study suggests that faculty prejudices toward student-athletes would be lessened or mitigated due to the nature of the relationship when student-athletes have a sport management faculty member as a mentor. This relates to the current study since sport management faculty members often serve as either formal or informal mentors to student-athletes, which should lessen any prejudicial attitudes that faculty members may hold toward student-athletes.

Grappendorf and Burton (2014) examined if bias exists when recommending appropriate jobs for sport management students. Sport management faculty were asked to evaluate fictional students for two different jobs, one being in the Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA) and one in the National Football League (NFL). The results from this study found that there were perceived differences between male and female students, as the female student was seen as more capable for the job in the WNBA and was encouraged to apply more than the male student (Grappendorf & Burton, 2014). It was also found that the male candidate was given less support in applying for both the NFL and the WNBA positions (Grappendorf & Burton, 2014). This study applies to the current research by showing that there are already prejudices and biases in place by sport management professors when looking at the general population students. Since this study shows that there are biases held toward sport management students in general, it will be insightful to further examine whether sport management faculty hold similar biases toward student-athletes.

Research Question

The current study investigated the following research questions: Do sport management faculty attitudes toward student-athletes significantly differ compared to the general student population? This information will help sport management faculty members identify and mitigate attitudinal (and possible treatment) discrepancies between student-athletes and students in general. We also aim to answer the questions; how do sport management faculty view both women's basketball players and men's basketball players differently than general population students and if demographic differences influence how sport management faculty view student-athletes.

CHAPTER THREE

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Measure

An adapted version of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) utilized by Comeaux (2011b) serves as the main instrument in the current study. The SAS was originally developed by Engstrom et al. (1995) and has been effective in investigating attitudes toward groups that may be targets of prejudice. The original instrument was developed to measure the attitudes of the general population of students at a university toward their student-athlete peers. The original SAS included 10 situational statements to which respondents were asked to react. Comeaux's (2011b) modified version of the SAS to measure faculty attitudes contained eight statements, which were adapted to fit the context of the current study (see Table 1). The eight items serve as dependent variables to assess whether there are attitudinal differences that sport management faculty members hold toward student-athletes vis-à-vis students in general. The eight items are comprised of different situations, both personal and social, with relevance to the prejudices being studied. For each of the eight items, there are 10 opposing adjectives describing the respondent's attitude toward the given situation, and respondents are asked to provide a response by selecting a point along a rating scale that best represents their feelings toward the given situation. The scale scored participants from one to five with one being the most negative response and five being the most positive response. The instrument also included demographic questions including college size, participant age, race, and other general information.

Each participant in the current study was randomly assigned one of three different versions of the SAS. The first version, which was the control for this study, used general terminology about "students" to assess attitudes toward the general population of students. The

second version asks about a male student-athlete in a high-profile sport (i.e., basketball), while the third and final form asks about a female student-athlete in a high-profile sport (i.e., basketball). Other than the different wording about students or student-athletes (e.g., “student” or “male basketball player” or “female basketball player”), the forms are otherwise identical. Respondents are not aware that multiple versions of the forms exist. This setup is an adaptation of the SAS procedures used by Engstrom et al. (1995) and Comeaux (2011b). Given findings about gender differences in research (Comeaux, 2011a; 2011b), the survey included a form about male and female student-athletes. The sport of basketball was selected for the final two forms as it is common at the NCAA level with more than 1300 schools sponsoring basketball teams; in addition, the sport tends to be high profile (i.e., high attendance, high television viewership”), with both men’s and women’s teams sponsored at most universities (Foy & Ray, 2019; Next College Student Athlete, n.d.). The revised SAS used in the current study had a reliability coefficient alpha value of 0.807 for the neutral form, 0.858 for the male student-athlete form, and 0.900 for the female student-athlete form.

Procedures

Participants for the current study were contacted through email listservs of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM), the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport (NASSS), and the Commission on Sport Management Accreditation (COSMA). Recruitment emails included a brief and general synopsis of the study as well as a link to the online survey instrument. If an individual decided to participate, they were then taken to the survey and shown a page with the purpose, risks, and general information about the study and then asked to agree on a consent form. If an individual consented to the study, participants

were then randomly assigned an SAS form from the three previously mentioned utilizing the Qualtrics randomization feature.

