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Exploring Career Maturity
A Comparison of Student-Athletes and Non-Athletes at a Division I Institution

Walter L. Tarver, III

Abstract
This quantitative study compared the career maturity of student-athletes and non-athletes at a Division I university, and assessed career maturity differences among student-athletes. Super’s Theory of Career Development served as the theoretical framework, while the Career Maturity Inventory-Revised Attitude Scale (CMI-R/AS) was utilized to collect data. Student-athletes were found to exhibit lower levels of career maturity than non-athletes. Among student-athletes, males scored lower on career maturity than females. Additionally, those identifying more closely with their athletic identities, those with higher aspirations to play professional sports, those with stronger beliefs in the likelihood that they would play professional sports, and those competing in revenue sports (football and men’s basketball) had lower levels of career maturity. Finally, as year of athletic eligibility increased, student-athletes’ career maturity increased.
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Introduction

There are approximately 500,000 student-athletes at over 1,100 American colleges and universities (NCAA, 2017a). However, less than 2% of them will be drafted to play a professional sport (Brower, 2015; Mirabile & Witte, 2013; NCAA, 2017b; Tyrance et al., 2013). Additionally, some are ill prepared to pursue career opportunities beyond those as professional athletes (Brower, 2015; CNN, 2014; “Universities fail student athletes,” 2014). What happens to those who fail to realize their professional sports dreams? According to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), most of them will pursue careers in something other than sports (NCAA, 2014). Are they prepared to do so, though?

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, it sought to compare student-athletes’ career maturity to their non-athlete peers. Next, it sought to assess whether or not there were any differences in career maturity among student-athletes.

Literature Review

Super’s Theory of Career Development

Super purports that individuals go through five developmental phases: growth, exploration, establishment, maintenance, and decline (Gies, 1990; Super, 1957). During growth, people develop their self-concepts and attain knowledge about careers (Luzzo & Severy, 2009). Exploration involves actively investigating careers that range from idealistic to realistic (Gies, 1990). Establishment is where individuals focus on establishing themselves in careers (Kosine & Lewis, 2008) and assessing their career choices (Gies, 1990; Luzzo & Severy, 2009). Maintenance involves individuals pursuing similar careers in other organizations or changing careers altogether (Kosine & Lewis, 2008). Finally, decline is akin to preretirement (Gies, 1990). Individuals may transition into new careers (Gies, 1990), but retirement is the eventual outcome (Gies, 1990; Luzzo & Severy, 2009).

Career Maturity

Super linked individuals’ ability to progress through the career development process to their career maturity (Super, 1957), defined as their level of awareness and knowledge of the process related to making sound career decisions (Levinson et al., 1998). Furthermore, it is described as a group of actions required to recognize, select, plan, and implement career goals (Coertse & Schepers, 2004).

Those who exhibit the appropriate level of career maturity are able to collect information that helps them understand themselves, make informed career choices, assimilate knowledge of self and work, and integrate everything into the career decision making process (Super, 1957). Super summarized career maturity as existing along five dimensions: planfulness, exploration, information gathering, decision making, and reality orientation (Coertse & Schepers, 2004; Lau et al., 2013). See Table 1.
Table 1

*Super's Five Dimensions of Career Maturity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Career Maturity</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planfulness</td>
<td>The capacity to formulate a career plan and apply it in an operational manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>The act of questioning one's self-concept and one's career situation, and gathering information based on this self-concept, through the use of career resources and participation in social institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>The ability to collect information about the workplace, work preferences, and non-work roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>The ability to select careers grounded in sound, informed decision-making processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Orientation</td>
<td>The ability to develop a strong understanding of oneself, while being rational about available career alternatives, and establishing stable career preferences based on well-defined values, interests, objectives, and the development of substantive work experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CMI-R/AS**

The CMI-R/AS measures career maturity along: orientation, involvement, independence, compromise, and decisiveness (Busacca & Taber, 2002) (See Table 2). The instrument consists of 25 statements. Each statement has a value of zero or one, with total scores ranging from zero to 25. Scores of 20-25 indicate high career maturity, scores ranging from 16-19 indicate normal career maturity, while scores of 15 or lower indicate low career maturity (Busacca & Taber, 2002). The CMI-R/AS is provided in Appendix A.

