



12-2014

An Examination of the Role of Gender in Understanding Faculty Perceptions of Student- Athletes at NCAA Division I Institutions

Jana Thomas Spitzer

University of Tennessee - Knoxville, jthoma47@utk.edu

Recommended Citation

Spitzer, Jana Thomas, "An Examination of the Role of Gender in Understanding Faculty Perceptions of Student-Athletes at NCAA Division I Institutions. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2014.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/3170

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Jana Thomas Spitzer entitled "An Examination of the Role of Gender in Understanding Faculty Perceptions of Student-Athletes at NCAA Division I Institutions." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Higher Education Administration.

Norma T. Mertz, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Bob Rider, Dennis J. Ciancio, Barbara Thayer-Bacon

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

An Examination of the Role of Gender in Understanding Faculty
Perceptions of Student-Athletes at NCAA Division I Institutions

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jana Thomas Spitzer
December 2014

Copyright © 2014 by Jana Thomas Spitzer
All rights reserved.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my amazing daughter, Abigail, who makes me strive to be a better person every day.

Acknowledgements

I would not be writing this page if not for the support of my husband, Noah. Noah, I know without a doubt that I would not have come this far without you. My self-doubt certainly would have stopped me a long time ago if not for all of your words of encouragement along the way. I will never be able to fully thank you for all of the hours you watched Abbie so I could work on my dissertation and for all of the laughter you provided when I otherwise might have cried.

I would also like to thank a few other incredibly important people in my life who have helped me during my time in this program. To my mother, father, and brother, thank you for your support, love, and guidance. You have always been just a phone call away and have consistently believed in me. To my dear friends from the Higher Ed program, especially the Dead End BBQ crew (Courtney Shaffer, Elizabeth Smith, David Key, and Mary Lucal – plus our unofficial faculty advisor, Margaret Sallee), I will cherish your friendships forever. Seeing each of you get one step closer to your degree has helped me to push forward.

And last, I would be remiss if I did not formally acknowledge my dissertation committee and other faculty members who have guided me to this point: Drs. Norma Mertz, Dennis Ciancio, Bob Rider, Barbara Thayer-Bacon, Joy DeSensi, Trish McClam, and E. Grady Bogue. Dr. Mertz, I have no idea how you do it. You mentor so many students, yet you make us all feel important. Your timely, direct feedback is invaluable, but not nearly as precious as the emotional support and encouragement you provide. I am eternally grateful for your help along the way, and I may never truly be able to fully

convey my appreciation for the time you have spent reading drafts and meeting with me in person throughout this process. You have made me a better writer and a better researcher through your courses and through your mentorship.

Dr. Ciancio, you made statistics accessible and interesting. I greatly enjoyed your courses and your willingness to serve on my dissertation committee. Your guidance has been crucial to my development as a researcher, and you have taught me to examine research with a critical eye and not just take findings at face value – a skill which is certainly important in many facets of life.

Dean Rider and Dr. Thayer-Bacon, I cannot thank you enough for joining my committee near the end of my journey. You both have such incredibly busy schedules, and you could easily have turned me away. Instead, you showed enthusiasm about my topic and interest in my development and success as an academic. You each challenged me and made me reflect on angles of my study which I had not yet considered.

Dr. DeSensi, I have never met a faculty more sincerely interested in helping students than you. When I asked you to be on my committee, you did not hesitate and immediately started pointing me in the direction of relevant literature based on your many years of experience in the field.

Dr. McClam, your interest in my area of research from the moment of our first meeting was infectious. As I was trying to hone in on a specific topic, you helped me brainstorm about potential angles to consider – a conversation which turned out to be very instrumental in defining my study. You have posed questions in each of my

defenses which have been incredibly thought-provoking and have pushed me to dig deeper into the research and strengthen my study.

And finally, to Dr. Bogue, please know I miss you. The idea of pursuing a Ph.D. was not even on my radar when we first met. You encouraged me to consider the Higher Education Administration program and supported my efforts throughout my coursework. I learned so many lessons about leadership and service in your courses and by witnessing your example. Lessons which will stay with me for my entire life. You have left an amazing legacy which will continue positively influencing others for many, many years to come.

Abstract

Previous research has indicated that faculty hold negative perceptions toward male student-athletes. Studies have shown that faculty perceptions are most negative when the student-athlete competed at an NCAA Division I institution, in a high-profile sport, and was non-White. What remained unknown was the role of gender in understanding faculty perceptions of student-athletes. The current study considered this gap in the literature and determined if the gender of the student-athlete, the gender of the faculty member, or other characteristics of the faculty member influenced perceptions of male or female student-athletes. The study utilized the Situational Attitudes Scale (SAS) to compare faculty reactions to ten different scenarios involving male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general student population. The responses from 282 faculty at one NCAA Division I institution were analyzed. Faculty were found to hold more negative perceptions of male student-athletes than either female student-athletes or students in the general population in nine of the ten scenarios posed, although the difference in perception was only found to be statistically significant in eight of the ten situations.

Whereas faculty perceptions of male student-athletes were always the most negative of the three groups, faculty perceptions of female student-athletes differed depending on context. Faculty were found to hold more negative perceptions of female student-athletes than students in the general population in certain situations, primarily situations that involved preferential financial or admissions decisions by the institution which targeted female student-athletes. However, faculty were found to hold more

favorable perceptions of female student-athletes than students in the general population in other situations, particularly situations related to academics such as when the student has a lower semester GPA or misses a class.

The gender of the faculty member was not found to have a significant impact on faculty perceptions of student-athletes. While some other characteristics of the faculty member, specifically academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation in collegiate athletics, and previous experience teaching male student-athletes, were found to be significant in a few specific scenarios, the faculty member's race, and previous experience teaching female student-athletes were found to have no significant impact of faculty perceptions.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	5
Theoretical Framework.....	6
Significance of the Study	8
Delimitations and Limitations.....	9
Definitions.....	10
Organization of the Study	12
Chapter 2 Review of the Literature.....	13
Student-Athletes’ Perceptions of Faculty Interactions	13
Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics	16
Faculty Perceptions of Student-Athletes.....	22
Academic competency.....	22
Student-athletes in revenue and non-revenue sports.....	24
Race.....	29
Gender.....	32
Theoretical Framework: Gender Role Theory	34
Summary.....	36
Chapter 3 Methods and Procedures	38
Research Design.....	38
Site and Population	39
Instrumentation	41
Procedures.....	45
Data Analysis	49
Chapter 4 Results	51
Description of Sample and Participants	51
Data Preparation and Interpretation	58
Research Question Results.....	58
Research Question 1	58
Research Question 2	64
Research Question 3	64
Summary.....	68
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Recommendations.....	70
Summary of Findings.....	71
Discussion.....	72
Conclusion	81
Implications for Higher Education.....	81
Recommendations for Future Research	83
List of References	86
Appendices.....	97
Appendix A.....	98

Appendix B	100
Appendix C	107
Appendix D	114
Appendix E	121
Appendix F.....	122
Appendix G.....	123
Appendix H.....	124
Vita.....	126

List of Tables

Table 1. Selected Variables in Relationship to Research Questions and Literature	46
Table 2. General Student Version – Respondent Demographics	55
Table 3. Male Student-Athlete Version – Respondent Demographics	56
Table 4. Female Student-Athlete Version – Respondent Demographics	57
Table 5. Univariate F-tests for Form Differences and Situation Mean Scores	59
Table 6. Scenario Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Form	61
Table 7. Tukey HSD Post Hoc Patterns of Between Group Differences for 8 Significant Scenarios	62

Chapter 1

Introduction

College athletics have been highly criticized by academic researchers over the past 20 years for a multitude of reasons. College athletics has been criticized for becoming increasingly commercialized and professionalized (Bok, 2003; Knight Commission, 2010; Lapchick, 2006; Shulman & Bowen, 2001), for the low graduation rates and below average academic performance of athletes in the classroom (Atwater, 2010; Knight Commission, 2001; Shulman & Bowen, 2001), and for the frequent academic and regulatory scandals associated with student-athletes, coaching staffs, and athletic departments (Bok, 2003; Briody, 1996; Coakley, 2006). Taken collectively, these criticisms generate a negative portrait of intercollegiate athletics, a portrait which can affect, and in many cases tarnish, an institution's academic reputation (Atwater, 2010; Briody, 1996; Thelin, 1996; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000).

Perhaps this threat to a university's repute helps to explain why recent studies have shown that faculty hold negative attitudes towards athletics and student-athletes at their institutions (Atwater, 2010; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Briody, 1996; Coakley & Roswal, 1994; Comeaux, 2010; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2007; Noble, 2004; Norman, 1995; Ott, 2011). Consistently the research has shown that students participating in high profile sports (i.e., football and basketball) are typically seen more negatively than students who participate in low profile sports (sports other than football and basketball), and that both groups are seen more negatively than are general students at the institution (Baucom & Lantz, 2001;

Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Tovar, 2011). The existing literature has also hinted that the race of the student-athlete may play a part in faculty perceptions (Comeaux, 2010; Comeaux, 2013). According to Comeaux (2010), faculty tend to view the academic and post-undergraduate accomplishments of Black student-athletes less favorably than the academic and post-undergraduate accomplishments of White student-athletes.

Where does the generally negative perception of student-athletes originate? Research suggests that faculty attitudes toward student-athletes tend to stem from negative stereotypes about student-athletes' academic preparedness and their lack of perceived commitment to the institution as an academic, rather than an athletic, entity. The "dumb jock" stereotype is commonly acknowledged in scholarly literature on perceptions of student-athletes (Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Sailes, 1993; Stone, Sjomeling, Lynch, & Darley, 1999; Williams, Colles, & Allen, 2010). Additionally, research indicates that faculty question student-athletes' commitment to their academic pursuits (Atwater, 2010; Williams, Colles, & Allen, 2010). This contention is especially true for faculty perceptions of male student-athletes participating in high profile sports (Atwater, 2010).

Such stereotypes and negative perceptions pose a potential threat to how faculty interact with student-athletes and how student-athletes perceive themselves. Studies spanning over forty years have demonstrated that stereotypes can influence the behavior of the person holding the negative perception (Cooper & Good, 1983; Ennis, 1995; Guéguen, 2012; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968; Rubie-Davies, Hattie, & Hamilton, 2006;

Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977; Weinstein, 2002). Perhaps one of the earliest studies of this nature was conducted by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) who studied the effects of elementary school teachers' perceptions of students in the classroom on subsequent academic performance. When teachers were told in advance that a group of students were high achieving (regardless of whether or not the students actually were), teachers behaved in such a way that facilitated student success, thus leading to a self-fulfilling prophecy. Additionally, when teachers were told that a group of students were lower achieving, the lowered expectations by the teachers led to decreases in academic performance by the students.

Further, Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977) concluded that, "Conceptual analysis of the cognitive and behavioral consequences of stereotyping suggests that a perceiver's actions based upon stereotype-generated attributions about a specific target individual may cause the behavior of that individual to confirm the perceiver's initially erroneous attributions" (p. 656). In an educational context, this change in behavior (i.e., lowered or raised expectations) "may alter [instructors'] teaching practicing and thus student opportunity to learn" (Rubie-Davies, Hattie, & Hamilton, 200, p. 440). Additionally, stereotypes projected on student-athletes can threaten a student-athlete's ability to develop a healthy and stable sense of self (Stone, Sjomeling, Lynch, & Darley, 1999; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1989). As suggested by Jussim, Eccles, and Madon (1996), members of negatively stereotyped groups are at risk of internalizing some of the "inaccurate but ultimately self-fulfilling expectations" (p. 378) which others attribute to them.

Since previous research contends that student-athletes are in danger of developing a negative self-image and that faculty are at risk of treating student-athletes differently based on their negative perceptions of student-athletes, it becomes imperative to gain a better understanding of the nature of these negative attitudes in hopes of reducing any behavioral effects such perceptions can impact in the future. While existing research suggests that faculty perceive Black student-athletes and student-athletes who participate in high profile sports more harshly than White student-athletes and student-athletes who participate in low profile sports, little to date is known about if or how the gender of the student-athlete affects faculty perceptions. This gap in our knowledge has been identified as an area of needed future research (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Comeaux, 2010; Comeaux, 2013; Engstrom, 1991; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995). Considering how male and female student-athletes may be perceived differently by faculty can provide insight into another dimension of the negative student-athlete stereotype which has implications for affecting faculty behavior towards student-athletes as well as student-athletes' perceptions of their own academic capabilities.

Statement of the Problem

Previous research has established that student-athletes are perceived more negatively by faculty than students in the general population at an institution. Empirical evidence also suggests that the visibility of the sport-played (i.e., high profile sports versus low profile sports) and the race of the student-athlete affects faculty perceptions of the student-athlete. Additionally, research has established that these negative perceptions and harmful stereotypes of student-athletes can potentially affect faculty behavior

towards student-athletes and affect student-athletes' sense of self, particularly in regard to their academic abilities. What is not yet well understood is whether or how faculty perceptions of female student-athletes differ from those held of male student-athletes. Understanding if and how faculty perceptions of male and female student-athletes might differ is crucial in gaining a better understanding of the perceptions and stereotypes associated with student-athletes in general and in creating awareness of how such biases might affect faculty behavior towards student-athletes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to consider how faculty perceptions of student-athletes are affected by the gender of the student-athlete at NCAA Division IA institutions.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding the study include:

1. Do faculty members at NCAA Division IA institutions perceive male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general population differently?
2. Does the gender of the faculty member affect his or her perceptions of male and female student-athletes?
3. Do other characteristics related to faculty members including race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching student-athletes affect how they perceive male and female student-athletes?

Theoretical Framework

To understand how faculty perceptions of student-athletes may vary based on the gender of the student-athlete, this study utilized a gender role theory framework. Gender role theory seeks to explain inequities between male and female behavior as well as how males and females are expected to behave by others. Gender role theory focuses on the ways in which gender is “performed” based on culturally accepted and recreated normative behavior which dictates certain expectations for males and females (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Karau, 1991). This theory poses an appropriate lens for considering faculty perceptions of student-athletes because of its focus on gender as a “socially constructed” concept which invariably translates to differing expectations for males and females. Males are commonly expected to possess traits which exhibit agency such as independence, assertiveness, and competency (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Such characteristics are seen as appropriate and largely desirable in the world of athletes. Females, however, are traditionally expected to learn communal or expressive traits which restrain their aggression while reinforcing caring and unselfish behavior (Eagly & Karau, 1991). Such traits are not generally congruent with the competitive nature of athletics.

For female student-athletes, these gender expectations can cause conflict between their “masculine” athletic identity and their feminine gender roles (Fallon & Jorne, 2007). Research has shown that female student-athletes are vulnerable to labels such as “manly,” and consequently, “lesbian” (Person, Benson-Quaziana, & Rogers, 2001), especially when they participate in sports which are considered particularly “masculine,” such as

basketball, track and field, or rugby (Burke, 1986; Fallon & Jorne, 2007). Yet, studies have also suggested that female student-athletes tend to boast higher GPAs and may face fewer negative consequences from their athletic status than their male peers (Aries, McCarthy, Salovey, & Banaji, 2004; Shulman and Bowen, 2001; Simons, Van Rhee, & Covington, 1999). One potential explanation for this difference is that women are not always seen as credible athletes (Jones & Greer, 2011) and post-college athletic opportunities are viewed as limited, or are certainly less financially rewarding, than the professional opportunities for men (Atwater, 2010). This may lead faculty, and perhaps even female student-athletes themselves, to deemphasize the athletic role and focus, rather, on academic pursuits and opportunities.

Gender role theory has previously been used in scholarly research as a lens for considering gender differences as they relate to athletics (Fallon & Jorne, 2007; Harrison & Lynch, 2005; Jones & Greer, 2011; Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2010; Whisenant, 2008). For the current study, gender role theory provided a framework for understanding if and how faculty perceptions of student-athletes vary based on the gender of the student-athlete. In particular, gender role theory influenced the research questions and research design because the primary variable of interest became the gender of the student-athlete and how perceptions may be altered based on preconceived gender role expectations. As described in Chapter Three, the study was designed to isolate gender as a variable influencing faculty perceptions. Additionally, the study design considered how the gender of the faculty member adds an additional dimension to the equation which has not yet been explored in this context. With its focus on role expectations and gender as a

socially constructed notion, gender role theory provided a useful framework for considering the interplay between the gender of the student-athlete and the gender of the faculty member.