Participants

The recruitment emails invited anyone who had taught courses in sport management or a related area (e.g., sport business, sport administration, sport communication), including full-time faculty, part-time faculty, lecturers, instructors, and graduate teaching assistants, to complete a survey instrument that included the SAS and demographic questions. A total of 247 participants completed the survey. Of those 247 participants, roughly 30% did not complete the demographic data. Of the respondents that did answer, 58.5% of participants were male, 39.8% were female, and 1.7% chose to self-identify as not falling in either category. 61.9% of respondents were white or Caucasian, 6.50% of respondents were black or African American, while 2% were Latino or Hispanic and 1.20% of respondents were Native American. The research in this study was completed by participants at numerous institutions across the United States. Most surveyed institutions were greater than 20,000 students. See Table 2 for full breakdown of institution sizes. Of the surveyed institutions, the largest percentage of schools belonged to the Division I Football Bowl Subdivision, with 49.1% of the institutions surveyed. All other percentages are broken down in Table 2. Of the schools surveyed, 71 respondents did not answer, however, 75% percent were public institutions, and 25% were private of those that did answer.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Do sport management faculty attitudes toward student-athletes significantly differ compared to the general student population?

Significant differences were found when looking at mean scores between general population students and men's basketball players as well as women's basketball players and men's basketball players. In other words, sport management faculty viewed male basketball players more negatively than both general population students and female basketball players. The significant difference was found by utilizing an ANOVA analysis of the mean scores of all the situations across the forms within the survey. Complete data from the ANOVA is provided in Table 3.

Within the form differences, five out of eight questions elicited significantly different responses from the control survey between both the men's basketball players and the women's basketball players. Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 showed significant differences in the means while questions 3, 6, and 7 did not. Attitudes were significantly different with respect to seeing a student driving an expensive car, a student receiving an A in the class, the university announcing the creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program, a student receiving a full scholarship to attend the university, and the out-of-class achievements of a student being featured in the campus newspaper. The questions or situations that did not elicit a significantly different response were a student missing a class, a student being admitted to the school with College Board Scores (e.g., SAT, ACT) significantly lower than those of the general student population,

and a student deciding to pursue their degree program at a slower pace than normal. All information regarding form differences are provided in Table 2.

How do sport management faculty view women's basketball players differently than general population students?

In one out of eight situations, the women's basketball players were viewed more positively than both the general population students as well as the men's basketball players—the situation that involved a student driving an expensive car. In addition, the men's basketball players in this situation were not significantly different from the control, meaning that in this situation they were seen the same as the general population of students.

How do sport management faculty view men's basketball players differently than general population students?

In four out of eight situations, the men's basketball players were viewed more negatively than both the general population students and the women's basketball players. The situations in which men's basketball players were viewed more negatively included the player receiving an A in the class, the university announcing the creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program, a player receiving a full scholarship to attend the university, and the out-of-class achievements of the player being featured in the campus newspaper. This significant difference was accounted for in the original ANOVA analysis, but allows us to see specifically which situations they were more negatively viewed in.

Do demographic differences influence how sport management faculty view student-athletes?

After the initial ANOVA analyses were complete, a multivariate ANOVA was conducted to see if any of the demographic data influenced the means and if there were any trends. No significant findings were found across the data collected. All data is provided Table 3.

Discussion

Research has found that faculty members tend to hold more negative attitudes toward student-athletes than their general-population peers in both Division I and Division II settings (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom et al., 1995). Research, however, was encompassing of all academic disciplines within a university. There have also been studies that identified the attitudinal differences between faculty gender and race and how they affect said attitudes. The current study adds to the research by identifying a major area that has a close overlap to student-athletes and their experiences to see if there is any difference in attitudes found.