The CMI-R/AS has proven to be a valid and reliable instrument. Each of its scale items were based on the 1978 version of the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) (Crites & Savickas, 1996), which was found to reliable and valid (Crites, 1978b). The CMI-R/AS's use in studies comparing student-athletes to non-athletes has been noted, and has further confirmed its validity and reliability (Ahlgren, 2001; Busacca & Taber, 2002; Hill, 2001; Hinsey, 2015; Linnemeyer & Brown, 2010; Rivas, 2002). As suggested by Super, the measures of the CMI-R/AS are closely linked to successful career outcomes resulting from the congruence between one's vocational maturity and one's personal reality (See Figure 1).
### Table 2

*Attitude Scale Variables Defined*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Scale Variables</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>The aptitude and awareness an individual has towards the process of making an occupational choice and the variables that enter into that choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>The degree to which one is engaged in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>The extent to which one is able to make autonomous choices as part of the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>The extent to which one is open to varying choices and alternatives that present themselves during the career decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>The level to which one is confident in one’s ability to make career-related decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview of Relevant Studies

Various studies have compared the career maturity of student-athletes in the revenue sports to their non-athlete peers, and found student-athletes to be less career mature (Ackerman, 2017; Clark, 2017; Hill, 2001; Houle & Kluck, 2015; Smallman & Sowa, 1996). In another study, student-athletes in the revenue sports failed to have viable career plans at the culmination of their college experience (Navarro, 2014). This aligns with the idea that their focus is on playing professional sports (Cox et al., 2009; NCAA, 2015).

Research around gender and the career maturity of student-athletes has been inconsistent (Parietti et al., 2016). One realm of the literature noted that Division I female student-athletes exhibited higher levels of career maturity than male student-athletes (Ackerman, 2012; Clark, 2017; Houle & Kluck, 2015; Murphy et al., 1996). Other studies however, found female student-athletes to exhibit lower levels of career maturity compared to male student-athletes (Parietti et al., 2016; Tyrance et al., 2013).

Along race/ethnicity, a few studies found no significant relationship between race/ethnicity and career maturity (Ahlgren, 2001; Beam, 2012; Harrison, Jr., et al., 2013; Tyrance et al., 2013). However, Houle (2010) found that Caucasian student-athletes possessed higher levels of career maturity than African-American student-athletes. Among those who expected to play professional sports, African-
American student-athletes exhibited lower levels of career maturity than Caucasian student-athletes (Hill, 2001).

As it relates to identity, previous studies found no connection between college student-athletes’ identities and their career engagement (Brown & Hartley, 1998; Martens & Cox, 2000). In contrast, student-athletes who identified more highly with their athletic selves, did not engage in career exploration activities outside of sports (Burns et al., 2012; Houle, 2010; Houle & Kluck, 2015; Poux & Fry, 2015). This was especially the case for football, basketball, and baseball players, who tended to concentrate on pursuing professional sports careers while ignoring other career options (Cox et al., 2009). Additionally, student-athletes who identified more closely with their athletic selves rejected career development altogether, to engage in their sport (Houle & Kluck, 2015).

Finally, some studies found no significant link between class level and career maturity. There was no relationship between career maturity and class level among Division I swimmers and gymnasts (Dailey, 1995). Smallman and Sowa (1996) yielded the same findings in their study of male student-athletes. Conversely, a study of Division I freshmen and senior student-athletes found that seniors had higher levels of career maturity (Ahlgren, 2001).
Purpose and Hypotheses

This study set out to examine the career maturity of Division I student-athletes in comparison to non-athletes, and to assess whether or not there were differences in career maturity within the student-athlete population. Based on the literature, the following were hypothesized:

- **H₁**: Student-athletes will exhibit lower career maturity than non-athletes.
- **H₂**: There will be no difference in career maturity between female and male student-athletes.
- **H₃**: Caucasian student-athletes will exhibit higher career maturity than African American student-athletes.
- **H₄**: Student-athletes’ career maturity will increase as their years of athletic eligibility increase.
- **H₅**: Student-athletes who identify more highly with their athletic identities will exhibit lower career maturity than other student-athletes.
- **H₆**: Student-athletes in revenue sports will exhibit lower career maturity than those in non-revenue sports.
- **H₇**: Student-athletes with higher beliefs in the likelihood that they will play professional sports will exhibit lower career maturity than other student-athletes.
- **H₈**: Student-athletes with professional sports aspirations will exhibit lower career maturity than other student-athletes.