Significance of the Study

The current study has significance for research and practice. Understanding how faculty may perceive male and female student-athletes differently impacts research because the question posed in this study fills a void which exists in the literature related to faculty perceptions of student-athletes. While existing research indicates that faculty perceive student-athletes (particularly Black athletes and those who participate in high profile sports) more negatively than students in the general population, there is a dearth of evidence regarding how the gender of the student-athlete and the gender of the faculty member affects perceptions.

Additionally, the present study informs practice. Faculty and athletic departments can benefit from gaining a better understanding of stereotypes and preconceived notions of student-athletes. If negative perceptions of student-athletes exist, and if there is a difference in how faculty perceive male and female student-athletes, it is likely that most faculty holding such perceptions are not aware of their subtle biases. By shedding light on any potentially negative stereotypes held by faculty toward male and/or female student-athletes, faculty and athletic departments can advance programming, update policy, and implement teaching strategies which will improve the overall academic experience for student-athletes in higher education.

Delimitations and Limitations

It is important to acknowledge the boundaries and limitations of this study. While the research question asserts to understand how faculty perceive male and female student-athletes at NCAA Division IA institutions, the research questions neglect perceptions of student-athletes who attend institutions affiliated with all other NCAA divisions. This means that the current study cannot speak to faculty perceptions of student-athletes at NCAA Division II or III schools nor can inferences be made about collegiate students participating in sports at a recreational level. Additionally, the study is designed to understand how faculty perceptions of student-athletes may vary by the gender of the student-athlete. While the research design allows for several variables concerning the faculty member to be considered, the design only provides information regarding the student-athletes gender in order to isolate the primary research variable. Thus, the findings of this study cannot speak to ways in which the race of the student-athlete and/or specific sport played may impact a faculty member's perception.

A limitation of the study is that it utilized a quantitative method which involved self-reported attitudes. Such self-reported responses may not always be a reflection of behavior. While faculty, and people in general, may hold prejudicial views about a number of aspects of our world, they may not overtly discriminate based on those views. With this shortcoming acknowledged, harmful attitudes still have the potential to affect the more subtle, often unintentional, discrimination which affects society (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Additionally, when using self-reported attitudes, there is always a risk of participants choosing responses which they feel are socially desirable rather than

responses which most closely reflect their attitudes. While the survey design used in this study intends to lessen the likelihood of participants selecting responses which are socially desirable, no survey instrument can completely eliminate this potential bias.

Another potential limitation of this study relates to the survey design used. Surveys tend to restrict participants to predetermined responses which may not perfectly reflect the participant's views. While this is certainly a limitation of survey designs in general, such a strategy provided uniformity for analysis purposes so that broad trends in perceptions amongst large groupings of respondents could be made.

Definitions

Gender: For purposes of this paper, gender is defined as “the culturally and socially constructed differences between females and males found in the meanings, beliefs, and practices associated with ‘femininity’ and ‘masculinity’” (Brym and Lie, 2006).

High profile and low profile sport: The term high profile sport is used to indicate football and basketball. Low profile sport is used to describe all other sports such as soccer, volleyball, tennis, baseball, swimming, etc. Scholarly literature and the media often use the terms revenue and non-revenue sports to differentiate between these two groups; however, Shulman and Bowen (2001) note that not all football and basketball programs generate revenue – even at NCAA Division I institutions.

NCAA: NCAA stands for the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The NCAA is a non-profit organization comprised mostly of “athletic administrators or faculty representatives from member institutions and conferences” (NCAA, 2012). The

purpose of the Association is to create and enforce regulations and guidelines for intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA consists of three primary Divisions: Division I, Division II, and Division III. Institutions participating in Division I and Division II are permitted to offer athletic scholarships, while Division III institutions cannot offer athletic scholarships. Division I institutions are generally the largest schools.

NCAA Division I: NCAA Division I institutions have the largest athletic programs in terms of number of sports teams offered. Additionally, NCAA Division I institutions have a minimum and maximum amount of financial assistance provided to student-athletes. NCAA Division I is currently divided into three subdivisions:

Football Bowl Subdivision: Member institutions that are a part of the Football Bowl Subdivision participate in a postseason bowl system in football. This subdivision typically represents the largest intercollegiate football programs in the United States, and member institutions must meet minimum football attendance standards.

Football Championship Division: Member institutions participate in a football postseason playoff, rather than the bowl system mentioned above.

Division I: These institutions are a part of the larger NCAA Division I category, but do not sponsor football teams.

Perception: Perception is defined as “the processes by which we form impressions of other people’s traits and personalities” (DeLamater and Myers, 2010, p. 116). Further, DeLamater and Myers contend that perception is not a passive process, but rather an active process in which, “our expectations and cognitive structures influence what we notice and how we interpret it” (p. 116).

Student-Athletes: Individuals who participate in a variety of sports (high profile and low profile) who are subject to the rules and regulations outlined by the NCAA.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One presented the background and context for the study. Additionally, Chapter One identified the study's purpose, research questions, theoretical framework, and significance. Potential limitations and delimitations as well as critical definitions related to the study were discussed in this section as well.

Chapter Two provides a thorough, critical review of relevant research and literature related to what we know about faculty perceptions of student-athletes and athletics. In Chapter Three, the methods and procedures used in the conduct of the study are delineated. The findings of the study including demographic information related to the study's participants are provided in Chapter Four. Finally, Chapter Five offers a summary and discussion of the findings and a consideration of the implications of the findings and conclusions that may be drawn. Recommendations for future research will also be presented in Chapter Five.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The present study examined faculty perceptions of student-athletes, particularly how those perceptions are affected by the gender of the student-athlete. With this purpose in mind, the current chapter reviews relevant research related to faculty perceptions of student-athletes. The literature reviewed in this chapter is organized into three main sections: studies which consider student-athletes' perceptions of faculty interactions, studies which examine faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics in general, and studies specifically related to faculty perceptions of intercollegiate student-athletes. Taken together, this research provides considerable insight into factors which affect faculty perceptions of student-athletes. The final portion of this chapter details the theoretical framework which guides the study. The tenets of gender role theory are highlighted followed by a discussion of how the theory is used as an interpretive framework for understanding gender as a variable which may affect faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Student-Athletes' Perceptions of Faculty Interactions

In discussing how faculty perceive student-athletes, it is important to consider how student-athletes perceive their treatment from faculty. If student-athletes feel they are treated equitably in comparison to other students, then perhaps considering faculty who hold potentially negative attitudes towards them is irrelevant; however, studies have shown that student-athletes perceive differential treatment, and interestingly, this differential treatment is both positive and negative. A 2007 study funded by the NCAA

(Potuto & Hanlon) surveyed over 900 student-athletes from 18 NCAA Division 1A schools with the purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the student-athlete experience. Two questions on the instrument were intended to gauge students' perceptions of their treatment by faculty. The first question asked the student-athletes surveyed to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the statement, "I feel that some of my professors discriminate against me because I am an athlete." Student-athletes were given a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree on which to mark their response. Over 25 percent of the respondents somewhat agreed that they perceived discrimination by faculty, while 16 percent indicated that they agreed, and approximately 8 percent strongly agreed. The second question asked the student-athletes surveyed to respond to the statement, "I feel that some of my professors favor me because I am an athlete." Over 29 percent of the respondents somewhat agreed that they perceived favoritism by faculty, while 13 percent agreed, and 3 percent strongly agreed. Taken collectively, the findings from these two questions suggest that – positively or negatively – student-athletes perceive they are treated differently by their professor because of their athletic status.

Simons, Bosworth, Fujita, and Jensen (2007) conducted a similar study of 538 student-athletes at a single, large NCAA Division I-A public institution, but rather than focusing on perceived treatment by faculty, these researchers sought primarily to assess student-athletes' perceptions of faculty attitudes. Using a survey created for their study, the researchers found that 33 percent of student-athletes believed they were perceived negatively by faculty, and over 61 percent reported they had either been refused or given

a hard time when requesting special accommodations for athletic competitions. In addition, 62 percent stated a professor had made a disparaging remark about athletes in class. Further, 89 percent reported that they rarely or never received preferential treatment.

Seeking to determine if these concerns were the same for student-athletes at NCAA Division II institutions, Parsons (2010) replicated the Simons, Bosworth, Fujita, and Jensen (2007) study. Using essentially the same instrument, Parsons surveyed 252 student-athletes at a Midwestern NCAA Division II school. While Simons et al. found that one third of the students surveyed perceived negative attitudes from faculty members, only 12 percent of the students in Parsons' study reported they perceived negative perceptions on the part of faculty. Additionally, females in Parsons' study were less likely to report having heard a disparaging remark from professors in class and less likely to feel the need to hide their athletic participation than male student-athletes in the study.

Utilizing an adapted version of the survey instrument created by Simons et al. (2007), Williams, Colles, and Allen (2010) sought to determine whether student-athletes at NCAA Division III institutions expressed similar concerns to student-athletes at NCAA Division I and II schools. The adapted survey was returned in its entirety by 409 student-athletes from three northeastern, NCAA Division III institutions. Similar to Parsons' (2010) findings, they found that student-athletes had generally favorable perceptions of faculty interactions. Once again, male student-athletes were more likely than female student-athletes to have been affected by a number of negative encounters.

Specifically, male student-athletes in this sample were “more likely to have heard negative comments from faculty about their abilities, and were more likely to avoid letting faculty know that they were athletes. In addition, male athletes had stronger perceptions that faculty believed they were less motivated and less capable academically” (p. 228).

Collectively, these studies suggest that many athletes, particularly those at Division I institutions, believe they are treated differently and viewed differently by faculty than students who do not participate in sports. This perceived differential treatment, particularly when the differential treatment is thought to be negative, has the potential to undermine the academic experience of student-athletes and potentially lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy where the student-athletes perform more poorly because of these lowered expectations.

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics

To date, relatively few studies have sought to understand faculty perceptions of student-athletes; rather, the majority of existing research focuses on determining faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at their institution. While this is an important distinction, it can be argued that studies related to faculty views of athletics at their school may help to explain how faculty members perceive student-athletics in general (Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2007; Ott, 2011). For this reason, studies which provide insight into faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at their institution will be considered in this literature review.

The research has consistently found that faculty hold generally negative views of intercollegiate athletics at their institutions (Briody, 1996; Cockley and Roswal, 1994; Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2007; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). Indeed, faculty have been shown to hold more negative views of the relationship between athletics and an institution's academic reputation than students, alumni, or college administrators (Briody, 1996; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). This trend remains true regardless of NCAA classification.

In an attempt to better understand the nature of faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics, the Knight Commission sponsored a national survey of faculty at 23 NCAA Division IA institutions (Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2007). The Knight Commission, along with faculty at the University of Michigan, designed and piloted a survey instrument which was completed in its entirety by over 2,000 tenure-track faculty. Respondents were asked to read statements and respond on a 4-point Likert-type scale the extent (Not at All, Slightly, Moderately, or Very Much) to which the statement described their campus. Faculty were also given the option to select, "Don't Know" or "No Opinion." Faculty were asked, for example, "Organizationally, intercollegiate athletics is an auxiliary service (e.g., campus bookstore) that generates its own revenue and is accountable to university administrators, not faculty." Over 46 percent of respondents indicated that this statement applied to their campus "very much." Another 15% believed this statement at least moderately applied to their institution.

The Knight Commission also asked faculty to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, "Faculty roles associated with oversight of intercollegiate athletics are

ill defined on my campus.” Approximately 24 percent of faculty responded that this statement applied “very much” to their campus, while nearly 17 percent said this statement moderately applied. Further, over 30 percent of faculty believed the statement, “Decisions about intercollegiate athletics on my campus are driven by the priorities of an entertainment industry that is not invested in my university’s academic mission” applied “very much” to their institution. Another 20 percent moderately agreed. When asked to respond to the statement, “The athletic department can use its power with influential politicians, business leaders, and alumni to get what it wants on my campus,” 52% indicated the statement applied to their campus, very much or moderately (27%, very much; 25% moderately). From these findings, the researchers concluded that faculty view athletics as “an auxiliary enterprise” over which “faculty oversight is weak” (p. 75). They additionally stated that, “[faculty] are inclined to believe that faculty governance roles in this domain are ill defined and [they] tend to be dissatisfied with the nature and impact of their involvement” (p. 75). These conclusions suggest that faculty feel disconnected from athletics and unable to participate in meaningful involvement with the way athletic governance is currently constructed.

Similarly, Cockley and Roswal (1994) sought to determine how faculty involvement and knowledge of athletics affected faculty perceptions of athletics at their institution. Cockley and Roswal surveyed faculty at 16 NCAA Division I institutions, 16 NCAA Division II institutions, and 16 NCAA Division III institutions to compare data across NCAA classifications. The researchers, using a survey designed specifically for their study, were able to obtain over 800 usable faculty responses from 48 randomly

selected institutions. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement to a series of statements about their perceived knowledge of the athletic programs and policies on their campus and their satisfaction with athletics at their institutions. Specifically, Cockley and Roswal sought to determine if differences existed in regard to faculty satisfaction and perceived knowledge of athletic policies and procedures between NCAA Division I, II, and III institutions. Using a One-Way ANOVA by Ranks test, they found statistically significant differences in the satisfaction level among the three divisions. NCAA Division I faculty were least satisfied with athletics at their institutions, followed by faculty at NCAA Division II, and faculty at NCAA Division III institutions, who were found to be the most satisfied among the three groups. Based on these findings, the researchers concluded that faculty, particularly at NCAA Division I and II institutions, had become dissatisfied with their role (or lack thereof) in decision-making related to athletics at their institutions. They surmised that this distancing from faculty and the decision-making process led faculty to hold less positive views of athletic programs in which athletics are seen as a separate entity “largely influenced by external forces” (p. 224).

The athletic performance of teams at their institutions has also been found to impact faculty perceptions of athletics. In 2004, Noble conducted a study to assess faculty attitudes towards athletic programs at NCAA Division III institutions. He was specifically interested in determining how the athletic success of a program affected faculty perceptions of the role of athletics at their institutions. Noble drew two samples of faculty, one from schools deemed athletically successful and the other from schools

deemed athletically unsuccessful during the previous year. For Noble, “success” was determined based on the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) Director’s Cup standings. Utilizing 397 responses from the Intercollegiate Athletics Attitude Survey, Noble found that faculty at institutions which were athletically successful held statistically significant more positive views of their athletic programs than faculty at less athletically successful institutions. Additionally, he found that faculty believed that athletic success can impact the image of the institution. Noble reported that “Over half of faculty members from schools with unsuccessful athletic programs were in agreement that a poor intercollegiate athletic program has a negative impact on how the institution is perceived by the community and alumni” (p. 133). Such findings suggest that athletic program success can impact faculty perceptions of student-athletics.

Kuga (1996), acknowledging the potential impact faculty could have in influencing athletic guidelines, sought to understand how and why faculty choose to participate in or resist participating in athletic governance. Using a new, 48 item instrument created for the study, Kuga surveyed 240 full-time faculty from a Big Ten Conference University. The survey presented statements, and then asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. The statements sought to gauge 1) the extent to which faculty members believed athletic programs impact institutional goals and education experiences, 2) the perceived impact of faculty influence in athletics, and 3) faculty willingness to participate in athletic governance. She found that over 50 percent of faculty were interested in participating in the governance of athletics and wanted to provide input on potential reform initiatives. As a general rule, Kuga found

that male faculty members were significantly more interested in participating in athletic governance because of an interest in reforming athletics than female faculty members ($F(1, 122) = 4.91, p < .05$), and faculty members who had participated in athletics, either as participants or spectators, were significantly more interested in participating in athletic governance than faculty who had not had such experiences ($F(1, 74) = 11.52, p < .01$). Additionally, faculty who had no previous participation in athletics were significantly more likely to view a “value conflict” between the goals of the athletic department and the goals of academics at their institutions. Based on these findings, Kuga contends that faculty’s negative attitudes toward athletics might be lessened by increasing their involvement in athletics and/or athletic governance. This assertion highlights the need to consider faculty involvement and previous participation in athletics as a variable when considering faculty perceptions of athletics.