With respect to faculty views of female revenue-generating student-athletes, it was found that sport management faculty members were more likely to feel accepting, trusting, or pleased when presented with a scenario about a women's basketball player driving an expensive car. This was the only situation on the SAS scale within the survey where the female student-athletes were viewed significantly more positively than general population students. In previous research, there were more negative situations found surrounding female student-athletes, but this situation was not one of them (Comeaux, 2011a). This finding is a substantial departure from Comeaux's findings in 2011, as there were no positive differences found for female student-athletes. This difference may be able to be explained by the changes in women's sport from 2011 (the time of Comeaux's original findings) to now in 2023. The NCAA cites that there has been an overall increase in the total number of student-athletes competing in women's sports since 2011 as well as a general positive trend in support for women's athletics (NCAA, 2023). It is possible that this increase in overall individuals participating in women's sport as well as the large push from the NCAA to increase participation and viewership of women's sport allows there to be a better opinion on female student-athletes.

For the male revenue-generating student-athletes, it was found that sport management faculty members were more likely to feel suspicious, disturbed, displeased, angered, and even mad in several situations on the SAS survey as compared to general population students. The situations that evoked these feelings were when a men's basketball player received an A in class, was a part of an expanded advising and tutoring program, received a full scholarship to the university, and when said student's out-of-class achievements made it into the campus newspaper. Comeaux (2011a) found similar negative attitudes as those found in this study, specifically in the situations dealing with student-athletes' intellectual abilities, out-of-class achievements, and special services. These feelings can stem from the perceived special treatment that student-athletes are given, as well as other prejudices that professors may hold against student-athletes (Comeaux, 2011a). These negative attitudes can have a direct impact on student-athletes and their academics, as both the present study as well as the previous study by Comeaux (2011a) found that professors react more negatively to a male student-athlete receiving an A in their course. This leads us to speculate that certain faculty members may hold biases when awarding grades to student-athletes, which could in turn affect the grading of student-athletes.

Of the eight situations, three did not have any significantly different reactions between either category of student-athletes and general population students. These situations were a student missing one of a faculty member's classes, a student being admitted to the university with lower college board scores, and the student choosing to pursue their degree program at a slower pace. In Comeaux's (2011a) study using the same situations, it was found that there was a significantly more negative outlook to two of these situations, with those being a student missing a class as well as a student being admitted to the university with lower college board scores. This can possibly be explained by the fact that these situations may be becoming more common

across the board among students, rather than being situations that are exclusive to student-athletes like in some other situations given. In addition, since there is a potential better understanding of the student-athlete experience from sport management professors, it could be that these are situations that are common among everyday life, which is why we did not find a difference in the forms.

The main finding of this study was that male revenue-generating student-athletes were frequently viewed more negatively than female revenue-generating student-athletes and general population students. This is in line with research by Comeaux (2011a; 2011b). What is different from this previous research is that female revenue-generating student-athletes are viewed the same as general population students in most situations. In previous studies, student-athletes as a whole, including women athletes, were generally viewed more negatively than their general population peers. Possible explanations for this finding are that female athletics are not viewed in the same light or of the same level of rigor that male athletics are, which leads us to understanding why female athletes may be viewed the same as general population students in all but one situation. Male athletes being viewed differently comes as no surprise, as this aligns with the research mentioned earlier in this study. The findings within this study are important due to the fact that it shows that solely relying on education around the student-athlete experience may not lead to better overall faculty and student relationships as suggested by Comeaux in his studies.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The current study provides evidence that sport management faculty hold some similar stereotypes toward student-athletes as do faculty members in other academic fields. Faculty members in sport management programs seem to have negative views toward male revenue-generating student-athletes in particular when compared with the general population of students and female revenue-generating student-athletes. The results of this study and previous studies should be utilized to help sport management faculty members think about how to form a better working relationship between faculty and student-athletes. It is apparent from this study and previous works that education about the student-athlete experience alone is not enough to bridge the gap between attitudinal differences of general population students and student-athletes.

The information found in this study as well as the information found in previous studies should be used to further inform the discussion around student-athletes and their experiences on college campuses. In previous research, it has been suggested that student affairs professionals as well as academic advisors and counselors should work closely with faculty to create more meaningful relationships between student-athletes and faculty members (Comeaux, 2011a). Student affairs professionals have recently begun to educate faculty on the subpopulation of student-athletes, which has led to faculty thusly understanding the overall subculture that student-athletes are a part of on college campuses – a vital part of bridging the gap between the attitudes toward student-athletes. With this being said, however, the current study shows that this education may not be enough to bridge the gap.