Methodology

This study took place at a Division I university in the southeastern region of the United States. There were 468 student-athletes from 16 varsity sports (seven men’s sports and nine women’s sports) and over 27,000 non-athletes. As student-athletes represented less than 2% of the population, disproportionate allocation between-strata sampling strategy was used. It allows researchers to select the same number of individuals for each subgroup (Daniel, 2012).

The researcher utilized a site administrator to obtain the e-mails of all student-athletes and non-athletes. All 468 student-athletes were selected to participate, while Excel was utilized to randomly select 468 non-athletes. The researcher crafted an email for the site administrator to use to recruit subjects for the study, including a letter of informed consent, the anonymous link to the online CMI-R/AS, and the accompanying demographic and supplemental questions.
Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were calculated across the categorical variables. To address H1, an independent t-test was run, with athletic status as the independent variable, and career maturity as the dependent variable. For H2, a one-way ANOVA was run with gender and athletic status as a combined independent variable and career maturity as the dependent variable. As it relates to H3, the variances for each race/ethnicity category were disproportionate. Thus, race/ethnicity was converted into a new independent variable consisting of two levels, Caucasian and non-Caucasian, and was run as part of an independent t-test, with career maturity as the dependent variable. For H4, H5, H7, and H8, one-way ANOVAs were run with athletic eligibility, identity, belief in the likelihood of playing professional sports, and professional sports aspirations as the independent variables and career maturity as the dependent variable. Finally, for H6, a means comparison by sport was run.

Findings

Based on a quantitative analysis of the results, there were several findings. To begin with, student-athletes (CM=17.7, SD=5.15) scored lower on career maturity than non-athletes (CM=19.3, SD=5.18). The difference was statistically significant (t(280) = -2.59, p = .01)) and supports H1, which states that student-athletes will have lower career maturity than non-athletes.

Also, there was a significant difference in career maturity along gender and athletic status (F(3, 278) = 22.33, p = .00). Specifically, female student-athletes (CM=20.9, SD=3.4) exhibited higher levels of career maturity than male student-athletes (CM=14.9, SD=4.9). This does not support H2, which posits that there will be no difference in career maturity between female student-athletes and male student-athletes.

As it relates to H3, which states that Caucasian student-athletes will exhibit higher levels of career maturity than African-American student-athletes, differences could not be adequately captured. Due to disproportionality, the race/ethnicity variables had to be collapsed into two levels (Caucasian and Non-Caucasian). As such, H3 could not be supported.

For the remaining hypotheses, Table 3 illustrates the mean career maturity levels for the variables linked to them. The findings are summarized as follows. First, the difference in career maturity along year of athletic eligibility and athletic status was significant (F(4, 114) = 6.71, p = .00). Most notably, the largest variation occurred when there was minimally a two-year difference in athletic eligibility. This supports H4, which states that student-athletes’ career maturity will increase as their year of athletic eligibility increases. A difference in career maturity based on identity was also confirmed to be significant (F(2, 116) = 124.83, p = .00), thereby supporting H5, which states that student-athletes who identify more
highly with their athletic identities will exhibit lower career maturity than other student-athletes.

With respect to $H_6$, which states that student-athletes in revenue sports (football and men’s basketball) will exhibit lower career maturity than those in non-revenue sports, football players (CM=11.3, SD=1.1) were found to have the lowest career maturity. However, basketball players (CM=14.9, SD=2.6) exhibited higher career maturity levels than those in the non-revenue sport of baseball (CM=12.4, SD=3.0). Thus, $H_6$ was not fully supported.

Next, there was a significant interaction of the effect of belief in likelihood of playing professional sports on career maturity ($F(2, 116) = 12.30, p = .000$). Student-athletes with a high belief in the likelihood of playing professional sports scored significantly lower on career maturity than their athlete peers. This supports $H_7$, which states that student-athletes with higher beliefs in the likelihood of playing professional sports will exhibit lower career maturity levels.

Finally, a significant difference in career maturity was found between student-athletes with professional sports aspirations and other student-athletes ($F(2, 116) = 12.30, p = .000$). Those with professional sports aspirations exhibited lower levels of career maturity. This confirms $H_8$, which states that student-athletes with professional sports aspirations will exhibit lower career maturity levels than other student-athletes.