Collectively, these studies suggest that faculty generally hold negative perceptions of athletic programs on their campuses. Based on the limited number of studies that exist, faculty appear to perceive athletics as an auxiliary enterprise, and many see a disconnect between the institutional mission of the university and the goals of the athletic department. Such feelings of disengagement can lead to resentment when the primary mission of an institution is supposed to revolve around academic and personal development (Engstrand, 1995). These negative perceptions of athletics by faculty help contextualize faculty perceptions of student-athletes since student-athletes are inseparably associated with the athletic department at their institution. If faculty view athletics at their institution as an auxiliary enterprise which serves a separate mission from the

academic goals of the university, then faculty perceptions of student-athletes may in turn be negatively affected by association.

Faculty Perceptions of Student-Athletes

Relatively few studies, to date, have specifically sought to examine faculty perceptions of student-athletes; and the studies which exist provide somewhat mixed results (Comeaux, 2010). The one consistent finding is that faculty seem to hold prejudicial attitudes towards student-athletes (Atwater, 2010; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Comeaux, 2010; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Tovar, 2011). In this section, I will discuss research which has addressed faculty perceptions of the academic competency of student-athletes, faculty perceptions of student-athletes in revenue and nonrevenue sports compared to students in the general population, faculty perceptions of the academic accomplishments of Black and White student-athletes, and what little has been suggested about how faculty perceptions of student-athletes may be affected by the gender of the student-athlete.

Academic competency. In 2010, Atwater conducted a mixed methods study at a single NCAA Division I institution which did not sponsor football to determine faculty attitudes regarding the academic competencies of student-athletes at the institution. The quantitative portion of the study used a modified version of the Academic Competence Evaluation Scales (ACES). The ACES was created by Dr. DiPerna of Pennsylvania State University to assess perceived academic competencies and was originally a self-assessment instrument for students. Atwater modified the original survey to allow faculty members to compare their perceptions of student-athletes' academic

competencies with those of other students at the institution. He then conducted a reliability analysis to verify that the instrument exceeded acceptable benchmarks for reliability in its new format.

Atwater sent an electronic copy of his modified version of the ACES survey to 1,551 faculty at a single NCAA Division I institution. He received 156 completed surveys from faculty representing various academic ranks (i.e., Instructor to Tenured Professor) and academic disciplines, a modest 10% return. For the quantitative portion of his study which used the ACES, Atwater asked faculty to rate the perceived academic competencies of student-athletes. The ACES instrument offers standardized benchmarks for determining whether a student (or group of students) is considered competent in a given area. Atwater found that faculty perceived student-athletes to meet the benchmarks for academic competency in terms of their critical thinking skills, interpersonal skills, engagement, and study skills. However, they perceived student-athletes to lack academic competency in their reading/writing skills, math/science skills, and motivation.

The qualitative portion of Atwater's (2010) study involved individual, semi-structured interviews with ten faculty members who had previously completed the quantitative segment of the study to gain a better understanding of "faculty attitudes towards 1) college athletics in higher education settings and 2) student-athletes in higher education settings" (p. 144). He was particularly interested in how faculty perceived student-athletes' motivation since that was one area in which the quantitative portion of his study had concluded faculty perceptions were more negative. He asked faculty, "What do you perceive as the primary motivations for student-athletes to participate in

college athletics?” Atwater found that all ten faculty interviewed qualified the motivations of student-athletes based on the sport played by the student-athlete (i.e., revenue or non-revenue). Their responses indicated a belief that male student-athletes participating in non-revenue sports and all female student-athletes were more likely to be “academically-driven” (p. 110) than male student-athletes who participated in revenue-generating sports. Male student-athletes in revenue sports were seen as motivated by athletics and a desire to “go pro,” rather than a desire to receive an education. Furthermore, faculty in this sample spoke of both the benefits and drawbacks to student-athlete participation. They acknowledged the notoriety which comes with being a student-athlete and the great level of support provided due to their athletic membership; however, they also noted time commitment as a major academic hindrance of athletic participation. Collectively, these supposed attributes of student-athletes, whether accurate or inaccurate, have the potential to impact faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Student-athletes in revenue and non-revenue sports. Two studies concerning faculty perceptions of student-athletes specifically sought to determine if there was a difference between how faculty perceived male student-athletes in revenue and nonrevenue sports compared to their non-athlete peers. Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen (1995) randomly surveyed 201 faculty at a large eastern, NCAA Division I-A institution. One hundred and twenty six faculty returned completed surveys, representing a response rate of 60%. Faculty were asked to provide demographic information, then complete the questions on the Situation Attitude Scale (SAS) instrument. The SAS asked

faculty to read ten brief scenarios and then indicate their reaction to the scenario by marking a point on a semantic differential scale. For example, a faculty member might be presented with a scenario which said, “A student in your class withdraws from school.” Following this statement, the participant would select how they would react to the given situation on a 5-point Likert-type scale between “unconcerned” and “concerned” or between “neutral” or “disappointed.” The SAS instrument design is ideal for eliciting responses from various groups without respondents being aware that other versions of the form exist. Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen used three versions of the SAS. One form included scenarios as described above where the “student” received no other identifiers. A second version of the form suggested that “a football player” (i.e., revenue sport) had withdrawn from school. The final version portrayed “a male soccer player” (i.e., non-revenue sport) had withdrawn from school. To further illustrate, one version of the survey states that:

“A student gets an A in your class.”

An alternate version of the survey states:

“A football player gets an A in your class.”

A third version of the survey uses the following variation:

“A male lacrosse player gets an A in your class.”

The faculty members are then asked to indicate their reaction to the statement by selecting a position on a Likert Scale. For example, the faculty member might be asked to select a position on the following scale based on the statement above:

Suspicious o o o o o Trusting

Using this study design, the researchers found that in seven out of ten situations posed in the SAS, faculty held statistically significantly more negative attitudes towards male student-athletes who participated in revenue and nonrevenue sports than their non-athlete peers.

The findings of the study did not, however, distinguish between the male revenue and nonrevenue groups; rather these two groups were lumped together in the findings and conclusions and compared collectively against their non-athlete peers. Faculty's negative attitudes tended to emerge in response to scenarios which could be inferred in terms of providing preferential treatment to student-athletes, either those participating in revenue or nonrevenue sports. Faculty attitudes were found to be most negative in situations where a student (or student-athlete depending on the version of the survey) "gets an 'A' in class" or when a student "receives a full scholarship." Despite the exact same wording in the remainder of the scenario among the forms, the situations which involved either a revenue or non-revenue student athlete were perceived differently than when the question simply stated a "student."

In a similar study which considered NCAA Division II institutions which did not offer athletic scholarships, Baucom and Lantz (2001) found a similar trend; faculty seemed to harbor more prejudicial attitudes towards male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes than their non-athlete peers. Baucom and Lantz utilized a similar research design to the strategy employed by Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen in 1995. They solicited responses to a version of the SAS survey from all 409 faculty members at a highly selective, NCAA Division II Midwestern university and received 119 usable

responses. The researchers considered the institution to be highly selective because the entering freshmen class had a mean high school GPA of 3.7 and a mean ACT score of 27.2. Selected faculty received one of three versions of the SAS which asked statements about a student, a revenue student-athlete, or an athlete participating in a non-revenue sport depending on the form. As with Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen's study, faculty receiving the survey were unaware that other versions of the survey existed. Baucom and Lantz performed a 3 x 10 MANOVA (form by situation) and found a significant main effect among the three forms (Wilks' Lambda = 0.495, $p < .001$). The researchers then used ANOVAs to determine that faculty held negative attitudes which were statistically different towards student-athletes, especially in situations where academic preferential treatment was mentioned such as a student-athlete receiving a full scholarship ($F(2, 118) = 6.69, p < .05$), being admitted with lower college scores ($F(2, 118) = 33.99, p < .05$), or being provided specialized tutorial services ($F(2, 118) = 7.47, p < .05$). In each of these cases, Tukey's post hoc comparisons indicated that faculty perceived revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes more negatively than students who did not participate in sports. The researchers noted that special admissions practices for student-athletes were not permissible at their institution, so any potential biases found should not have been based on the student-athletes receiving preference in admission.

Baucom and Lantz explained that the overall GPA of student-athletes at the institution was 3.15 on a 4.0 scale at their institution, which is actually .01 higher than the mean GPA for non-athletes. The researchers thus hypothesized that faculty respondents in their study might subject all student-athletes to "negative stereotypes based on person

cues (i.e., their role as an athlete) regardless of how strong a student they may be or how motivated they are to obtain a meaningful education” (p. 271). Baucom and Lantz did not find significant differences between faculty attitudes towards revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes in their study. However, they explained that the NCAA Division II institution sampled did not include any sports which were truly “revenue” generating.

The findings of these two studies and the previously mentioned study by Atwater (2010) were largely confirmed by a large, national survey conducted by Lawrence, Hendrick, and Ott (2007). The researchers received responses from 2,071 faculty from 23 institutions representing all NCAA Divisions. Questions were asked to assess faculty’s perceptions of athletics, their satisfaction with athletic governance, and to identify any potential concerns regarding athletics on their campuses. Consistent with the findings from Engstrom et al. (1995), Lawrence, Hendrick, and Ott found that faculty held significantly more negative attitudes towards athletes in high-profile sports at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions than athletes who participate in other sports or the general student population. While only 12% of faculty were dissatisfied with the academic performance of student-athletes in nonrevenue sports, 27% of faculty were dissatisfied with the academic performance of football and basketball (gender was not addressed) student-athletes in their classes. Lawrence, Hendrick, and Ott also found that faculty tended to hold more negative perceptions of student-athletes in football and basketball in terms of their academic preparedness and motivation. Only thirty-two percent of faculty were satisfied with the academic preparedness and motivation of football and basketball players, while the majority of faculty (69%) were

satisfied with the academic preparedness and motivation of student-athletes in other sports.

In 2011, Tovar conducted a study to understand faculty perceptions of male student-athletes in revenue sports (basketball and football). Tovar surveyed over 250 full-time faculty from eight different departments at four NCAA Division I institutions using a survey which combined questions from 1.) Perceptions about Athletic Departments Questionnaire (PADQ), 2.) Stereotypes about Student-Athletes Questionnaire (SASQ), 3.) Student Contact Questionnaire (SCQ), and 4.) Faculty Involvement Questionnaire (FIQ). Ultimately, the purpose of Tovar's study was to understand how faculty perceptions of athletic programs at their institutions affected faculty perceptions of male basketball and football players, to understand how faculty contact with male basketball and football players impacted negative stereotypes, and to understand how faculty involvement in athletic governance affected faculty stereotypes of male basketball and football players. Tovar found that positive perceptions of athletic departments significantly and positively impacted ($r = 0.54, p < 0.01$) faculty perceptions of male basketball and football student-athletes. Further, while increased contact with male basketball and football student-athletes was shown to be correlated with less negative perceptions ($r = -0.15$), the relationship was not found to be significant. Tovar found a significant relationship between faculty involvement in athletic governance and faculty perceptions of male basketball and football student-athletes ($r = -0.33; p < 0.01$).

Race. Many studies have addressed the negative stereotypes associated with Black student-athletes (Lapchick, 2000; Person, Benson-Quaziana, Rogers, 2001; Sailes,

1993; Stone, Lynch, Sjomeling, & Darley, 1999). Such studies typically look at how athletes are stereotyped or treated by their peers, the media, or society in general. One notable exception comes from the work of Comeaux (2010) who used critical race theory as a lens for considering faculty members' perceptions of the post-undergraduate accomplishments of Black and White student-athletes. Using a complete list of faculty from one NCAA Division I institution in the western part of the United States, Comeaux randomly divided faculty into four groups. Each group received one of four versions of a vignette which depicted a student-athlete's academic and post-undergraduate accomplishments. The only difference among the versions of the vignette was the race and gender of the student-athlete in the photo accompanying the scenario. The four variations included a picture of a White male football player, a Black male football player, a White female basketball player, and a Black female basketball player. Faculty members did not know that other forms of the vignette existed. Comeaux received 464 responses from teaching and research faculty from various ranks and academic departments: 158 of the respondents received the version of the scenario which included the Black male student-athlete, 75 the version with the Black female student-athlete, 148 the version with the White male student-athlete, and 83 the version with the White female student-athlete.

Faculty in Comeaux's study (2010) were asked to respond to the "photo elicitation" and short vignette. The researcher referred to this study as a qualitative analysis because the responses to the vignette were open-ended and major themes were identified by two independent researchers (one of whom was Comeaux). Using a

hierarchical content analysis, Comeaux and his fellow research analyst found that faculty held differential feelings towards the achievements of Black male and female student-athletes as compared to White male and female student-athletes. Respondents tended to use different language when describing Black student-athletes' successes (whether or male or female) than they did when describing White student-athletes' successes.

Comeaux presented his findings by highlighting four major themes from his transcript analysis: success in spite of sport demands (mentioned by 41% of faculty respondents), color-blind ideology (mentioned by 11% of faculty respondents), success in spite of race (mentioned by 10% of faculty respondents), and racially coded-language (used by 14% of faculty respondents). Comeaux provided several examples of faculty responses to demonstrate the explicit and more subtle differences in faculty perceptions of scenarios involving a Black student-athlete and a White student-athlete. For example, Comeaux quotes one faculty respondent who viewed a vignette involving a Black student-athlete as saying, "Good for him! What a wonderful role model. I hope he speaks to young African American students about his achievement. Was he assisted by an affirmative action program" (p. 403)? Yet another faculty member responding to a vignette depicting a female, Black student-athlete said, "I am pleased for her – I hope she did not get higher grades than she deserved. If she did well in her studies while playing sports, then that's fine. These should be at a university because they have intellectual qualities." These comments are in direct contrast to faculty responses which involved a White student-athlete after which a common faculty response was, "Seems commonplace to me," or "What is the issue here? All seems fine" (p. 403). Comeaux found that a few

faculty (approximately 8%) tended to “camouflage” racism with comments which suggested that Black student-athletes had not earned their accomplishments; these are suggestions which were not made in responses to White student-athletes. Comeaux concluded that such findings should be disconcerting to anyone in higher education “who [is] committed to creating more equitable educational experiences for all students” (p. 405).

Although Comeaux included gender as a variable in his study, he did not address the findings from a gender perspective. He merely acknowledged that “more research is needed to explore the complete narrative about the ways in which race and gender interact to shape the various dimensions of Black female student-athletes” (p. 404).

Gender. It seems to be widely accepted (both anecdotally and in scholarly research) that female student-athletes are perceived more kindly than male student-athletes, particularly in terms of their academic capabilities. This is partially attributed to the fact that female student-athletes boast higher GPAs than their male counterparts (Aries, McCarthy, Salovey, & Banaji, 2004; Simons, Van Rhee, & Covington, 1999).

Interestingly, however, in a more recent study by Shulman and Bowen (2001), they argue that women’s athletics appear to be following a trend with respect to GPA which is similar to the “male model” of athletics. Shulman and Bowen analyzed preexisting data from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation’s “College and Beyond” database, data obtained from the Cooperative Institutions Research Program (CIRP), and data from The College Board. They targeted data from 1951, 1976, and 1989 on student-athletes and non student-athletes to compare how the ethos of athletics has changed over

time. The data utilized were collected from 30 institutions which were classified by the researchers in the following categories: 8 Division I private schools, 4 Division I public schools, 4 Division IAA Ivy League schools, 3 Division III private schools, 7 Division III coed liberal arts colleges, and 4 Division III women's colleges.

One of the key findings concerning males was that the gap between the mean GPA for male student-athletes and the general male student population had grown progressively wider between the cohorts. In 1951, the male student-athletes surveyed had a mean GPA nearly exactly the same as the mean GPA for the general student population. By 1976, the gap had widened, and by 1989, the gap was considerably larger with male student-athletes' GPAs falling significantly lower than that of the general student population. Shulman and Bowen monitored the GPA trend of female student-athletes as well. While there were no 1951 cohort available, the 1976 and 1989 cohorts showed a pattern similar to that of males. In 1976, female student-athletes showed precisely the same mean GPA as their non-athlete female peers. However, by 1989, a GPA gap had developed where "Women athletes as a group ranked in the 46th percentile of their class, as compared with women students at large whose average GPA put them in the 53rd percentile" (p. 143). The authors do not state whether or not this change in GPA was statistically significant. Their overall findings still suggest that, as a general rule, female student-athletes continue to outperform their male student-athlete peers academically in terms of their college GPA. This is consistent with the findings of other researchers (Sellers, Kuperminc, & Damas, 1997; Simons, Van Rhee, & Covington, 1999). Whether or not these differences in male and female student-athlete academic

performance affect faculty perceptions of student-athletes in general is still largely unknown.