Recommendations

In previous studies that also found faculty attitudinal differences between general population students and student-athletes (Comeaux, 2011b), recommendations included that faculty should be educated on the student-athlete experience to mitigate negative views. Specifically, Comeaux (2011b) suggested that there should be professional training workshops that inform faculty about topics such as student-athlete recruitment, admissions, academic support services, and other topics that would be beneficial in mitigating the attitudinal differences (Comeaux, 2011b). The current study, however, reveals that general education about the student-athlete experience may be of limited value in addressing this issue, as sport management faculty are likely to already be well-versed in the nature of college athletics and the student-athlete experience. The fact that sport management faculty members still hold negative attitudes toward student-athletes despite their knowledge of college athletics can help us think about alternative approaches to address stereotypes. What may be more beneficial is a relational approach to the issue rather than one that is educational. Comeaux (2011b) also recommends that faulty-supervised internships, faculty attendance at sporting events, and the creation of a student-faculty mentor program would all be paramount to aiding in the attitudinal differences found toward student-athletes. Based on the findings of the current study, support exists for consideration of a relational approach, as an educational approach that seeks to inform faculty members about the nature of student-athletes' lives in college sports may have limited benefit. As a result of these findings, it would be best for athletic departments and sport management faculty members to come together to find a solution that is beneficial for all individuals affected by said relationship. Following Comeaux's recommendations for internships, faculty attendance

at sporting events and the creation of a mentoring program may be the most beneficial place to start in aiding this relationship.

While the current study did find useful information in relation to the overall student-athlete experience, it also has limitations. The study covered the overall attitudinal differences between students, but we do not know why individuals feel the way they do specifically. Further research into the reasoning behind these attitudinal differences would be beneficial, as it would allow for a more informed approach to addressing these attitudinal differences in the future. Despite these limitations, the current study offers important information into the reality of the student-athlete experience and allows individuals interested in said experience a better understanding of what a student-athlete may experience in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Baucom, C., & Lantz, C. D. (2001). Faculty attitudes toward male Division II student-athletes.

Journal of Sport Behavior, 24, 265–265.

Bowens, B. (2019). *Revenue vs non-revenue sports, who is most likely to graduate?* LinkedIn.

<https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/revenue-vs-non-revenue-sports-who-most-likely-graduate-brandon-bowens/>

Carrillo, G. (2016). *Reasons for an athletics compliance department*. Inside compliance.

<https://blogs.luc.edu/compliance/?p=60>

Comeaux, E. (2011a). Examination of faculty attitudes toward Division I college student-

athletes. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 30, 75–87. Add doi number

Comeaux, E. (2011b). A study of attitudes toward college student-athletes: Implications for

faculty-athletics engagement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 80, 521–532. Add doi number

DataUSA. (2019). *Sport & fitness management*. Data USA. [https://datausa.io/profile/cip/sport-](https://datausa.io/profile/cip/sport-fitness-management)

[fitness-management](https://datausa.io/profile/cip/sport-fitness-management)

Division I academic progress rate (APR). NCAA.org. (n.d.).

<https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2013/11/20/division-i-academic-progress-rate-apr.aspx>

Eitzen, D. (2016). *Fair and foul: Beyond the myths and paradoxes of sport*. (6th ed.). Rowman &

Littlefield Publishers.

- Engstrom, & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of prejudice toward university student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 189–193.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01582.x>
- Engstrom, C.M., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1989). Attitudes of Residence Hall Students toward Student-Athletes: Implications for Advising, Training and Programming. Research Report #19-89.
- Engstrom, C., Sedlacek, W., & McEwen, M. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and non-revenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 217-227.
- Foy, S. L., & Ray, R. (2019). Skin in the game: Colorism and the subtle operation of stereotypes in men's college basketball. *American Journal of Sociology*, 125, 730–785.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/707243>
- Gerdy, J. (2006). *Airball: American education's failed experiment with elite athletics*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Gleditsch, R., & Berg, J. (2017). Racial attitudes of university faculty members: Does interracial contact matter? *Humbolt Journal of Social Relations*, 39, 104–116. Add doi number
- Grappendorf, H., & Burton, L. (2016). Are sport management faculty biased? An examination of faculty perceptions of male and female students' applications for a job in sport. *Global Sport Business Journal*, 4, 1-10.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2005). NCAA Division I Board of Directors sets cutlines for academic reform standards. [Press release]. [http://www.ncaa.org/media_ and events](http://www.ncaa.org/media_and_events)