**Discussion and Implications**

Super believed that outcomes linked to one’s ability to navigate the career development process were firmly linked to their level of career maturity (Super, 1957). Thus, he would attribute student-athletes lagging behind non-athletes in their career maturity to the absence of necessary characteristics associated with the career planning process. As it applies to the findings in this study, the following explores Super’s theory in greater perspective.

Super’s theory dictates that student-athletes’ lower career maturity levels are linked to their inability to develop their self-concepts. This is the first key phase of the career development process. This would especially be the case for those student-athletes whose self-concepts are grounded in their athletic identities. Also, the confined culture in which student-athletes exist limits their exposure to career development activities. As Cox et al. (2009) state, intercollegiate athletics is structured in a way that prohibits student-athletes’ academic and vocational development. Furthermore, the excessive time demands placed on student-athletes also serve as a potential obstacle, with them spending on average of 20 to 30 hours per week in their respective sports (Tyrance, 2010). This is especially relevant for those student-athletes in revenue sports and those with strong beliefs in the likelihood they will play professional sports (Cox et al., 2009; Griffith & Johnson, 2002).
Table 3

Career Maturity: Student-Athlete Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Athletic Eligibility</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-Athlete</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men’s Track &amp; Field/CC</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women’s Track &amp; Field/CC</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sports Aspirations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Playing Professional Sports</td>
<td>Highly Likely</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly Unlikely</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M indicates mean. SD indicates standard deviation. SEM indicates standard error of mean.*
Career Maturity and Student-Athletes

Looking more closely at those student-athletes in the revenue sports, they believe they have a high likelihood of playing professional sports. Super would explain their low levels of career maturity by the fact that they are generally closed off to other careers. Thus, they do not develop strong self-concepts, something specific to sound career decision making. It could also be stated that identity plays a role here, as these student-athletes would tend to exhibit above average attachments to their athletic selves.

An additional factor to consider is what happens when a student-athlete has the realization that he or she is not going to play professional sports, even though his or her career aspirations were originally targeting that path. Super coined a term called minicycling, which refers to individuals revisiting some phases of the career development process (Kosine & Lewis, 2008). This minicycling concept is applicable to year of eligibility as well. As the results of this study demonstrated, as year of eligibility increased, career maturity increased, especially if there was a minimum of a two-year difference in eligibility. Super’s theory supports the belief that student-athletes originally exhibiting lower levels of career maturity would see gradual increases in career maturity due to the sudden necessity of having to engage in the career development process.

Subsequently, this study could have significance for student-athletes, career advisors, and athletic department administrators. First, it could encourage student-athletes to be more proactive in developing secondary career plans. Additionally, it could inform the work of career advisors as they develop programs and services for student-athletes. Finally, this study could enlighten athletic department administrators as to the necessity of ensuring that their student-athletes are prepared for the transition into life after sports.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation was that most of the participants self-identified as Caucasian/Non-Hispanic. This made it difficult to draw substantive conclusions about career maturity along race/ethnicity. Another limitation was that only four of the 16 sports had enough participants to generalize across sports (See Table 4). Finally, when the survey was administered, 13 of the 16 sports were in season, which may have impacted response rates.

Future research could include conducting this study at multiple institutions across Division I, II, and III. Looking at multiple institutions might yield a large enough number of participants for each sport, thereby providing a more in-depth analysis across variables. Also, a qualitative study asking former student-athletes to revisit their level of career readiness and their participation in the career development process, as it relates to non-playing careers, might yield some useful data.
Table 4  
Frequencies by Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Basketball</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Basketball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Golf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Golf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Tennis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Tennis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Track &amp; Field/Cross Country</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Track &amp; Field/Cross Country</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The findings have practical application for advancing the work of higher education administrators with respect to preparing student-athletes for life after sports. As a result of this study, the researcher crafted the Athlete Career Enrichment (ACE) Program to address the career planning needs of student-athletes. By establishing a partnership between campus career services and athletics, ACE can focus on closing the career maturity gap between student-athletes and non-athletes as well as the one that exists among student-athletes. The following provides a snapshot of the ACE blueprint.

First, student-athletes would be required to attend an ACE Program orientation as part of their sports’ pre-season activities. They would receive a program overview, complete a career maturity assessment, and be matched with a career advisor. At the end of the pre-season, student-athletes would meet with their assigned career advisors to discuss their career maturity assessment results.