Several of the previous studies discussed in this review acknowledged the importance of (and current lack of) concentrated consideration given to gender as a variable. Specifically, Baucom and Lantz (2001), Comeaux (2010), Engstrom (1991), and Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen (1995) identified gender as an important, but not yet well understood variable related to faculty perceptions of student-athletes. The current study serves to address this previously identified gap in the literature.

Theoretical Framework: Gender Role Theory

The current research seeks to understand how faculty perceptions of student-athletes may be affected by the gender of the student-athlete. Gender role theory serves as the theoretical framework for considering this question because of its focus on role expectations. The theory seeks to explain how gender is “performed” by individuals based on cultural expectations of normative behavior for males and females. The theory is rooted in post-structural feminism and is often associated with Judith Butler (1990) and her work on gender performativity. Gender role theory postulates that males are expected to exhibit certain traits which display agency while females are expected to demonstrate more communal or expressive traits (Eagly & Karau, 1991; Eagly & Karau, 2002). The difference in these expectations matters because it affects both the way males and females act as well as how their actions are judged by others.

Gender role theory has been used as a lens to view a wide array of social issues. Researchers have used this theory to consider how prescribed gender roles may impact

health (Courtenay, 2000), family dynamics (Livingston & Judge; 2008), workplace expectations/discrepancies (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruenig, 2009; Schein, 2001; Schein, 2007), and emotional response (Gallacher & Klieger, 2001; Gustafson, 2006; Palapattu, Kingery, & Ginsburg, 2006) just to cite a few broad examples. It has also been used in an athletic context; specifically, researchers have used gender role theory to consider the relationship between gender role endorsement and athletic identity (Lantz & Schroeder, 1999), the perceptions of gender role orientation of male and female athletes by their non-athlete peers (Harrison & Lynch, 2005; Harrison & Secarea, 2010), and the impact of gender roles and athletic roles on academic performance (Harrison, Stone, Shapiro, Yee, Boyd, & Rullan, 2009).

The current study utilizes gender role theory as a means for considering how faculty perceptions of student-athletes may be affected by preconceived gender role expectations. Traditionally, participation in athletics has been viewed as masculine behavior (Desertrain & Weiss, 1988; Sage & Loudermilk, 1979). Females who engage in sports are sometimes stereotyped as “manly” (Person, Benson-Quaziana, & Rogers, 2001), or presumably “homosexual because of their violation of traditional gender-role behavior” (Fallon & Jome, 2007). The discrepancy in how the female is “supposed” to act in social situations compared to athletic situations is assumed to cause role conflict within the individual and potentially impact how others perceive how successfully the person performs her socially expected roles (Desertrain & Weiss, 1988; Rohrbaugh, 1979; Sage & Loudermilk, 1979; Wetzig, 1990). Similarly, male athletes may face typecasting as well. Researchers have found male athletes to be particularly at risk of

being labeled with the “dumb jock” stereotype (Sailes, 1993; Stone, Sjomeling, Lynch, & Darley, 1999).

Failure to meet social gender-role expectations can cause student-athletes to internalize the stereotypes assumed of them and thus act accordingly creating a self-fulfilling prophecy (Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996). Such biases, for male and female student-athletes, suggest differing expectations based on gender may exist. These differing expectations may impact how faculty perceive male and female student-athletes based solely on anticipated gender behavior.

As gender role theory suggests, the impact that gender has on influencing expectations of behavior and on impacting an individual’s actions based on those expectations cannot be discounted. In recognition of the importance of acknowledging the impact of gender, the current study utilized gender role theory as a tool for explaining and operationalizing the role of gender in relation to faculty perceptions of student-athletes. Since stereotypes are so often subtle and unintentional, gender role theory provided a lens for interpreting the results of the study in a way which highlighted an area of research which has previously been ignored.

Summary

Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen (1995) proposed that the negative attitudes held by faculty “may be a consequence of the perceived incompatibility between the goals of big-time college athletic programs and the basic values of academic integrity and academic excellence in higher education” (p. 218). They went on to suggest that the negative stereotyping by faculty members is particularly troubling since faculty

“generally are a part of a system that espouses equity and fairness,” (p. 218) and are likely harboring prejudicial views unintentionally or without believing it impacts their actual behaviors. However, as Potuto and O’Hanlon (2006) found, student-athletes are aware of the preferential and discriminatory treatment they sometimes receive from faculty members based on their athletic status. In an organization such as higher education which is designed to improve the academic and personal growth of all students, it is crucial to gain a better understanding of how and why these negative attitudes exist to better combat them in the future. The literature reviewed in this chapter presented findings which establish that faculty hold negative attitudes towards student-athletes based on the sport they play and based on their race; however, more research is needed to determine how faculty perceptions of student-athletes vary based on the gender of the student-athlete. The current study, utilizing a gender role theory framework for construction and interpretation, serves to fill the current void in research concerning faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Chapter 3

Methods and Procedures

The purpose of this study was to consider how faculty perceptions of student-athletes are affected by the gender of the student-athlete at NCAA Division IA institutions. The methods and procedures utilized in the study to address this purpose are outlined in this chapter. Included is information regarding the research design, the site and population used for the study, the instrument used for data collection, and the procedures followed to collect and analyze the data.

The current study utilized a quantitative research approach to answer the following research questions:

1. Do faculty members at NCAA Division IA institutions perceive male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general population differently?
2. Does the gender of the faculty member affect his or her perceptions of male and female student-athletes?
3. Do other characteristics related to faculty members including race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching student-athletes affect how they perceive male and female student-athletes?

Research Design

A quantitative study design was chosen because it allowed for collecting data from a large number of participants and for using established procedures for seeing if

there were differences in perceptions of male and female student-athletes. Specifically, the study employed a survey design using a variation of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). A detailed description of the survey instrument is provided in a later section of this chapter.

Site and Population

The population for this study was all full-time and part-time teaching faculty at a large, public, research extensive university in the Southeastern United States which will henceforth be referred to as “South University.” South University has a total enrollment of just over 27,000 students which includes approximately 21,000 undergraduate students and 6,000 graduate students. The overall student population is 49.5% female and 50.5% male. There are over 1,500 instructional faculty, and the institution has a 15 to 1 student-to-faculty ratio. Forty-one percent of full-time faculty are female. Eighty-three percent of full-time faculty identify as White, 9% identify as Asian or Pacific Islander, 4% Black, 3% Hispanic, less than 1% American Indian or Alaskan Native, and less than 1% identify as multiracial. South University’s eleven colleges offer over 300 degree programs.

Student-athletes at South University compete at the NCAA Division I level and are a part of the Southeastern Conference (SEC). South University fields ten women’s teams and eight men’s teams including:

- Men’s and Women’s basketball
- Men’s and Women’s cross country
- Men’s and Women’s track and field
- Men’s and Women’s golf

- Men's and Women's swimming and diving
- Men's and Women's tennis
- Men's football
- Men's baseball
- Women's volleyball
- Women's softball
- Women's soccer
- Women's rowing

Four hundred and thirty seven student-athletes were listed on the 2013 athletic rosters at South University. One hundred and seventy eight (41%) were female and 259 (59%) were male. The University has won over 20 national titles in various sports and over 180 conference championships within the SEC.

South University was selected, in part, because of its NCAA Division I status. Previous research has suggested that faculty at such institutions may have formed stronger opinions regarding athletics at their institutions since sports play a more visible role in their reputation and financial bottom line than faculty at NCAA Division II or III institutions (Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Engstrand, 1995; Norman, 1995). Additionally, faculty at an NCAA Division I institution are likely to have interacted with student-athletes, and faculty specifically at an SEC institution are likely to have experienced a long history and tradition of involvement with collegiate athletics.

Instrumentation

A variation of the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) originally created by Sedlacek and Brooks (1969) was used to collect data for the study. The SAS is a scenario-based survey which has been used in a variety of studies to assess attitudes or prejudices (or lack of prejudices) towards another group. Modified versions of the original SAS have been used as a means of measuring prejudice towards Blacks (Balenger, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1992), Asian Americans (Liang & Sedlacek, 2003), Mormons (Gilman, 1983), American Indians (Ancis, Bennett-Choney, & Sedlacek, 1996), student-athletes (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991), persons with disabilities (McQuilkin, Freitag, & Harris, 1990), fraternity and sorority members (Wells & Corts, 2008), and others. The scale has repeatedly been found to be a reliable and valid mode of measuring attitudes (Balenger, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1992; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991; Wells & Corts, 2008). Most recently, Sedlacek (in-press) reported “the test-retest and coefficient alpha reliability estimates for scores [for the original SAS] are in the .70 to .89 range” (p. 2). The validity of the instrument has been substantiated by multiple studies by calculating the mean difference between forms (Balenger, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1992; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991; Sedlacek & Brooks, 1976; Wells & Corts, 2008); however, no statistical data has been provided to support this contention.

The SAS survey is designed to allow some flexibility with the scenarios used in order to develop situations which are relevant to the groups being considered. Situations specifically created to address faculty attitudes towards student-athletes have been utilized in three earlier studies (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom, 1991; Engstrom,

Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995). This study utilized the modified SAS scenarios created by Engstrom (1991) to examine faculty attitudes towards male revenue and non-revenue student-athletes. Engstrom included situations such as the following in her survey:

“A student in your class withdraws from school.”

“A student gets an ‘A’ in your class.”

“A student in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.”

“The out of class achievements of one of your students is featured in the campus newspaper.”

The current study utilized Engstrom’s survey instrument with only minor modifications since the situations are all still appropriate and relevant. Specifically, slight adjustments were made to the instructions to participants. A copy of Engstrom’s original instructions and the instructions used in the current study are available in Appendix A. The instructions needed to be modified slightly because the survey was originally administered using an online format rather than a mailed questionnaire. The only other alteration to Engstrom’s original instrument involved the subjects referenced in the scenarios in the various forms. Whereas Engstrom’s research identified general students, male student-athletes participating in revenue sports, and male student-athletes participating in non-revenue sports as subjects in her scenarios, the current study used the exact same scenarios but identified general students, male student-athletes, and female student-athletes as subjects. This difference will be discussed in more detail later in this section. Reporting on the reliability of her instrument, Engstrom (1991) stated:

The median Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the Revised Student-Athlete SAS survey was high (.87) ranging from .65 to .96 across situations. The reliability of the neutral form ranged from .70 to .95 across situations with a median reliability of .84. The reliability of the revenue form ranged from .65 to .96 across situations with a median reliability of .88. The non-revenue form obtained a median reliability of .86 with reliability scores ranging from .60 to .97. (p. 103)

A copy of the revised SAS student-athlete form used by Engstrom in 1991 is provided in Appendix A.

The SAS is designed to minimize the likelihood of respondents selecting answers which they feel may be socially desirable (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991; Liang & Sedlacek, 2003; Sedlacek, in-press; Wells & Corts, 2008). This goal is accomplished by providing multiple versions of the instrument without participants being aware that other variations of the survey exist. For instance, in Engstrom's research on revenue and non-revenue male athletes, one version of the survey asked scenarios about a general student-athlete, whereas two other versions of the survey posed scenarios which specified the student-athlete involved was either a "male basketball player" or a "male tennis player."

For this study, faculty participants were randomly assigned to receive a link featuring one of three versions of the survey which presented 10 brief scenarios, each of which differed in only one way – the subject of the scenarios. One group of faculty received a version which asked the faculty member to consider a situation related to a "student" in his or her class. This form was considered the "general student" form (see

Appendix B). Another group of faculty received a version of the survey in which the subject was identified as a male student-athlete (see Appendix C), while the final group of faculty received a variation in which the subject was identified as a female student-athlete (see Appendix D). The scenarios were followed by 10 bipolar semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957) in which the respondents indicated their reactions to the given situation on a 5-point scale. As an example, here is how a situation and corresponding reactions looked in its general student form:

“A student in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.”

1.	Fair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unfair
2.	Unexpected	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Expected
3.	Concerned	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unconcerned
4.	Calm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Upset
5.	Undisturbed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Disturbed
6.	Wrong	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Right
7.	Happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Sad
8.	Suspicious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Trusting
9.	Accepting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Resentful
10.	Proud	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Embarrassed

By contrast, an alternate form asked, “A male student-athlete in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.” This statement was followed by an identical list of reactions. The third

version of the form asked, “A female student-athlete in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.” The reaction options again were identical for this form of the SAS.

The demographic portion of the survey included questions regarding the faculty member’s gender, race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous athletic participation, and amount of contact with athletes. These variables were chosen because previous research has shown that they impact faculty views of student-athletes or athletics in general (Engstrand, 1995; Lawrence, Ott, & Hendricks, 2009; Ott, 2011). Table 1 shows the relationship among the included variables, the study’s research questions, and the related literature.

Procedures

The principal investigator began by obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from South University, then by securing IRB approval from the researcher’s affiliated institution, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (see Appendix E). Following this measure, all full-time and part-time faculty from South University were contacted via email to request their participation in the study. Faculty email addresses were obtained from publically available institutional websites. The list of addresses was destroyed to protect the identity of participants after the initial email and two reminder emails were sent.

Table 1

Selected Variables in Relationship to Research Questions and Literature

Variable	Research Question	Method of Obtaining Data	Related Literature
Student-Athlete Gender	Question 1	Controlled by SAS scenario format	Suggested area of future research (Baucom & Lantz, 2001, Comeaux, 2010, Engstrom, 1991, Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995). Addressed by study.
Faculty gender	Question 2	Self-reported response	Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Kuga, 1996; Ott, 2011; Seidler, Gerdy, & Cardinal, 1998
Faculty race	Question 3	Self-reported response	Comeaux, 2010
Faculty rank	Question 3	Self-reported response	Ott, 2011
Faculty field of instruction	Question 3	Self-reported response	Harrison, 2004; Noble, 2004, Ott, 2011
Faculty previous athletic participation	Question 3	Self-reported response	Kuga, 1996
Faculty interaction with student-athletes	Question 3	Self-reported response	Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Friesen, 1992, Ott, 2011

A copy of the email which was distributed to participants is available in Appendix F. In the email, faculty were briefly introduced to the topic of the study and the nature of the data to be collected. Specifically, faculty were told that the study sought to understand their perceptions of common situations with students. Faculty were not explicitly told that the study was related to perceptions of student-athletes since the general student form only indicated situations within the general student population rather than student-athletes.

Faculty were then invited to participate in the study by completing a short 10 – 15 minute survey. An incentive feature which included a random drawing for one of four \$25 gift certificates to Amazon was used to recruit participants. Participants were informed that the drawing would take place within one week of the time after the online survey closed and that entry into the drawing was not contingent upon completion of the survey. A link guiding faculty directly to the incentive form was provided so they could enter the drawing without having to complete the survey if desired. A follow-up email, which was almost identical to the initial email, was sent to faculty members who had not responded to the survey one week after the initial email (see Appendix G). The follow-up email reminded faculty about the study and encouraged them to complete the survey. A second reminder email, which was identical to the first reminder email, was sent to all faculty members after one additional week.

Additional information regarding the study was available to all participants to read and print as soon as they clicked on the link embedded in the solicitation email. This information explained the purpose of the study, provided contact information for the researcher, and explained the necessary disclosures outlined by the IRB so the faculty member could make an informed decision about participation before officially beginning the survey (see Appendix H). Faculty, again, were only provided with the general purpose of the study which was to assess their perceptions of common situations with students, rather than student-athletes in particular. This was done for two reasons: 1) to prevent confusion for faculty members who receive the general student form of the survey, and 2) to protect the research design of the study which sought to minimize the

likelihood of obtaining socially desirable responses. The additional study information, which participants were encouraged to print and retain for their personal records, also explained to faculty that completion of the survey constituted informed consent. Furthermore, the notification explained that the Amazon gift card incentives were not directly tied to the survey and could not be traced back to the faculty member's responses. This point was emphasized because the incentive form requested email contact information from the faculty member in order to distribute the gift cards to the winners of the drawing.