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2023, March 22). *A look at trends for women in college sports*. NCAA.org. <https://www.ncaa.org/news/2023/3/1/media-center-a-look-at-trends-for-women-in-college-sports.aspx>

Next College Student Athlete. (n.d.). *Complete list of men's basketball colleges*. NCSA Sports. <https://www.ncsasports.org/mens-basketball/colleges>

Stokowski, S., Li, B., Hutchens, N. S., Bell, C. A., & Shaw, A. A. (2020). “Students Are the Reason Most of Us Have Jobs”: Sport Management Faculty Members’ Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Students. *The Physical Educator*, 77(5), 854–878. <https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2020-V77-I5-10270>

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2022, September 8). *Entertainment and sports occupations: Occupational outlook handbook*. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/entertainment-and-sports/home.htm>

Wallace, M. (2020). Understanding Cooperative Education. <https://www.naceweb.org/career-development/internships/understanding-cooperative-education/>

Warner, S., Stokowski, S., Fridley, A., & Kim, K. (2022). Sport Management Faculty Members’ Mentorship of Student-Athletes. *Sport Management Education Journal*, 16(2), 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2021-0009>

Sutton, W.A. (1989). The Role of Internships in Sport Management Curricula-A Model for Development. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 60(7), 20–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1989.10606340>

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1 – Situations: Revises SAS for Student-Athletes

1	You see a student (male basketball player, female basketball player) driving an expensive car.
2	A student (male basketball player, female basketball player) gets an A in your class.
3	A student (male basketball player, female basketball player) misses one of your classes.
4	The University announces the creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program for students (male basketball players, female basketball players).
5	A student (male basketball player, female basketball player) in your class has received a full scholarship to attend this University.
6	A student (male basketball player, female basketball player) in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.
7	A student (male basketball player, female basketball player) decides to pursue their program at a slower pace.
8	The out-of-class achievements of one of your students (male basketball player, female basketball player) are featured in the campus newspaper.

Table 2 – Demographic Data of Participants

Baseline characteristic	Full sample	
	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	103	45.3
Male	70	54.7
Self-Identify	3	1.2
Missing	71	-
Race		
White / Caucasian	153	61.9
Black / African American	16	6.5
Latino / Hispanic	5	2
Asian	5	2
Native American	3	1.2
Pacific Islander	0	0
Missing	65	-
NCAA Division		
Division I FBS	78	49.1
Division II	19	11.9
Division III	20	12.6
NAIA	4	2.5
Division I FCS	14	8.8
Division I without football	21	13.2
Missing	3	1.9
Enrollment Size		
less than 5,000	88	-
5,001 – 10,000	34	19.2
10,001 – 20,000	24	13.6
more than 20,000	30	16.9
Missing	89	50.3

Table 3 – ANOVA Analysis of Survey Responses*Pairwise Comparisons*

Dependent Variable: mean_score

		Mean	95% Confidence Interval for			
		Difference (I-	Difference ^b			
(I) group	(J) group	J)	Std. Error	Sig. ^b	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
bb_female	bb_male	.212*	.069	.008	.044	.379
	control	.012	.067	1.000	-.149	.174
bb_male	bb_female	-.212*	.069	.008	-.379	-.044
	control	-.199*	.065	.007	-.355	-.043
control	bb_female	-.012	.067	1.000	-.174	.149
	bb_male	.199*	.065	.007	.043	.355

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Table 4 – ANOVA Analysis of Individual Questions*Pairwise Comparisons*