Next, career advisors would work with their assigned student-athletes to map out viable career plans. They would track their progress throughout their college experience, with regular individual and group check-ins. Career advisors would also collaborate with athletics to ensure that career development programming
Career Maturity and Student-Athletes

is implemented in a manner that accommodates student-athletes’ demanding schedules.

At the end of the academic year, career services and athletics will partner to prepare a year-end report. The report would summarize the workshops and events offered, the number of career advising sessions conducted, an assessment of the overall effectiveness of the program, and a synopsis of any other major career planning activities that took place.

Subsequently, the ACE Program could serve as a guide for serving student-athletes’ career needs. While some student-athletes will have the opportunity to play professional sports, the majority will not be so fortunate. This could facilitate increased student-athlete engagement in the career development process and change how they view their career development, thereby affecting more positive career outcomes as they manage the transition into life after sports.
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**Appendix A**

**Career Maturity Inventory–Revised Attitude Scale (CMI –R/AS)**

Please read each statement carefully and indicate your level of agreement (Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree).

1. Everyone seems to tell me something different; as a result, I don't know what kind of work to choose.

   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

2. It’s probably just as easy to be successful in one occupation as it is in another.

   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

3. I have little or no idea what working will be like.

   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

4. Once you choose a job, you can’t choose another one.

   - [ ] Strongly Agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither Agree or Disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
5. I keep wondering how I can reconcile the kind of person I am with the kind of person I want to be in my future occupation.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

6. Sometimes you have to take a job that is not your first choice.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

7. Work is dull and unpleasant.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

8. I can’t understand how some people can be so certain about what they want to do.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

9. As far as choosing an occupation is concerned, something will come along sooner or later.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree
10. Choosing an occupation is something you have to do on your own.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

11. As long as I remember, I’ve known what kind of work I want to do.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

12. There may not be any openings for the job I want most.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

13. I don’t know how to go about getting into the kind of work I want to do.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

14. There is no point in deciding upon a job when the future is so uncertain.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree
15. I spend a lot of time wishing I could do work I know I can never do.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

16. If someone would tell me which occupation to enter, I would feel much better.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

17. I know very little about the requirements of the job.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

18. When choosing an occupation, you should consider several different ones.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

19. There is only one occupation for each person.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree
20. The best thing to do is to try out several jobs, and then choose the one you like best.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

21. You get into an occupation mostly by chance.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

22. I seldom think about the job I want to enter.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

23. You almost always have to settle for a job that’s less than you had hoped for.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree

24. I really can’t find any work that has much appeal to me.

☐ Strongly Agree  
☐ Agree  
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree  
☐ Disagree  
☐ Strongly Disagree
25. I’d rather work than play.

☐ Strongly Agree
☐ Agree
☐ Neither Agree or Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly Disagree

Demographic/Supplemental Questions

Q1  What gender do you most identify with?
    Male
    Female
    Other: _____________________________

Q2  Which most accurately reflects your class level?
    Freshman
    Sophomore
    Junior
    Senior
    Graduate Student

Q3  Which of the following most closely describes your race/ethnicity?
    Caucasian/Non-Hispanic
    African/Black American
    Hispanic/Latino
    Asian/Pacific Islander
    Native American
    Other: ______________

Q4  Are you a varsity student-athlete?
    Yes
    No (If no, skip to “Question #13.”)

Q5  Are you receiving any type of scholarship?
    Yes
    No

Q6  What is your year of eligibility?
    1st year
    2nd year
    3rd year
Tarver

4th year
5th year
6th year

Q7 Which do you identify with the most?
- Being an athlete
- Being a student
- Being a student-athlete
- Other: ________________

Q8 What sport(s) do you compete in?
- Baseball
- Men's Basketball
- Women's Basketball
- Football
- Men's Golf
- Women's Golf
- Rowing
- Soccer
- Softball
- Men's Swimming & Diving
- Women's Swimming & Diving
- Men's Tennis
- Women's Tennis
- Men's Track & Field/Cross Country
- Women's Track & Field/Cross Country
- Volleyball

Q9 Do you have professional sports aspirations?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q10 How would you rate your likelihood of playing professional sports?
- Highly unlikely
- Unlikely
- Neutral
- Likely
- Highly likely
Q11  Other than being a professional athlete, what other job do you aspire to do?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q12  Who has been most beneficial to you as it relates to thinking about your future?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q13  Have you experienced any unforeseen circumstances that have impacted your responses to this survey?
Yes (If yes, please describe briefly below.)
No
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY.