

Faculty Attitudes Toward Male Revenue and Nonrevenue Student-Athletes

Cathy McHugh Engstrom

William E. Sedlacek

Marylu K. McEwen

The study of attitudes of faculty at a major eastern public research university indicated that faculty perceived male revenue and nonrevenue athletes negatively in situations dealing with academic competence, special services, and recognition. This implications of these findings should be discussed among student-athletes, faculty, advisors, and student affairs staff.

INTRODUCTION

Intercollegiate athletics has been a controversial topic on college campuses and with the media for over 100 years. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has frequently contended that participation in college athletics has positive benefits for its participants. However, many studies have challenged this assertion (Edwards, 1984; Lawrence, 1985; Roper & McKenzie, 1988). Few characters in the U.S. culture stimulate negative images more startling or suffer more misunderstanding than "dumb jock" student-athletes (Shriberg & Brodzinski, 1984; Zingg, 1982). It is assumed, particularly at large institutions, that an athlete is socially inept and does not do well in the classroom (Sellers, 1992), and student-athletes' lack of contact with the campus community makes them a group susceptible to stereotyping (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986). Fellow students tend to waver from being avid fans to holding very condescending stereotypes of this peer group (Zingg, 1982). There are limited forums to challenge the stereotypes held toward this special population since student athletes often live in separate suites and apartments from other students, they have their own advising services, and they have limited

opportunities to engage with faculty, students or staff in co-curricular activities.

These negative stereotypes held about student-athletes can have a devastating effect on the students' self-image (Sellers, 1992; Wittmer, Bostic, Phillips & Waters, 1981; Zingg, 1982). The research on self-fulfilling prophecy highlights the potential for student-athletes to internalize the expectations of poor academic performance and lowered chances for success (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986).

The "dumb jock" image for Black student-athletes is even more pervasive (Adler & Adler, 1985; Roper & McKenzie, 1988). It is assumed that they possess innate athletic superiority but lack any academic competencies or abilities. Black athletes, like other Black students, experience years of systematic degradation. They are immersed in a social environment that is alienating and nonsupportive (Adler & Adler, 1985; Leach & Connors, 1984; Roper & McKenzie, 1988). The myths and stereotypes that have surfaced repeatedly in the media about Black student-athletes are all part of a system that is exploitative and developmentally damaging to student-athletes and an embarrassment to academe (Edwards, 1984; Funk, 1991; Lawrence, 1985).

Male Student-Athletes as a Nontraditional Student Group?

Sedlacek (in press-a) has proposed a two-step measurement strategy to define operationally nontraditional. One step involves giving members of a given group (e.g., Asians) the Noncognitive Questionnaire (NCQ), an instrument is designed to assess attributes that are not

Cathy McHugh Engstrom is Assistant Professor of Education at Syracuse University. William E. Sedlacek is Assistant Director of Testing and Research in the Counseling Center and Professor of Education at the University of Maryland at College Park. Marylu K. McEwen is Associate Professor of Education at the University of Maryland at College Park. Computer time for this project has been provided in full through the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland at College Park.

often measured by other standard instruments of aptitude and intelligence and that may describe common ways for persons with nontraditional experiences to demonstrate their abilities (Sedlacek, 1989). If results on the NCQ systematically correlate more with the success of members of a given group, such as student-athletes, than they do for White males who have more traditional experiences in society, then the group meets the first criterion for consideration as a nontraditional group. In one study Sedlacek and Adams-Gaston (1992) found the NCQ to be a better predictor of student-athletes grades than were SAT scores.

If a group also faces prejudice, it meets the second criterion in operationally defining its members as non-traditional (Sedlacek, in press-a). Engstrom and Sedlacek (1991, 1993) provided evidence that negative prejudice existed toward male student-athletes among fellow students, particularly around issues of academic competency. Sedlacek claimed that student-athletes who met these two criteria, were a group that has been oppressed and discriminated against, similar to such groups as women, disabled students, and Blacks (Sedlacek, in press-a). Although groups such as athletes, Blacks, and older people all show their diversity in various ways they all face developmental challenges and issues, and, they must cope with a system that was not designed to support them (Sedlacek, in press-b).