Additionally, the study information explained that responses to the survey would remain confidential and that their answers would be aggregated for reporting purposes. Respondents' answers were not linked to their email address and the survey feature which records IP addresses was disabled to maintain faculty confidentiality. Further, participants' identities were protected by sending an individual email to each faculty member to prevent participants from seeing other participants' email addresses. It was also explained that no personal information which might identify individuals or the institution would be kept or disclosed as a part of the survey.

The link to the survey and study information provided in the email directed the faculty member to a third-party data collection company, Qualtrics. Survey responses were initially stored on Qualtrics' secure server. All data were encrypted and made available only to the principal investigator. Once all of the survey responses were collected, the data were imported to the principal investigator's external hard drive for analysis and deleted from the online server. The downloaded data were stored in a file on

the primary investigator's external hard drive which was password protected. All data will be destroyed from the principal investigator's external hard drive within three years after the successful defense of the dissertation.

Data Analysis

Once responses to the online survey were returned, the data were imported into the statistical package SPSS 20 and analyzed using descriptive statistics. While the descriptive information was useful in understanding the demographics of the sample, it was also used as a means of checking the data for potential data entry errors or outliers. After the data were determined to be "clean," the coefficient alpha was computed to ensure an appropriate level of internal consistency within the instrument.

Research question #1 asked, "Do faculty members at NCAA Division IA institutions perceive male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general population differently?" To answer this question, a multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) was performed using the survey form (general student, male student-athlete, or female student-athlete) as the independent variable and the mean of the situation scores as the dependent variables. The results of the MANOVA were used to determine if a significant main effects (at the .05 level) existed among the three forms and the situations. Following this step, univariate F-tests were performed to identify significant differences in each specific situation by form.

Research Question #2 asked, "Does the gender of the faculty member affect his or her perceptions of male and female student-athletes?" To answer this question, a MANOVA was performed to find the form-by-gender of the faculty member interaction

effect. Additional MANOVAs were run to address Research Question #3 which asked how other faculty characteristics, specifically race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous athletic participation, and contact with student-athletes, impacted how faculty perceived male and female student-athletes.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of the study was to consider how faculty perceptions of student-athletes are affected by the gender of the student-athlete at NCAA Division IA institutions. Faculty perceptions of student-athletes were assessed utilizing a survey administered to all 1,862 full-time and part-time faculty at one, large NCAA Division IA institution. Data from the survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multivariate analyses of variances.

The findings of the study are presented in this chapter and are organized into two parts. First, demographic information about the sample and participants of the study is provided. Then, the ways in which the data were prepared for analysis are discussed. Last, the results of the statistical analyses in relation to the three research questions are presented.

Description of Sample and Participants

The list of publically available faculty email addresses acquired from South University's human resources office provided email addresses for 1,861 full-time and part-time faculty members. The email addresses were randomly sorted into three groups using the random number generator in Microsoft Excel. Six hundred twenty one faculty members received an email which contained a link to the general student version of the Situational Attitudes Scale in which the subject of the scenarios was a general "student" in the faculty member's class. Six hundred and twenty faculty received a link to the version of the SAS which indicated a male student-athlete in the scenarios, and 620

faculty received a link to the version of the SAS which indicated a female student-athlete in the scenarios. Twenty-three of the potential 621 participants receiving the general student version had email addresses which were no longer active, while ten of the 620 faculty receiving the male student-athlete version and 11 of the faculty receiving the female student-athlete version had email addresses which were no longer active. This left a final survey distribution of 1,817 faculty members who received the survey; 598 receiving the general student version, 610 receiving the male student-athlete version, and 609 receiving the female student-athlete version of the survey.

Of the 598 faculty who received the general student version of the SAS, 114 faculty started the survey. Two faculty members elected to skip directly to the incentive drawing without completing the survey and 18 faculty members chose not to complete the survey after starting the questionnaire. Surveys were determined to be incomplete and thus excluded from analysis if the participant did not respond to the scenario questions and/or if the faculty member did not indicate his or her gender ($n=10$) in the demographic portion of the survey since gender was a primary variable of interest. This same process for case exclusion was used for participants who received any of the three versions of the survey. Ninety-four faculty completed the general student version of the SAS which constitutes a 15.7% response rate. Of the 610 faculty who received the male student-athlete version, 122 faculty started the survey, two faculty opted to skip directly to the incentive drawing, and 36 faculty chose not to complete the survey after beginning. Eighty-four faculty completed the male student-athlete version of the survey (13.8% response rate). Of the 609 faculty who received the female student-athlete version of the

SAS, 132 faculty started the survey. Two faculty members elected to skip directly to the incentive drawing without completing the survey and 26 faculty members chose not to complete the survey after starting the questionnaire. One hundred and four faculty members completed the female student-athlete version of the survey (17.1% response rate). While a larger percentage of faculty chose not to complete the male student-athlete version of the survey (29.5%) than either the female (19.7%) or general student versions (15.8%), a Chi-Squared test revealed this difference to be non-significant ($\chi^2(1, N = 282) = 7.025, p = 0.22$). In all, 282 faculty completed useable surveys for an overall response rate of 15.5%.

One hundred and thirty two of the participants were male (47%) and 150 were female (53%). These numbers indicate that a higher proportion of female faculty responded to the survey than did their male counterparts since females represent only 41% of full-time faculty at South University. Ninety one percent of the sample ($n = 257$) identified as Caucasian/White, 2.5% ($n = 7$) identified as Black or African American, 1.5% as Hispanic ($n = 4$), 1% as Asian ($n = 3$), less than 1% as American Indian or Alaska Native ($n = 1$), less than 1% ($n = 1$) as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 3% other ($n = 6$), and 1% ($n = 3$) indicated more than one racial category. These numbers indicate that a greater proportion of Caucasian/White faculty members were represented in the sample than in the total faculty population at South University where 83% of full-time faculty identify as Caucasian/White.

Sixty-three faculty members in the sample indicated they were Professors (22.2%), 58 Associate Professors (20.5%), 73 Assistant Professors (25.8%), 9 Instructors

(3.2%), 68 Lecturers/Adjuncts (24.0%), 10 indicated “other” (3.5%), and 1 participant (less than 1%) did not respond to this question. Of the 10 respondents who indicated “other,” 5 described themselves as Research Professors or Assistant Professors, 3 as Clinical Faculty, 1 as a Senior Lecturer, and 1 as a Visiting Associate Professor. Eleven faculty described their primary field of instruction as Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources (3.9%), 6 Architecture (2.1%), 99 Arts and Sciences (35.4%), 32 Business Administration (11.4%), 13 Communication and Information (4.6%), 54 College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences (19.3%), 29 Engineering (10.4%), 11 Law (3.9%), 16 Nursing (5.7%), and 9 Social Work (3.2%). Two faculty members did not respond to this question.

Thirty-seven respondents (13.2%) indicated that they had participated in intercollegiate varsity athletics (19 male faculty and 18 female faculty). Two hundred and ten faculty (75.0%) said they had previously taught a male student-athlete (114 male faculty and 96 female faculty). Forty-two faculty (15.0%) said they had not previously taught a male student-athlete (11 male faculty and 31 female faculty), and 28 faculty (10.0%) indicated that they did not know whether or not they had taught a male student-athlete. Two hundred and twenty four faculty (80.0%) said they had previously taught a female student-athlete (111 male faculty and 113 female faculty) while 26 faculty (9.3%) said they had not taught a female student-athlete in the past (8 male faculty and 18 female faculty). Thirty faculty (10.7%) indicated that they did not know whether or not they had previously had a female student-athlete in class (12 male faculty, 18 female faculty). Tables 2, 3, and 4 provide a further breakdown of faculty demographic information by

Table 2
General Student Version – Respondent Demographics

		<i>n</i>	% of total
Gender			
	Male	44	15.6
	Female	50	17.7
Race			
		0	0.0
	American Indian or Alaska Native	2	0.7
	Asian	2	0.7
	Black or African American	85	30.1
	Caucasian/Black	2	0.7
	Hispanic	0	0.0
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	1.1
	Other	0	0.0
	Multiple Races		
Rank			
	Professor	19	6.8
	Associate Professor	14	5.0
	Assistant Professor	32	11.4
	Instructor	3	1.1
	Lecturer/Adjunct	24	8.5
	Other	1	0.4
Field of Instruction			
	Agriculture Sciences/Natural Resources	4	1.4
	Architecture and Design	2	0.7
	Arts and Sciences	26	9.3
	Business Administration	10	3.6
	Communication and Information	4	1.4
	Education, Health, and Human Sciences	24	8.6
	Engineering	11	3.9
	Law	5	1.8
	Nursing	4	1.4
	Social Work	2	0.7
	Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Athletic Participation			
	Yes	7	2.5
	No	86	30.6
Taught Male Student-Athlete			
	Yes	66	23.6
	No	18	6.4
	Unsure	9	3.2
Taught Female Student-Athlete			
	Yes	73	26.1
	No	9	3.2
	Unsure	11	3.9

Table 3
Male Student-Athlete Version – Respondent Demographics

		<i>n</i>	% of total
Gender			
	Male	38	13.5
	Female	46	16.3
Race			
	American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0.0
	Asian	1	0.7
	Black or African American	2	0.7
	Caucasian/Black	79	28.0
	Hispanic	1	0.4
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0
	Other	1	0.4
	Multiple Races	0	0.0
Rank			
	Professor	20	7.1
	Associate Professor	14	5.0
	Assistant Professor	23	8.2
	Instructor	4	1.8
	Lecturer/Adjunct	14	6.4
	Other	5	1.8
Field of Instruction			
	Agriculture Sciences/Natural Resources	2	0.7
	Architecture and Design	1	0.4
	Arts and Sciences	31	11.1
	Business Administration	9	3.2
	Communication and Information	6	2.1
	Education, Health, and Human Sciences	12	4.3
	Engineering	11	3.9
	Law	3	1.1
	Nursing	7	2.5
	Social Work	2	0.7
	Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Athletic Participation			
	Yes	15	5.3
	No	69	24.6
Taught Male Student-Athlete			
	Yes	68	24.3
	No	7	2.5
	Unsure	9	3.2
Taught Female Student-Athlete			
	Yes	69	24.6
	No	5	1.8
	Unsure	9	3.2

Table 4
Female Student-Athlete Version – Respondent Demographics

		<i>n</i>	% of total
Gender			
	Male	50	17.7
	Female	54	19.1
Race			
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.4
	Asian	0	0.0
	Black or African American	3	1.1
	Caucasian/Black	93	33.0
	Hispanic	1	0.4
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.4
	Other	2	0.7
	Multiple Races	3	1.1
Rank			
	Professor	24	8.5
	Associate Professor	30	10.7
	Assistant Professor	18	6.4
	Instructor	2	0.7
	Lecturer/Adjunct	26	9.3
	Other	4	1.4
Field of Instruction			
	Agriculture Sciences/Natural Resources	5	1.8
	Architecture and Design	3	1.1
	Arts and Sciences	42	15.0
	Business Administration	13	4.6
	Communication and Information	3	1.1
	Education, Health, and Human Sciences	18	6.4
	Engineering	7	2.5
	Law	3	1.1
	Nursing	5	1.8
	Social Work	5	1.8
	Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Athletic Participation			
	Yes	15	5.3
	No	89	31.7
Taught Male Student-Athlete			
	Yes	76	27.1
	No	17	6.1
	Unsure	10	3.6
Taught Female Student-Athlete			
	Yes	82	29.3
	No	12	4.3
	Unsure	10	3.6

general student version, male student-athlete version, and female student-athlete version, respectively.

Data Preparation and Interpretation

Faculty perceptions were determined by calculating a mean score for each participant on each of the 10 situations described in the SAS. Each scenario was followed by 10 bipolar descriptors presented on a 5-point Likert Scale. Composite scores for any of the scenarios ranged between 10 and 50, therefore giving mean scores a range between 1 and 5. In order to create a meaningful mean score for each situation, many of the bipolar descriptors had to be recoded in reverse in order to keep the polarity consistent. This process allowed for a mean score of 1 for a scenario to reflect a more negative response to the student situation and a mean score of 5 to reflect the more positive response to the student situation. Mean scores for participants receiving the general student version on a given situation were compared to mean scores for participants who completed the male student-athlete and female student-athlete versions. A significant difference in group means among the forms for any of the various student scenarios indicated that faculty responded differently to the scenarios based on the subject identified in the scenarios since that was the only variable adjusted in the forms.

Research Question Results

The current study was guided by three research questions. The statistical results related to each of these research questions will be provided below.

Research Question 1: Do faculty members at NCAA Division IA institutions perceive male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general

population differently? This question was answered by performing a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) at the .05 level to determine form/version main effect. The dependent variable was the mean score for each scenario and the independent variable was the form/version (i.e., the version with scenarios involving a male student-athlete subject, the version with scenarios involving a female student-athlete subject, and the general student version in which the subject in the scenarios were only identified as a student without any other descriptor). The MANOVA showed a statistically significant difference in terms of the form main effect (Wilks' Lambda = 0.681, $F(20, 530) = 5.61$, $p = .000$, $\eta p^2 = 0.175$). Because Wilk's Lambda was shown to be statistically significant, univariate F-tests were run to determine which situation mean scores were different among forms. According to this analysis, it was determined that statistically significant differences existed among forms for 8 of the 10 situations at the .05 level. Table 5 shows

Table 5
Univariate F-tests for Form Differences and Situation Mean Scores

Scenario ^a	F Statistic	Significance	ηp^2
Withdraws from school	5.086	0.007*	0.036
Drives expensive car	5.824	0.003*	0.041
Gets an 'A' in your class	11.264	0.000*	0.076
Misses one of your classes	2.322	0.100	0.017
Creation of an expanded tutoring program	13.708	0.000*	0.091
Receives full scholarship	21.242	0.000*	0.134
Admitted with lower college board scores	8.384	0.000*	0.058
Pursues program at slower pace	0.387	0.679	0.003
Featured in campus newspaper	19.687	0.000*	0.126
Received a 2.2 GPA last semester	4.119	0.017*	0.029

^a See Appendix B, C, and D for complete wording of scenarios

* Indicates significance at the 0.05 level.

the results of the univariate F-tests comparing situation mean scores and form.

Perceptions among the three versions of the SAS were found to be significantly different in regards to the following student scenarios: when the student withdraws from school, is seen driving an expensive car, gets an 'A' in a class, when an expanded advising and tutoring program is created, when the student receives a full scholarship, when he or she is admitted to college with below average college board scores, is featured in the campus newspaper, and when the student received a 2.2 GPA last semester. The two scenarios which did not elicit a significant difference were when the student missed a class and when the student chose to pursue his or her program at a slower pace. The mean situational scores and standard deviations are provided in Table 6 for each of the scenarios by form. A comparison of situational score means indicated that faculty held more negative perceptions when a male student-athlete was involved in every scenario but one – when the student identified in the situation decides to pursue his or her program of study at a slower pace (one of the two situations which was not found to be statistically significant).

Tukey HSD Post Hoc analyses showed several patterns of between group differences for the 8 scenarios which were previously identified as significantly dissimilar. Table 7 shows these differences and indicates comparisons which were significantly different. Faculty held significantly more negative perceptions when a male student-athlete or a non-athlete withdrew from school than when a female student-athlete withdrew. Faculty held statistically more negative perceptions when they saw a male

student-athlete driving an expensive car compared to when they saw a non-athlete driving an expensive car. Faculty were shown to hold more positive perceptions when non-

Table 6
Scenario Mean Scores and Standard Deviations by Form

Scenario ^a	General Student		Male Student-Athlete		Female Student-Athlete	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Withdraws from school*	3.512	0.051	3.463	0.054	3.678	0.048
Drives expensive car*	3.413	0.059	3.123	0.062	3.294	0.055
Gets an 'A' in your class*	4.315	0.055	3.948	0.057	4.211	0.052
Misses one of your classes	3.073	0.063	2.899	0.066	2.916	0.059
Creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program*	4.340	0.089	3.717	0.093	3.827	0.084
Receives full scholarship*	4.526	0.078	3.795	0.082	4.085	0.074
Admitted with lower college board scores*	3.027	0.057	2.698	0.060	2.810	0.053
Pursues program at slower pace	3.288	0.058	3.357	0.061	3.344	0.055
Featured in campus newspaper*	4.613	0.071	3.990	0.074	4.190	0.066
Received a 2.2 GPA last semester*	3.657	0.063	3.436	0.066	3.669	0.060

^a See Appendix B, C, and D for complete wording of scenarios

* Indicates significance at the 0.05 level.