Dependent Variable	(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. ^b	95% Confidence Interval for Difference ^b	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Q1_big_mean	bb_female	bb_male	.280	.129	.092	-.031	.591
		control	.397*	.124	.005	.097	.697
	bb_male	bb_female	-.280	.129	.092	-.591	.031
		control	.117	.120	.990	-.172	.406
	control	bb_female	-.397*	.124	.005	-.697	-.097
		bb_male	-.117	.120	.990	-.406	.172
Q2_big_mean	bb_female	bb_male	.366*	.082	<.001	.168	.563
		control	-.015	.079	1.000	-.206	.175
	bb_male	bb_female	-.366*	.082	<.001	-.563	-.168
		control	-.381*	.076	<.001	-.565	-.197
	control	bb_female	.015	.079	1.000	-.175	.206
		bb_male	.381*	.076	<.001	.197	.565
Q3_big_mean	bb_female	bb_male	.034	.108	1.000	-.228	.295
		control	.069	.105	1.000	-.184	.321
	bb_male	bb_female	-.034	.108	1.000	-.295	.228
		control	.035	.101	1.000	-.209	.279
	control	bb_female	-.069	.105	1.000	-.321	.184
		bb_male	-.035	.101	1.000	-.279	.209

Table 4 continued

Q4_big_mean	bb_female	bb_male control	.225 -.069	.098 .095	.069 1.000	-.012 -.297	.461 .160
	bb_male	bb_female control	-.225 -.293*	.098 .091	.069 .005	-.461 -.514	.012 - .073
	control	bb_female bb_male	.069 .293*	.095 .091	1.000 .005	-.160 .073	.297 .514
Q5_big_mean	bb_female	bb_male control	.236 -.078	.124 .120	.177 1.000	-.064 -.367	.535 .211
	bb_male	bb_female control	-.236 -.314*	.124 .115	.177 .021	-.535 -.593	.064 - .035
	control	bb_female bb_male	.078 .314*	.120 .115	1.000 .021	-.211 .035	.367 .593
	bb_female	bb_male control	.068 -.132	.117 .113	1.000 .734	-.216 -.406	.352 .142
Q6_big_mean	bb_male	bb_female control	-.068 -.201	.117 .109	1.000 .205	-.352 -.465	.216 .064
	control	bb_female bb_male	.132 .201	.113 .109	.734 .205	-.142 -.064	.406 .465
	bb_female	bb_male control	.136 -.013	.136 .131	.958 1.000	-.193 -.331	.465 .305
	bb_male	bb_female control	-.136 -.149	.136 .127	.958 .727	-.465 -.455	.193 .158
Q7_big_mean	control	bb_female bb_male	.013 .149	.131 .127	1.000 .727	-.305 -.158	.331 .455

Table 4 continued

Q8_big_mean	bb_fema	bb_male	.291	.126	.067	-.014	.596
	le	control	-.068	.122	1.000	-.362	.226
	bb_male	bb_fema	-.291	.126	.067	-.596	.014
		le					
		control	-.359*	.117	.008	-.642	-
							.075
	control	bb_fema	.068	.122	1.000	-.226	.362
		le					
		bb_male	.359*	.117	.008	.075	.642

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

b. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

Table 5 – ANOVA Analysis of Demographic Factors*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Dependent Variable: mean_score

Source	Type III Sum of	df	Mean	F	Sig.
	Squares		Square		
Corrected	2.911 ^a	17	.171	1.249	.235
Model					
Intercept	43.486	1	43.486	317.218	<.001
Enroll	.553	3	.184	1.346	.262
Division	.532	6	.089	.647	.692
PubPriv	.009	1	.009	.069	.793
Gender	.148	2	.074	.541	.584
White	.050	1	.050	.363	.548
Black	.405	1	.405	2.954	.088
Latino	.039	1	.039	.282	.596
Asian	.019	1	.019	.140	.708
NatAm	.108	1	.108	.789	.376
PacIs	.000	0	.	.	.
Error	19.055	139	.137		
Total	2289.725	157			
Corrected Total	21.966	156			

a. R Squared = .133 (Adjusted R Squared = .026)

VITA

Alaina Stem was born in Snellville, Georgia but raised in Lynchburg, Virginia. Before attending the University of Tennessee, Knoxville to complete her graduate studies, she attended the University of Tennessee, Knoxville where she earned a Bachelor of Science in Sport Management. Alaina serves as a graduate teaching associate in the Physical Education Activity Program, with a specialization in yoga and relaxation.