Fear, conscious and unconscious prejudicial attitudes and behaviors, patterns of misinformation, and stereotyping toward student-athletes all may be instilled and perpetuated by members of the campus community. The discrimination may manifest itself in different ways. Gaertner and Dovidio argued that over time, the "red-necked" form of discrimination has generally been replaced by a more subtle, aversive type (1986, p. 62). Gaertner and Dovidio described "aversive racists" as individuals who see themselves as nonprejudiced and non-discriminatory (1986, p.62). In actuality, these individuals hold negative feelings and beliefs about certain groups of people. Because they emphasize the importance of the egalitarian value system, their negative feelings toward particular

groups are excluded frequently from their consciousness. Aversive racists also tend to have numerous nonracial "facts" or reasons that justify, rationalize, or legitimize behaviors that generally disadvantage a certain group. Leach and Conners (1984) speculated that faculty members may hold more negative attitudes toward college student-athletes than do other students, administrators, and alumni. Such negative attitudes 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. However, because faculty members generally are part of a system that espouses equity and fairness, researchers may have difficulty determining the presence of negative faculty attitudes toward particular groups of students.

The purpose of this study was to assess whether faculty held stereotypical negative attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes at a major eastern public research university. In addition, types of situations that might elicit negative feelings toward revenue and/or nonrevenue athletes were investigated. The researchers also broke down the "male student-athlete" category to examine whether there were any differential attitudes existed toward revenue or nonrevenue student-athletes because such distinctions have not been acknowledged in the literature.

METHOD

Participants

We drew a random sample of 201 faculty at a large eastern public research university with a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division 1-A athletic program, and 126 faculty (60%) returned usable instruments. The faculty were randomly given one of the three forms. In order to get a wide representation of the faculty in the university, a group representing all ranks and types was surveyed because faculty members may influence student-athletes even if they are not teaching these students (i.e., through activities such as academic advising, governance committees, or policy development committees).

Demographic data on the study's participants who returned the surveys showed that 88 (69%) were male and 40 (31%) were female. The racial/ethnic background of the sample was 91% White (not of Hispanic origin), 2% African-American, 7% Asian American, and 0% Hispanic. The grouping by rank was as follows: 9% instructor, 23% assistant professor, 34% associate professor, 29% professor, and 15% other (e.g.s teaching assistants, research assistants, part-time faculty). Finally, the college breakdown of respondents was representative of the institution's faculty population, except for the College of Life Sciences and the College of Engineering, both of which were underrepresented.

Instrumentation

The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) has been shown to be a valid and reliable method to measure attitudes toward groups that are targets of oppression and prejudice such as Blacks (Balenger, Hoffman, & Sedlacek, 1992; White & Sedlacek, 1987), Arabs (Sergent, Woods, & Sedlacek, 1992), women (Minatoya & Sedlacek, 1983) and Hispanics (White & Sedlacek, 1987). The reliability coefficients in these studies were in the .70 to .89 range.

The description of the aversive racist (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) suggests why sophisticated, subtle instruments are needed to measure effectively the attitudes that individuals hold toward a particular group. The SAS design was designed to identify both overt and less conscious feelings and to minimize the production of socially desirable responses (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1970, 1976). The design for measuring attitudes toward a particular group involves identifying 10 personal and social situations with some relevance to the type of prejudice being investigated (e.g., racism, sexism), followed by 10 bipolar adjectives (e.g., happy-sad) for each situation. Respondents share their reactions to the situations by checking a point on each semantic differential scale (a likert scale) that describes their feelings (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957). Typically, an SAS questionnaire has 10 items that serve as dependent variables, or indicators of attitudes toward the particular group being studied (e.g., student-athletes,

Blacks, women). Each situation is self-descriptive and should be considered independently (Sedlacek, in press-a).

In addition, two or more forms have been developed that describe the same situations, but in one or more forms, the group (s) under investigation (e.g. Blacks, gays) are included in each situation. Because participants are not aware that other forms exist or that comparisons are being made, they do not try unconsciously or consciously attempt to change their answers in relation to a "neutral" form. The validity of the SAS is thus calculated by the mean response differences between the two or more forms (Sedlacek & Brooks, 1976).

The Revised SAS Student-Athlete instrument used in this study was based on the original instrument used to measure the attitudes of nonathlete students (freshmen and residence hall students) toward their peer student-athletes (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991, 1993). In the original instrument, the situations were generated by identifying themes articulated in the literature and by interviewing students about prejudice and stereotypes they reported facing. Five situations were included in this study from the original SAS Student-Athlete instrument plus five situations unique to this study. These new situations were developed from what the literature suggested were stereotypes held by faculty and feedback regarding the items was solicited from faculty and student affairs groups. The new situations were intended to better reflect experiences faculty members might have or identify with as they related to student-athletes.