Table 7
Tukey HSD Post Hoc Patterns of Between Group Differences for 8 Significant Scenarios

Scenario ^a	Significant Tukey HSD Post Hoc Comparisons ($p < 0.05$)
Withdraws from school*	General ($M = 3.51$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 3.68$) Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.46$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 3.68$)
Drives expensive car*	General ($M = 3.41$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.12$)
Gets an 'A' in your class*	General ($M = 4.32$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.95$) Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.95$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 4.21$)
Creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program*	General ($M = 4.34$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.72$) General ($M = 4.34$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 3.83$)
Receives full scholarship*	General ($M = 4.53$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.80$) General ($M = 4.53$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 4.09$) Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.80$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 4.09$)
Admitted with lower college board scores*	General ($M = 3.03$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 2.70$) General ($M = 3.03$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 2.81$)
Featured in campus newspaper*	General ($M = 4.61$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.99$) General ($M = 4.61$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 4.19$)
Received a 2.2 GPA last semester*	General ($M = 3.66$) vs. Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.44$) Male Student-Athlete ($M = 3.44$) vs. Female Student-Athlete ($M = 3.67$)

^a See Appendix B, C, and D for complete wording of scenarios

* Indicates overall univariate F significance at the 0.05 level

athletes and female student-athletes made an A in their class compared to when male student-athletes made an A. Statistical tests showed that faculty held more negative perceptions when an advising/tutorial program was created for either male or female student-athletes in contrast to when one was created for the general student population.

Further, Tukey HSD Post Hoc analyses revealed statistical differences between how faculty perceived full scholarships among each of the three groups. Faculty were most positive in the version of the survey which indicated a general student was receiving a full scholarship, less positive when the recipient was a female student-athlete, and even less positive when the recipient was a male student-athlete. Faculty held more negative perceptions when either male or female student-athletes were admitted with lower than average college board scores compared to a non-athlete who was admitted with lower scores. Similarly, faculty held more positive perceptions when a non-athlete was featured in the campus paper compared to when either a male or female student-athlete received such recognition. Faculty were also found to hold more positive perceptions when female student-athletes or non-athletes received a 2.2 GPA the previous semester than when a male student-athlete performed similarly.

Taken collectively, the results of the MANOVA and post hoc analysis indicate that, yes, faculty perceptions of male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students in the general population differ. Faculty perceptions towards male student-athletes were consistently more negative than their perceptions of either female student-athletes or students in the general population. This contention was supported by the fact that faculty held more negative perceptions of male student-athletes than female student-athletes or students in the general population in nine of the ten scenarios posed – eight of these nine scenarios involved statistically significant differences in perceptions. Faculty perceptions of female student-athletes were always found to be more positive than perceptions of male student-athletes, but were sometimes more positive and sometimes

more negative than perceptions of students in the general population. This suggests that faculty perceptions of female student-athletes may be more complex and may depend on the context of the situation.

Research Question 2: Does the gender of the faculty member affect his or her perceptions of male and female student-athletes? This question was answered by performing a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) at the .05 level to determine the effect of form/version and gender of the faculty member on the dependent variable, faculty perceptions (which were determined by calculating the mean scores for each scenario). Form/version was again found to have significant main effect on faculty perceptions (Wilks' Lambda = .677, $F(20, 524) = 5.637$, $p = .000$, $\eta p^2 = 0.175$), but the main effect of the gender of the faculty member was not found to significantly affect perceptions (Wilks' Lambda = .957, $F(20, 262) = 1.185$, $p = .301$). Significance at the .05 level was not obtained for the form/version by gender interaction effect (Wilks' Lambda = 0.902, $F(20, 524) = 1.388$, $p = .121$). Based on these findings, the current study cannot support the notion that the gender of the faculty member has a statistically significant impact on perceptions of male or female student-athletes.

Research Question 3: Do other characteristics related to faculty members including race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching student-athletes affect how they perceive male and female student-athletes? To answer this question, separate MANOVAs were run which considered the effect of each variable (race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous

participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching student-athletes) on faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Race. MANOVA results showed a non-significant interaction effect between form/version and race of the faculty member on faculty perceptions of student-athletes (Wilks' Lambda = 0.689, $F(80, 1632.23) = 1.236, p = .081$). Race, as a main effect, was also found to be non-significant at the .05 level (Wilks' Lambda = 0.715, $F(70, 1499.54) = 1.271, p = .068$).

Academic Rank. A MANOVA performed to consider the interaction effect of form/version and academic rank of the faculty member on faculty perceptions of student-athletes showed a non-significant difference at the .05 level (Wilks' Lambda = 0.691, $F(100, 1837.585) = .973, p = .557$). The main effect of academic rank was significant (Wilks' Lambda = 0.731, $F(50, 1166.34) = 1.658, p = .003, \eta p^2 = 0.060$). Univariate ANOVA tests revealed that academic rank was significant in two of the ten scenarios: scenario three ($F(5, 264) = 3.341, p = .033$) which stated that, "A student gets an 'A' in your class," and scenario ten ($F(5, 264) = 7.140, p = .002$) which stated that, "One of your advisees received a 2.2 GPA last semester." In regards to scenario three, Tukey HSD Post Hoc analysis showed that Associate Professors ($M = 3.99$) were more negative ($p = .049$) than faculty who identified themselves as Lecturers or Adjuncts ($M = 4.26$). In regards to scenario ten, Professors ($M = 3.38$) were significantly more negative ($p = .001$) than Assistant Professors ($M = 3.80$).

Field of Instruction. A MANOVA performed to consider the interaction effect of form/version and the field of instruction of the faculty member on faculty perceptions of

student-athletes showed a non-significant difference at the .05 level (Wilks' Lambda = 0.480, $F(180, 2157.62) = 1.044, p = .335$). The main effect of the faculty member's field of instruction was found to be significant (Wilks' Lambda = 0.605, $F(90, 1658.37) = 1.147, p = .007, \eta p^2 = 0.056$). Univariate ANOVA tests showed that field of instruction was significant in only the tenth scenario ($F(9, 252) = 9.546, p = .002$) which stated, "One of your advisees received a 2.2 GPA last semester." Tukey HSD Post Hoc analysis revealed that faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences ($M = 3.46$) had significantly more negative perceptions ($p = .020$) of student-athletes than faculty from the College of Nursing ($M = 4.02$). Faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences were also shown to have more negative perceptions ($p = .036$) of student-athletes than faculty in the College of Architecture ($M = 4.23$).

Previous Participation in Collegiate Athletics. A MANOVA performed to consider the interaction effect of form/version and faculty's previous participation in athletics on faculty perceptions of student-athletes showed a non-significant difference at the .05 level (Wilks' Lambda = 0.926, $F(20, 536) = 1.052, p = .398$). A main effect of previous collegiate sport participation on faculty perceptions of student-athletes was found significant (Wilks' Lambda = 0.930, $F(10, 268) = 2.022, p = .031, \eta p^2 = 0.072$). Univariate ANOVA tests showed that previous collegiate athletic participation was significant in two scenarios: scenario seven ($F(1, 277) = 1.267, p = .044$) which stated, "A student in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population," and scenario nine ($F(1, 277) = 1.928, p = .039$) which stated, "The out-of-class achievements of one of your students was featured in the

campus newspaper.” Concerning scenario seven, Tukey HSD Post Hoc analysis revealed that faculty who participated in collegiate athletics ($M = 2.98$) were significantly more positive in their perceptions of student-athletes who had been admitted with below average college board scores than faculty who had not participated in collegiate athletics ($M = 2.83$). Similarly, in scenario nine, faculty who participated in collegiate athletics ($M = 4.41$) were more positive in their perceptions of the campus newspaper feature than faculty who had not participated in collegiate athletics ($M = 4.26$).

Previously Taught Male or Female Student-Athlete. MANOVAs were performed to test the interaction effect of form/version and previous experience teaching male or female student-athletes. The interaction effect of form/version by previous experience teaching male student-athletes (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.894, $F(40, 1002.91) = .749$, $p = .873$) and previous experience teaching female student-athletes (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.866, $F(40, 1002.91) = .971$, $p = .523$) showed no significance at the .05 level. The main effect of previous experience teaching female student-athletes (Wilks’ Lambda = .927, $F(20, 528) = 1.027$, $p = .428$) was not significant at the .05 level. The main effect of previous experience teaching male student-athletes (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.888, $F(20, 528) = 1.613$, $p = .045$, $\eta p^2 = 0.058$) was significant at the .05 level. Univariate ANOVA tests revealed that experience teaching male student-athletes was only significant ($F(2, 273) = 4.129$, $p = .004$) in regards to the tenth scenario which stated, “One of your advises received a 2.2 GPA last semester.” Tukey HSD Post Hoc analysis showed that faculty who had previous experience teaching male student-athletes were significantly ($p = .039$)

more negative in their perceptions of male student-athletes ($M = 3.457$) than they were of female student-athletes ($M = 3.672$).

While two faculty characteristics (race and previous experience teaching female student-athletes) were found not to significantly affect faculty perceptions of student-athletes, other characteristics, specifically academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation in collegiate athletics, and previous experience teaching male student-athletes, were shown to significantly impact faculty members' perceptions in a few situations. However, in a majority of situations, their perceptions were not significantly affected by any of these faculty characteristics. Thus, overall, it is reasonable to suggest that faculty characteristics had only a limited influence on faculty perceptions of male and female student-athletes in the current study.

Summary

This chapter reviewed the results of the current study. Findings indicated that faculty perceptions of male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students in the general population differ, but not always in ways previously predicted. In general, faculty held more negative perceptions of male student-athletes than female student-athletes or students in the general population. Female student-athletes appeared to be the recipients of more negative perceptions than the general student population in some contexts while they were also the recipients of more positive perceptions than the general student population in other contexts. Characteristics of the faculty member, such as race, gender, field of instruction, etc., did not have as predictable or clear of an impact of

faculty perceptions as the gender of the student-athlete. A discussion of these findings and their implication for future research and practice is considered in the next chapter.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

Previous research indicates that faculty tend to hold more negative perceptions of male student-athletes, particularly male student-athletes participating in revenue-generating sports, than students in the general population. This finding consistently proves true at large and small institutions of higher education, but appears to be most pronounced at NCAA Division I institutions. The vast majority of research has neglected to consider the role of gender in understanding faculty perceptions of student-athletes, possibly because of anecdotal assumptions that female student-athletes do not face the same negative perceptions as their male student-athlete counterparts.

The purpose of this study was to consider how faculty perceptions of student-athletes are affected by the gender of the student-athlete at NCAA Division I institutions. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Do faculty members at NCAA Division IA institutions perceive male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students from the general population differently?
2. Does the gender of the faculty member affect his or her perceptions of male and female student-athletes?
3. Do other characteristics related to faculty members including race, academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching student-athletes affect how they perceive male and female student-athletes?

To answer these questions, all full-time and part-time faculty ($n = 1,817$) at a large, public research extensive university in the Southeastern United States were sent one of the three versions of the scenario-based Modified Situational Attitudes Survey (SAS). The versions of the modified SAS varied by the subject involved in the scenarios (i.e., the subject was either a general student, a male student-athlete, or a female student-athlete). Two hundred and eighty two faculty completed the survey for an overall response rate of 15.5%. Of these 282, 94 completed the general student version, 84 completed the male student-athlete version, and 104 completed the female student-athlete version. The responses were imported into SPSS and MANOVAs were performed to test the significance of group differences among the three variations of the survey.

The remainder of this chapter is organized into four sections. First, a summary of the findings are presented, followed by a discussion of the findings and conclusions. Then, implications of the findings are considered. Last, recommendations for future research are proposed.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of the current study are summarized below.

1. Faculty held different perceptions of male student-athletes, female student-athletes, and students in the general population. Faculty perceptions towards male student-athletes were consistently more negative than their perceptions of either female student-athletes or students in the general population. While perceptions of female student-athletes were always more positive than perceptions of male student-athletes, perceptions of female athletes were sometimes more negative

- and sometimes more positive than perceptions of students in the general student population.
2. The gender and race of the faculty member did not have a significant impact on perceptions of male and female student-athletes in this study.
 3. While academic rank, field of instruction, and previous participation in collegiate athletics significantly affected faculty perceptions in a few situations, the overall impact of these variables was limited. Further, while previous experience teaching male student-athletes affected faculty perceptions of student-athletes in one scenario, previous experience teaching female student-athletes had no significant impact on faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Discussion

The first major finding of this study largely confirmed anecdotal suspicion that male and female faculty hold more negative perceptions of male student-athletes than female student-athletes or students in the general population. This finding was consistent across all statistically significant scenarios. The scenarios involved students in a number of situations, some academic and some external to the classroom. The fact that there were consistently more negative perceptions of male student-athletes in such a variety of scenarios is particularly troubling because it implies that these perceptions constitute potential biases that may well limit the ability of faculty to consider student-athlete performance individually and fairly. Additionally, since the scenarios only identified the subject as a “male student-athlete,” any negative perceptions toward this population would likely be intensified with the inclusion of other variables which have already been

shown to adversely affect perceptions of student-athletes such as race (Comeaux, 2010; Comeaux, 2013) and participation in a revenue-generating sport (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Tovar, 2011).

The finding that male student-athletes were generally seen more negatively than their female counterparts was expected. Male student-athletes, particularly those participating in high-profile sports, have a great deal of attention placed on their athletic identity (even if they do not seek this attention themselves), and thus their commitment to their academic role may be placed justly or unjustly in question. While female athletics are becoming increasingly popular, they have not yet received the same level of attention that male athletics have received, nor are they assumed to be focused solely on their athletic role, and thus faculty may see less of a conflict between the female student-athletes' academic and athletic roles. This is consistent with Atwater's (2010) research which found that faculty were more likely to view male student-athletes participating in non-revenue sports and female student-athletes as more "academically driven." Previous research has also found that female student-athletes tend to have higher GPAs than male student-athletes (Aries, McCarthy, Salovey, & Banaji, 2004; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Simons, Van Rhee, & Covington, 1999), which may further explain faculty members' more positive perceptions of female student-athletes. Additionally, it may be that faculty, and people in general, expect females to have or have to have career pursuits outside of athletics. While it has become considerably more acceptable for women to participate in sports than at an earlier time, it still appears that less emphasis is placed on the athletic identity of female student-athletes than their male counterparts.

It is certainly not the opinion of the researcher that most faculty harbor intentional biases towards male or female student-athletes at their institution. A much more likely scenario is that differences in perception found in this study and others which have considered different aspects of potential biases against student-athletes reveal subtle elements of bias about which faculty members themselves may not be aware they harbor. As suggested above, it is possible that some of the bias towards male student-athletes stems from the attention given to them, particularly to those who are considered “high profile” as well as those who have been involved in major scandals or otherwise widely publicized negative behavior (Bok, 2003; Coakley, 2006). A number of high-profile, male student-athletes have dreams of competing at the often financially lucrative and elite “next level,” a career path far less frequently available to female student-athletes and a career path not often viewed with the same prestige or financial return for women. It is not clear how this aspect of high profile male athletics may influence perceptions of male or female student-athletes, however, without this added layer of conflict, female student-athletes may be better positioned and more incentivized to focus on their academic endeavors.

It is interesting that male student-athletes were seen more negatively even when the sport played by the athlete was not identified. This is consistent with the findings of Baucom and Lantz (2001) and Engstrom, Sedlacek, and McEwen (1995), who used the Situational Attitudes Scale at NCAA Division I and II institutions, and also found that male student-athletes participating in revenue and non-revenue sports were viewed more negatively than students in the general population. This suggests that faculty hold

negative perceptions towards this population in general, and while their negative perceptions may be intensified with male student-athletes in high profile sports, they nevertheless affect perceptions of male student-athletes. In the current study, while female student-athletes were sometimes found to be viewed more negatively than students in the general population, they occasionally were the beneficiaries of positive perceptions, unlike their male student-athlete counterparts.