The original SAS Student-Athlete used in two studies, one with residence hall students and another with new students, consisted of two forms: a neutral form with the word student, and a form with the word student-athlete (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1993; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991). In the SAS Student-Athlete study with residence hall students, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the neutral form ranged from .76 to .91, with a median of .85. The reliability coefficients for the student-athlete form ranged from .73 to .93, with a median of .84 (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1993). In the study conducted with entering new students, the reliability coefficients

TABLE 1

Revised SAS Student-Athlete Situation Means and Standard Deviations of Faculty

Situation	Neutral <i>n</i> =49		Revenue <i>n</i> =42		Nonrevenue <i>n</i> =35		Significance*
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
1. A student (football player, male soccer player) in your class withdraws from school.	34.67	4.63	33.77	4.55	33.27	3.63	
2. You see a student (male basketball player, male baseball player) driving an expensive sports car.	32.91	5.68	29.07	5.88	30.86	3.94	F
3. A student (football player, male lacrosse player) gets an A in your class.	42.51	4.88	37.51	4.49	35.54	4.52	F
4. A student (male basketball player, wrestler) misses one of your classes.	28.65	6.04	29.58	6.58	30.91	5.44	
5. The University announces the creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program for students (football players, students in nonrevenue sports).	42.28	7.33	40.12	8.86	33.48	10.10	F, FxG
6. A student (male basketball player, male tennis player) in your class has received a full scholarship to attend this University.	44.20	6.76	35.69	8.10	32.79	8.47	F, FxG
7. A student (football player, male soccer player) in your class was admitted with college board scores significantly lower than those of the general student population.	27.69	5.48	21.66	7.09	21.43	5.85	F
8. A student (male basketball player, male baseball player) decides to pursue his program of study at a slower pace.	30.23	4.72	32.19	5.41	33.09	5.39	F
9. The out-of-class achievements of one of your students (who is a football player, who is on the wrestling team) is featured in the campus newspaper.	43.12	7.20	37.49	6.71	37.40	7.35	F
10. One of your advisees (who is on the male basketball team, who is on the male tennis team) received a 2.2. GPA last semester.	24.00	6.80	26.02	7.44	25.72	5.27	

Note. Scale ranges: 50 = most positive; 10 = most negative attitudes

* $p < .05$ using MANOVA.

F = significant effect for form; FxG = significant effect for form-by-gender interaction.

for the SAS Student-Athlete neutral form ranged from .72 to .86, with a median of .82; the student-athlete form had reliability coefficients ranging from .61 to .93 with a median reliability coefficient of .73.

The instrument used in this study contained three forms which were identical, except that Form A referred in each situation to "student," Form B referred alternately by situation either to a male football or to a male basketball player (revenue sports); and Form C mentioned a male player in nonrevenue sports (lacrosse, wrestling, golf, tennis, baseball). The results were analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) at the .05 level with form and gender main effects. For the remainder of the article, the term students refers to those in the general student body.

RESULTS

Form Differences

The MANOVA was significant for the form main effect (Wilk's lambda = .395, $p < .05$). Univariate F tests showed that total scores for 7 out of 10 situations revealed significant differences by form (see Table 1). The Revised SAS Student-Athlete means and standard deviation scores for each situation of all faculty participants are also found in Table 1.

Responses were significantly different by form in the following situations: drives an expensive car; gets an A in class; creates an expanded tutorial program; receives a full scholarship to college; admitted with lower SATs; pursues a program of study at a slower pace; and student's accomplishments are featured in the

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations by Gender of Revised Student-Athlete Situation Scores

Situation ^a	FEMALES						MALES					
	Neutral		Revenue Student-Athlete		Nonrevenue Student-Athlete		Neutral		Revenue Student-Athlete		Nonrevenue Student-Athlete	
	<i>n</i> = 14		<i>n</i> = 13		<i>n</i> = 13		<i>n</i> = 38		<i>n</i> = 26		<i>n</i> = 22	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1.	34.99	4.91	34.94	4.09	33.26	3.88	34.59	4.60	33.23	4.77	33.27	3.56
2.	35.86	5.53	29.12	4.07	29.61	3.25	32.05	5.50	29.50	6.32	31.59	4.19
3.	41.91	5.64	38.87	4.05	33.77	5.48	42.68	4.70	36.88	4.61	36.59	3.58
4.	27.36	7.18	30.69	7.25	28.77	3.79	29.02	5.72	30.68	7.25	32.18	5.92
5.	44.36	3.25	45.81	5.41	29.69	9.66	41.68	7.04	36.84	9.02	35.72	9.88
6.	45.54	5.95	37.68	3.22	29.46	8.18	43.81	7.00	34.46	7.93	34.76	8.17
7.	27.66	5.92	21.13	7.22	21.69	5.32	27.71	5.43	21.65	7.08	21.27	6.25
8.	31.91	2.77	33.17	5.23	32.92	5.29	29.74	5.07	31.65	5.63	33.18	5.56
9.	46.18	5.56	38.56	6.94	35.69	6.57	42.24	7.43	36.42	6.35	38.41	7.74
10.	24.94	6.65	25.13	6.21	23.61	3.27	23.72	5.90	26.41	8.27	26.97	5.87

Note. Scale ranges: 50 = most positive; 10 = most negative attitudes.