The negative perceptions of male student-athletes may help to explain the differential rate at which faculty chose not to complete the male student-athlete version of the study as compared to the other versions. Of the 122 faculty who started the male student-athlete version of the survey, 36 faculty chose not to complete the survey after beginning (29.5% dropout rate). Of the 132 faculty who started the female student-athlete of the survey, 26 faculty members chose not to complete the survey after starting the questionnaire (19.7% dropout rate). Of the 114 faculty who started the general student version of the survey, 18 faculty members chose not to complete the survey after starting the questionnaire (15.8% dropout rate).

In considering the difference in the number of faculty who completed the male student-athlete version compared to the other versions of the survey, it may be that it is a reflection of the subtle, or even not so subtle, biases towards male student-athletes mentioned earlier. It may be that faculty were more hesitant to complete the male student-athlete version of the survey because of the stigma associated with this particular population and for fear of exposing potential biases or negativity towards this highly publicized group. This notion was suggested in an email to the researcher from a faculty

member who received the male student-athlete version of the survey. The respondent indicated that the scenarios should have included other student-athlete situations involving “annoying” behaviors of male student-athletes such as “excessive absence” and requests for “special consideration,” adding two negative behaviors that he or she associated with male student-athletes. While the opinion of one participant may not be a reflection of the majority of faculty members who viewed the survey, the response provides some insight into a potential reason why some other faculty members might have opted not to complete the study. It should be noted that no faculty members who took either of the other two versions of the survey contacted the researcher in regards to the scenarios used in the survey.

The response from the faculty participant above also suggests that the scenarios used for the current study may need to be revisited. While the SAS provides a very useful framework for reducing the potential for socially desirable responses and for comparing differences in perceptions among groups, perhaps the situations presented by the version of the current SAS need to be updated to include situations which are particularly sensitive to the kinds of experiences that affect faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

The current study found that while female student-athletes were always viewed more positively than male student-athletes, they were viewed more negatively than students in the general population in some situations. This was specifically the case in four of the ten scenarios: 1.) when the University announces the creation of an expanded advising and tutorial center, 2.) when the student received a full scholarship to attend the

University, 3.) when the student was admitted with college board scores lower than those of the general student population, and 4.) when the out-of-class achievements of a student in the faculty member's class were featured in the campus newspaper. It is interesting that three of these four situations involved financial or admissions decisions by the University. Perhaps faculty expressed more negative perceptions towards female student-athletes in these circumstances because of the tight financial situation many higher education institutions are currently facing. With limited resources, it is possible that faculty are less supportive of programs which benefit student-athletes in contrast to the general student population.

It is equally of interest that the current study found that female student-athletes are sometimes the beneficiaries of more positive perceptions from faculty than male student-athletes or the general student population. Specifically, faculty held more positive perceptions of female student-athletes compared to male student-athletes or the general student population when the student missed the faculty member's class or when the student received a 2.2 GPA the previous semester. This suggests that while faculty might hold more negative perceptions of female student-athletes when financial or admissions decisions are involved, they appear to be more favorable toward and possibly more accepting of female versus male student-athletes in an academic context. This finding is particularly intriguing given that previous research has indicated that female student-athletes have higher GPAs than male student-athletes (Aries, McCarthy, Salovey, & Banaji, 2004; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Simons, Van Rhee, & Covington, 1999). One might expect faculty to hold female student-athletes to a higher bar than a 2.2

semester GPA and thus anticipate that faculty would have viewed such a semester GPA more negatively for a population which usually performs at a higher level.

Previous research has suggested that certain characteristics of the faculty member may impact faculty perceptions of student-athletes or athletics in general at the institution (Comeaux, 2010; Kuga, 1996; Noble, 2004; Ott, 2011). Studies which considered the gender of the faculty member have produced mixed evidence as to whether or not perceptions of student-athletes varied based on the gender of the faculty member (Kuga, 1996; Ott, 2011; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). Kuga (1996) found that male faculty members, particularly those who were formerly athletes themselves, held more positive perceptions of athletics at their institutions and were more interested in participating in athletic governance. Ott (2011), however, found that neither gender, race, nor academic rank significantly impacted a faculty member's satisfaction with the academic reputation of student-athletes and athletic governance at their institution.

Similar to Ott's findings, the current study found no significant differences between male and female faculty members' perceptions, nor did the current study find the race or rank of the faculty member to significantly impact perceptions of student-athletes. While the researcher did not expect to see a significant difference between faculty perceptions based on the faculty member's race and academic rank, the researcher anticipated that the gender of the faculty member might have had a greater impact on the findings. This was anticipated because the design of the study allowed for isolating the gender of the student-athlete as a variable, something previous studies had not allowed. The researcher thought that female faculty might perceive female student-athletes more

positively than male faculty and that male faculty might perceive male student-athletes more positively than female faculty simply because of a shared gender experience. This was not found to be the case, however.

The current study also found limited evidence to support faculty's previous experience teaching male or female student-athletes as a major influence in understanding faculty perceptions of student-athletes. This lack of notable influence was a little unexpected given Ott's (2011) study which found a positive relationship between faculty experience teaching student-athletes and faculty's satisfaction and involvement in athletic governance. The findings of this study also seem to conflict with Cockley and Roswal (1994) who found that faculty who work more directly with athletic governance at their institutions held more favorable views of athletics in general. Taken together, this previous research implies that faculty interactions with student-athletes and athletics in general may positively influence faculty perceptions. However, previous experience teaching student-athletes, especially female student-athletes, had limited to no significant impact in this study.

The researcher expected previous experience as a collegiate athlete and field of instruction to have more of an impact than was found in the current study. As mentioned previously, Kuga (1996) found that faculty who had participated in collegiate athletics held more favorable views of athletics at their institutions and were more interested in participating in athletic governance. Field of instruction has also been shown to impact faculty perceptions, with faculty in such sports-related areas as Kinesiology and Sport Management generally holding more positive views of athletics at their institutions than

faculty from other areas (Harrison, 2004; Noble, 2004). The current study found that, while each of these variables (previous experience as an athlete and field of instruction) significantly affected faculty perceptions in a few situations, their overall impact was limited.

It is possible that the variables field of study and previous experience as an athlete were created too broadly to show differences which may have existed if these variables had been more narrowly defined. For example, faculty field of instruction was categorized as academic college (i.e., College of Arts and Sciences) as opposed to particular major. This was done in order to further protect the identity of the respondents, but it is possible that differences between faculty perceptions of student-athletes as related to this variable might differ by field of instruction. Additionally, the current study asked about the faculty member's previous participation in collegiate sports. This variable was suggested by Ott (2011) as a potential factor which might influence faculty's perceptions of athletics which is why it was included in this study. Two respondents questioned the specificity of this particular item. One stated that while he was not a collegiate athlete, his children were, and "to a certain extent, this could bias (his) responses." Another respondent indicated that while she was not a collegiate athlete she participated in high school athletes and was recruited to play in college. This faculty member also went on to state that her husband and two sons had also participated in collegiate athletes. The feedback from these two participants suggests that simply considering faculty member's previous participation in collegiate athletics may be unduly

narrowing this field and rather, a variable which gauges a faculty member's involvement in athletics in a broader sense should be considered.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this study was to consider how faculty perceptions of student-athletes were affected by the gender of the student-athlete at NCAA Division IA institutions. Based on the findings of this study, it is reasonable to conclude that faculty hold differing perceptions of male student-athletes and female student-athletes. Male student-athletes are generally viewed more negatively than female student-athletes or students in the general population, while perceptions of female student-athletes are sometimes more positive and sometimes more negative than perceptions of students in the general population. The faculty member's gender, race, and previous experience teaching female student-athletes had no significant impact on faculty perceptions of student-athletes. Other faculty characteristics including academic rank, field of instruction, previous participation as an athlete, and previous experience teaching male student-athletes had only a limited impact on faculty perceptions of student-athletes.

Implications for Higher Education

The findings of this study confirm that faculty biases exist towards student-athletes, especially male student-athletes. As discussed in Chapter I, negative perceptions of student-athletes have the potential to adversely affect student-athletes' sense of self, especially in an academic context. Differential treatment based on such biases further has the potential to lead to the "golem effect," where students perform more poorly due to lowered expectations (Babad, Inbar, & Rosenthal, 1982). The findings of this study

suggest that faculty members need to pay greater attention to their behaviors towards male and female student-athletes, most especially male student-athletes, to make sure that their behaviors are consistent with their treatment of other students in their class.

Institutions of higher education can support this effort by implementing training sessions for faculty that focus on working with special populations, including student-athletes and other groups of students which have historically faced lower expectations, such as students of color.

Since this study showed a positive relationship in a couple of situations between a faculty member's previous participation in athletics and perceptions of student-athletes, institutions might consider working with faculty who were athletes themselves to help build meaningful training programs for faculty that highlight the balancing act between academics and athletics at the collegiate level. Allowing male and female student-athletes an opportunity to discuss their academic and athletic experiences with faculty of all backgrounds could be beneficial as well, so long as this conversation is framed to enhance understanding, not to request special treatment.

Athletic departments can also use the findings of this study as they work with faculty and student-athletes. For one, athletic departments might talk with faculty to gain a better understanding of why they appear to hold such negative perceptions of male student-athletes and what might be helpful to do in the face of these perceptions.

Similarly, they might explore the basis for the more favorable perceptions faculty hold of female student-athletes in academic settings. While it has already been documented that female student-athletes tend to hold higher GPAs, it is possible that there are other

behaviors exhibited by female student-athletes (class attendance, class participation, communication about absences, etc.) that their male counterparts can adopt (if they are not consistently doing so already) which would improve faculty overall perceptions.

Second, athletic departments could also use the findings of this study to consider why faculty seem to hold more negative perceptions of male and female student-athletes compared to students in the general population when financial decisions are involved. For example, if a new tutorial center for student-athletes is being built (as was one of the scenarios in the study), perhaps additional transparency from the athletic department explaining the purpose of the building, the source of funding for the building, and the expected benefits for the university as a whole would help to improve perceptions.

Recommendations for Future Research

The current study helps to fill the gap in understanding the role of gender in faculty perceptions of student-athletes. This study surveyed faculty at one NCAA Division I institution, thereby limiting its generalizability. Further, it is limited since it is the first study to isolate gender in this context. To enhance the potential for generalizability, future research which replicates this study at other NCAA Division I institutions in the Southeast and in other parts of the country would be invaluable. By replicating this study at other NCAA Division I institutions in other parts of the country, researchers could also determine if there are differences in perceptions about student-athletes based on gender in relation to differences in regional norms and expectations of males and females. Further, this study should be replicated at NCAA Division II and III institutions. By replicating this study at NCAA Division II and III institutions,

researchers can determine if differences in faculty perceptions based on the gender of the student-athlete are more pronounced at NCAA Division I institutions as has been found to be the case by NCAA division based on other variables such as race and sport played.

It is critical to remember that gender does not exist in a vacuum; rather it is one of many characteristics which affect others' perceptions. Future research should focus on understanding the interplay between gender and other factors of faculty members' perceptions of student-athletes to determine which specific groups of student-athletes are most at risk for negative stereotypes. While this study found that the gender of the student-athlete adds a critical piece in understanding faculty perceptions, it would be helpful to know whether variables found to influence perceptions of male student-athletes, such as race and sport played, impact this relationship. It would be particularly interesting to consider how female student-athletes at NCAA Division I institutions who participate in high-profile sports, for example women's basketball, are perceived compared to male student-athletes in high-profile sports.

Future research could also consider adding or revising the scenarios included in the version of the SAS used for the current study. As the one faculty member who responded to the researcher proposed, there may be specific situations (such as "excessive absences" and "special considerations") which more readily elicit bias. It is possible that the SAS in its current form includes situations which are outdated or less relevant today. A qualitative study could be conducted to get a new list of faculty-generated situations which may prove to have a greater impact on faculty perceptions of student-athletes. Once this updated list has been created, new scenarios could be

developed and validated to be used in the three versions of the SAS since this method provides a great framework for comparing differences among groups. Additionally, there may be other demographic variables which could be considered in the demographic portion of the survey such as the faculty member's specific discipline rather than the broader academic college distinction which was used for this study. Since many colleges include a wide variety of programs, it is possible that considering a faculty member's specific discipline may reveal a variable with greater impact.

As mentioned above, data obtained from a qualitative study could also help to inform our understanding of the role of gender in faculty perceptions of student-athletes. In addition to the qualitative study proposed above which would help to elicit updated scenarios, a follow-up study comprised of interviews with faculty about differences in perceptions of male and female student-athletes would be useful to answer some of the questions raised in this study and to confirm/refute the findings of the current study. Such a study might specifically seek to address why faculty seem to have more positive perceptions of female student-athletes in an academic context than male student-athletes or students in the general population. Further, such a study might ask questions which address faculty perceptions of female and male student-athletes in situations where financial decisions are involved to see if faculty hold more negative perceptions towards both groups compared to students in the general population as was found in the current study. A qualitative study could also probe faculty reluctance to participate in a study which asked questions about male student-athletes, as was the case with that version of the survey used in this study.

List of References

- Ancis, J. R., Bennett-Choney, S. K., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1996). University student attitudes toward American Indians. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 24, 26-36.
- Aries, E., McCarth, D., Salovey, P., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). A comparison of athletes and nonathletes at highly selective colleges: Academic performance and personal development. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 577-602. Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- Atwater, C. (2010). *Faculty attitudes towards college athletics and the academic competency of student-athletes at a NCAA Division-I institution*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- Babad, E.Y., Inbar, J., & Rosenthal, R. (1982). Pygmalion, Galatea, and the Golem: Investigations of biased and unbiased teachers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 459-474.
- Balenger, V. J., Hoffman, M. A., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1992). Racial attitudes among incoming White students: A study of ten-year trends. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 245-252.
- Baucom, C., & Lantz, C. (2001). Faculty attitudes toward male Division II student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 24(3), 265-276.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Briody, J. (1996). *Perceptions of the impact of intercollegiate athletics on academic reputation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- Brym, R. J., & Lie, J. (2006). *Sociology: Your compass for a new world*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Burke, K. L. (1986). Comparison of psychological androgyny within a sample of female college athletes who participate in sports traditionally appropriate and traditionally inappropriate for competition by women. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 63, 779–782.
- Burton, L. J., Barr, C. A., Fink, J. S., & Bruening, J. E. (2009). “Think athletic director, think masculine?”: Examination of the gender typing of managerial subroles within athletic administration positions. *Sex Roles*, 61, 416-426.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coakley, J. (2006). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Cockley, W. T., & Roswal, G. M. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members’ perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17(4), 217-226.
- Comeaux, E. (2010). Racial differences in faculty perceptions of collegiate student-athletes’ academic and post-undergraduate achievements. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 27, 390-412.

- Comeaux, E. (2013). Faculty perceptions of high-achieving male collegians: A critical race theory analysis. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*(5), 453-465.
- Cooper, H., & Good, T. (1983). *Pygmalion grows up: Studies in the expectation communication process*. New York: Longman.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine, 50*, 1385-1401.
- DeLamater, J., & Myers, D. (2010). *Social Psychology* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Desertrain, G. S., & Weiss, M. R. (1988). Being female and athletic: A cause for conflict? *Sex Roles, 18*, 567-582.
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. (1991). Gender and the emergence of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 685-710.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*, 573-598.
- Engstrand, G. (1995). *Faculty control of athletics: A case study of the University of Minnesota*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Engstrom, C. M. (1991). *University faculty attitudes toward revenue and non-revenue student-athletes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.

- Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). *Attitudes of resident hall students towards student-athletes: Implications for advising, training, and programming* (Research Report #19-89). University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of prejudice toward university student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 189-193.
- Engstrom, C. M., Sedlacek, W. E., & McEwen, M. K. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 36*(3), 217-226.
- Ennis, C. D. (1995). Teachers' responses to noncompliant students: The realities and consequences of a negotiated curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*, 445-460.
- Fallon, M., A., & Jome, L. M. (2007). An exploration of gender-role expectations and conflict among women rugby players. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 311-321.
- Friesen, R. (1992). *A comparison of NCAA Division I-A coaches and administrators' attitudes toward issues in intercollegiate athletics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Gaertner, S.L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J.F. Dovidio and S.L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination and racism: Theory and research* (pp. 61-89). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gallacher, F., & Klieger, D. M. (2001). Sex role orientation and fear. *The Journal of Psychology, 129*, 41-49.

- Gilman, L. J. (1983). *Assisting evangelicals in presenting a positive witness to Mormons*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, CA.
- Guéguen, N. (2012). A web experiment on the self-fulfilling prophecy nature of social stereotypes: Application to online personal advertisements. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(4), 547-550.
- Gustafsdod, P. E. (1998). Gender Differences in Risk Perception: Theoretical and methodological perspectives. *Risk Analysis*, 18(6), 805-811.
- Harrison, C. K., Stone, J., Shapiro, J., Yee, S., Boyd, J.A., & Rullan, V. (2009). The role of gender identities and stereotype salience with the academic performance of male and female college athletes. *Journal of Sport and Society*, 33(1), 78-96.
- Harrison, L. A., & Lynch, A. B. (2005). Social role theory and the perceived gender role orientation of athletes. *Sex Roles*, 52(3/4), 227-237.
- Harrison, L.A., & Secarea, A.M. (2010). College students' attitudes towards the sexualization of professional women athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 33(4), 403-426.
- Harrison, T. (2004). *Internal stakeholder perceptions of intercollegiate athletic reform: A focus group examination*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Jones, A., & Greer, J. (2011). You don't look like an athlete: The effects of feminine appearance on audience perceptions of female athletes and women's sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 34(4), 358-377.

- Jussim, L., Eccles, J., & Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 28, pp. 281-388). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Knight Commission. (2001). *A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Charlotte, NC: Knight Commission.
- Knight Commission. (2010). *Restoring the balance: Dollars, values, and the future of college sports*. Charlotte, NC: Knight Commission.
- Kuga, D. (1996). Governance of intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of faculty members. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 149–168.
- Lantz, C.D., & Schroeder, P. J. (1999). Endorsement of masculine and feminine gender roles: Differences between participation in and identification with the athletic role. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*(4), 55-557.
- Lapchick, R. E. (2000). Crime and athletes: New racial stereotypes. *Society, 37*(3), 14-20.
- Lapchick, R. E. (2006). The integrity of the enterprise. In R. E. Lapchick (Ed.), *New game plan for college sport* (pp. 31-58). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Lawrence, J., Hendricks, L., & Ott, M. (2007). *Faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics: A national study of faculty at NCAA Division I football bowl subdivision institutions*. The University of Michigan, Online Submission, ERIC, EBSCO host (accessed January 10, 2011).
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Hendricks, L. (2009). Athletics reform and faculty perception. *New Directions for Higher Education, 148*, 73-81.

- Liang, C., & Sedlacek, W. (2003). Attitudes of White student services practitioners toward Asian Americans. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 40*(3), 30-42.
- Livingston, B. A., & Judge, T. A. (2008). Emotional responses to work-family conflict: An examination of gender role orientation among working men and women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(1), 207-216.
- McQuilkin, J., Freitag, C., & Harris, J. (1990). Attitudes of college students towards handicapped persons. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*(3), 17-22.
- Noble, J. (2004). *Faculty attitudes toward NCAA Division III athletic programs*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO.
- Norman, G. (1995). *Faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at colleges and universities belonging to Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of North Texas, Denton, TX.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Ott, M. (2011). Faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 4*, 370-395.
- Palapattu, A. G., Kingery, J. N., & Ginsburg, G. S. (2006). Gender role orientation and anxiety symptoms among African American adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*(3), 441-449.

- Parsons, J. C. (2010). *Determining the existence of an athletic stigma on a NCAA Division II university campus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Ashland University.
- Person, D. R., Benson-Quaziana, M., & Rogers, A. M. (2001). Female student athletes and student athletes of color. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 55-64.
- Potuto, J., & O'Hanlon, J. (2007). National study of student-athletes regarding their experiences as college students. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 947-966.
- Rohrbaugh, J. B. (1979). *Women: Psychology's puzzle*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Rubie-Davies, C., Hattie, J., & Hamilton, R. (2006). Expecting the best for students: Teacher expectations and academic outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 429-444.
- Sage, G. H., & Loudermilk, S. (1979). The female athlete and role conflict. *Research Quarterly*, 50, 88-96.
- Sailes, G. A. (1993). An investigation of campus stereotypes: The myth of Black athletic superiority and the dumb jock stereotype. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 88-97.
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675-688.
- Schein, V. E. (2007). Women in management: reflections and projections. *Women in Management Review*, 22, 6-18.

- Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. (1969). Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychology Reports, 27*, 971-980.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (in press). Measures worth considering in diversity research and programming. *Readings on Equal Education*.
- Seidler, T., Gerdy, J., & Cardinal, B. (1998). Athletic directors and university presidents. *International Sports Journal, 2*(2), 36-46.
- Sellers, R. M., Kuperminc, G. P., & Damas, A., Jr. (1997). The college life experiences of African American women athletes. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 25*(5), 699-720.
- Shulman, J. & Bowen, W. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simons, H. D, Van Rheenen, D., & Covington, M. (1999). Academic motivation and the student athlete. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(2), 151-162.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perceptions of interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(9), 656-666.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2010). Gender role conflict, athletic identity, and help-seeking among high school football players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 22*(3), 262-273.
- Stone, J., Sjomeling, M., Lynch, C., & Darley, J. (1999). Stereotype threat effects on Black and White athletic performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(6), 1213- 1227.

- Thelin, J. (1996). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tovar, E. (2011). Faculty perceptions of Division I male student-athletes: The relationship between student-athlete contact, athletic department involvement, and perceptions of intercollegiate athletics. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Kansas. Lawrence, KS.
- Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2000). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management, 14*, 154–178.
- Weinstein, R. S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, B., & Corts, D. (2008). Measuring attitudes towards sorority and fraternity members: Indication of implicit, ingroup favoritism. *College Student Journal, 42*(3), 842-846.
- Wetzig, D. L. (1990). Sex-role conflict in female athletes: A possible marker for alcoholism. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 35*, 45–53.
- Whisenant, W. A. (2008). Sustaining male dominance in interscholastic athletics: A case of homologous reproduction..or not? *Sex Roles, 58*, 768-775.
- Williams, J., Colles, C., & Allen, K. (2010) Division III athletes: Perceptions of faculty interactions and academic support services. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 3*, 211 – 233.

Appendices

Appendix A

Comparison of Directions from Engstrom (1991) and the Current Study

Directions from Engstrom's (1991) SAS general student form

Participant Instructions

This questionnaire measures how you think and feel about a number of situations that might occur in the classroom. It is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is anonymous, so please do not sign your name. A notation indicating the form type has been written in on the answer sheet.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes your feelings towards the item.

Sample item: ending classes this spring

happy A B C D E sad

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings, (e.g. you might select "B" by indicating "B" on the answer sheet provided by blackening in the appropriate space for that word scale. Do not mark on the booklet. Please respond to all work scales. Please use a #2 pencil. A pencil is enclosed.

Sometimes you may feel as though you had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the questionnaire. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Respond as honestly as possible without puzzling over individual items. Respond with your first impressions wherever possible.

Place the questionnaire and the completed answer sheet into the enclosed addressed envelope. Please put the envelope in the mail as quickly as possible.

Thank you!

Directions from the current study's SAS general form

Instructions to Participant

The following questionnaire will ask you to read 10 brief scenarios regarding a student in your class. After each scenario, you will see a list of 10 descriptive word scales. Please indicate the direction and extent of your feelings on the continuum.

Sample item: You just finished teaching your last class of the semester.

happy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	sad

If you feel very happy that the semester is over, you would select the "O" to the far left, whereas you might select the middle "O" if you have mixed or neutral feelings about the end of your semester. Sometimes you may feel as though you have seen the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so please respond to each item separately as an independent judgment. Be as honest as possible without over thinking individual items. Please respond with your first impression whenever possible.

Demographic Questions

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

Please select one or more of the following that indicate your racial or ethnic group.

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Other
- Asian
- Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Which of the following represents your current academic rank (select only one)?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Lecturer/Adjunct
- Other title (please specify): _____

Which of the following categories best describes your primary field of instruction (select one)?

- Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources
- Architecture and Design
- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Communication and Information
- Education, Health, and Human Sciences
- Engineering
- Law
- Nursing
- Social Work
- Veterinary Medicine

Did you ever participate in intercollegiate varsity athletics?

- Yes
- No

Have you ever had a male intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Have you ever had a female intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Demographic Questions

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

Please select one or more of the following that indicate your racial or ethnic group.

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Other
- Asian
- Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Which of the following represents your current academic rank (select only one)?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Lecturer/Adjunct
- Other title (please specify): _____

Which of the following categories best describes your primary field of instruction (select one)?

- Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources
- Architecture and Design
- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Communication and Information
- Education, Health, and Human Sciences
- Engineering
- Law
- Nursing
- Social Work
- Veterinary Medicine

Did you ever participate in intercollegiate varsity athletics?

- Yes
- No

Have you ever had a male intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Have you ever had a female intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Demographic Questions

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

Please select one or more of the following that indicate your racial or ethnic group.

- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- Other
- Asian
- Caucasian/White
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

Which of the following represents your current academic rank (select only one)?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Lecturer/Adjunct
- Other title (please specify): _____

Which of the following categories best describes your primary field of instruction (select one)?

- Agriculture Sciences and Natural Resources
- Architecture and Design
- Arts and Sciences
- Business Administration
- Communication and Information
- Education, Health, and Human Sciences
- Engineering
- Law
- Nursing
- Social Work
- Veterinary Medicine

Did you ever participate in intercollegiate varsity athletics?

- Yes
- No

Have you ever had a male intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Have you ever had a female intercollegiate student-athlete in a class you taught?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

Appendix E

IRB Approval

THE UNIVERSITY of TENNESSEE 

KNOXVILLE

Office of Research & Engagement
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)

1534 White Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37996-1529
865-974-7697
fax 865-974-7400

April 4, 2014

IRB#: 9459 B

Title: An Examination of the Role of Gender in Understanding Faculty Perceptions of Student-Athletes at
NCAA Division I Institutions

Jana Spitzer
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
332 Bailey Education Complex
Campus

Norma Mertz
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
325 Bailey Educational Complex
Campus

Your project listed above has been reviewed and granted IRB approval under expedited review.

This approval is good for a period ending one year from the date of this letter. Please make timely submission of renewal or prompt notification of project termination (see item #3 below).

Responsibilities of the investigator during the conduct of this project include the following:

1. To obtain prior approval from the Committee before instituting any changes in the project.
2. If signed consent forms are being obtained from subjects, they must be stored for at least three years following completion of the project.
3. To submit a Form D to report changes in the project or to report termination at 12-month or less intervals.

The Committee wishes you every success in your research endeavor. This office will send you a renewal notice (Form R) on the anniversary of your approval date.

Sincerely,



Brenda Lawson
Compliance Officer

Enclosure

Appendix F

Email to Participant

Dear faculty member,

I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration Program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I am researching faculty perceptions of common situations with students as part of a study which will assist in the completion of the requirements for my Ph.D., and I need your help. Participation in this study involves the completion of a survey which should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time.

To encourage participation, a drawing will be held within one week of the close of the survey for one of four \$25 Amazon gift certificates. You can access the survey and drawing entry form anytime between now and April 29, 2014 by clicking on the following link:

https://utk.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cLKWBMgjkJWk7Ot

When you click on the link, you will see additional information regarding the study which will allow you to make an informed decision about participation.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact me. I realize that your time is incredibly valuable, so I thank you in advance for your participation!

Best regards,

Jana Spitzer

Doctoral Candidate
jspitzer@utk.edu

Appendix G

Reminder Email to Participant

Dear faculty member,

This is a reminder email requesting your participation in the following study. If you have already participated, thank you very much for your time. It is greatly appreciated.

I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration Program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I am researching faculty perceptions of common situations with students as part of a study which will assist in the completion of the requirements for my Ph.D. Participation in this study involves the completion of a survey which should take no more than 10-15 minutes of your time.

To encourage participation, a drawing will be held within one week of the close of the survey for one of four \$25 Amazon gift certificates. You can access the survey and drawing entry form anytime between now and April 29, 2014 by clicking on the following link:

https://utk.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9MECtflXcijzQW1

When you click on the link, you will see additional information regarding the study which will allow you to make an informed decision about participation.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact me. I realize that your time is incredibly valuable, so I thank you in advance for your participation!

Best regards,

Jana Spitzer

Doctoral Candidate
jspitzer@utk.edu

Appendix H

Study Information

Welcome! Thank you for taking the time to learn more about my study! Below you will find important information about the study followed by a link directing you to the survey and drawing entry form. Completion of the survey constitutes informed consent. Please print a copy of this study information for your records.

Purpose and Description of Study

The current study is being conducted by Jana Spitzer, a Ph.D. candidate in the Higher Education Administration Program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The study is designed to aid in my dissertation research related to faculty perceptions of common situations with students. Data acquired from this survey will be analyzed using SPSS, and the findings will become part of my final dissertation and potentially part of subsequent publications or presentations related to the same topic. Information from this study will assist institutions of higher education in their efforts to understand and improve how faculty and students interact.

Protection Measures and Participation

Your participation in this survey is voluntary and your responses will not be connected to any identifiable information. The survey utilizes a third party provider, Qualtrics, which will not record any IP addresses or email addresses, thus protecting your identity. Information obtained from responses will be aggregated for reporting purposes, and neither individuals nor the institution will be identifiable. You may choose not to participate in this survey or withdraw from the survey at any time without penalty by simply closing out the browser.

The email address obtained by the primary investigator for soliciting the initial research request will be deleted from the investigator's computer as soon as a final email reminder about the survey has been sent to all potential participants. Data collected from the survey will initially be saved on the secure Qualtrics server until it is exported to the primary investigator's external hard drive and stored in a password-protected file. At that time, the data from the survey will be deleted from Qualtrics' server. All data will be destroyed from the principal investigator's external hard drive within three years after the successful defense of the dissertation.

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher or her dissertation advisor:

<i>Principal Investigator</i>	<i>Advisor and Committee Chair</i>
-------------------------------	------------------------------------

<p>Jana Spitzer Student Services Center 332 Bailey Education Complex Knoxville, TN 37996</p>	<p>Dr. Norma Mertz Educational Leadership and Policy Studies 1122 Volunteer Boulevard Knoxville, TN 37996</p>
--	---

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact The University of Tennessee's Research Compliance Services division:

Compliance Officer

Brenda Lawson

Office of Research

1534 White Avenue

Knoxville, TN 37996

Incentives

You may choose to participate in a drawing for one of four \$25 Amazon gift certificates. Your entry into the drawing is not contingent upon completion of the survey. You can access the incentive form directly without completing the survey if you so choose. The entry form for the drawing will ask for your email information separately and will not be tied to your survey responses, thus protecting your identity. The drawing for the certificates will take place within one week from the date when the survey link expires. Winners will receive their \$25 gift certificates via email. Once the winners of the drawing have been contacted, all contact information will promptly be destroyed.

Participation

You must be at least 18 years old in order to participate in the study and/or to be entered in the incentive drawing. While measures have been put into place to protect your identity, anonymity cannot be guaranteed. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the primary investigator, advisor, or compliance officer. To continue, select one of the following options:

- I wish to take the survey and then be directed to the incentive entry form
- I wish to skip directly to the incentive entry form without completing the survey

Vita

Jana Thomas Spitzer was born in northern Virginia, but moved several times before her family settled in Waynesville, NC when she was eight years old. She graduated with honors and as a varsity student-athlete from East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, TN with a bachelor's degree in Sociology. She then attended the University of Tennessee – Knoxville, where she earned a Master of Arts degree in Sociology with a concentration in Criminology. During that time, she taught several introductory Sociology courses at UTK and at a local area community college. Following the completion of her graduate degree, she spent several years working for a Knoxville-area bank and serving as a Sociology adjunct instructor. In 2009, Jana began the Ph.D. program in Higher Education Administration at UTK, a degree which was conferred in December of 2014.

Jana lives in Knoxville with her husband, Noah, and their daughter, Abigail. She is currently the Coordinator of Advising and Assessment for the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences' Office of Student Services at UTK.