^a See Table 1 for complete wording of situations.

campus newspaper. In all but one of these situations, the attitudes of the faculty were more negative toward the male revenue and non-revenue student-athletes than they were toward students. In one situation, pursuing a program of study at a slower pace (Situation 8) faculty were more positive about having this option provided for nonrevenue and revenue student-athletes than for students. Three situations did not elicit significant differential faculty attitudes toward the various students groups—withdrawing from school, missing a class, and getting a 2.2. GPA.

LSD post hoc one-way comparison tests revealed several different patterns of between-group significance (see Table 2). In four situations—gets an A in class, receives a full scholarship, admitted with lower SATs, and accomplishments are recognized in the campus newspaper—the scores with both the revenue and the nonrevenue forms were significantly different (more negative feelings expressed) from the scores obtained with the neutral form.

Some negative feelings that respondents indicated toward the revenue student-athletes and the nonrevenue ones in the “gets an A in your class” situation were “unlikely, suspicious, impossible, unexpected, surprised.” Faculty members indicated that they were more “sad, disapproving, angered, and embarrassed” when either a revenue student-athlete or a nonrevenue one received a full scholarship to college than they were when a student obtained this same privilege.

Respondents also thought it was more unfair, upsetting, and wrong that a revenue or a nonrevenue student-athlete, as compared with a student, be admitted to college with college board scores lower than those of the general student population. In addition, faculty were more “embarrassed, disinterested, mad, and disapproving” when either a revenue or a non-revenue student-athlete’s achievements were featured in the campus newspaper than when the same recognition was given to a student.

LSD post hoc comparison tests indicated in the situation “drives an expensive sports car” that faculty felt significantly more negative attitudes toward a revenue student-athlete driving an expensive sports car than they did toward a

student in the general student body. However, there was not a significant difference between the attitudes of faculty toward a student in general and those toward a nonrevenue student-athlete.

In the situation “the University announces the creation of an expanded advising and tutoring program” the nonrevenue form yielded significantly more negative attitudes than did both the student and revenue student-athlete forms. Faculty felt more disturbed, intolerant, and displeased when such a program was developed for nonrevenue student-athletes, and they believed it to be more inappropriate and unacceptable for students participating in these sports than it would be for students in general or for revenue student-athletes.

Finally, in the situation “pursues his program of study at a slower pace,” there was a significant difference between the responses on nonrevenue form and those on the neutral form. Faculty said that they were more happy and pleased by this choice when made by nonrevenue student-athletes than when made by students. It was more “appropriate,” “right,” and “expected” for the nonrevenue group than it was for students. There was no significant difference between the responses to the revenue form and those to the neutral form in this situation.

Gender Differences and Form-by-Gender Interaction

Significance at the .05 level was not obtained for gender main effect (Wilks’s lambda = .932, $p > .05$). The MANOVA showed significance for the form-by-gender interaction effect (Wilks’s lambda = .760, $p < .05$). According to the univariate F tests, total scores for 2 out of 10 situations revealed significant differences for form-by-gender interaction (see Table 1). The Revised SAS Student-Athlete means and standard deviations for these two situations for female and male faculty members are found in Table 2; means and standard deviations for the remaining eight are also presented, although there were no significant gender or interaction effects (see Table 3).

Specifically, in one of the situations with a form-by-gender interaction effect—“the University announces the creation of an expanded

advising and tutoring program”— the strongest negative attitudes toward the creation of these services for male nonrevenue student-athletes came from female faculty members. On the other hand, female faculty members were more positive about the creation of tutorial and advising programs for male revenue student-athletes than they were for all students. Male faculty members seemed to be most disturbed with revenue athletes receiving these services (but not to the negative degree that women expressed toward nonrevenue student-athlete recipients) and were less upset when programs were offered for nonrevenue student-athletes.

In the second situation with a form-by-gender interaction effect (Situation 6), female faculty members had slightly more positive feelings than male faculty about students and revenue student-athletes receiving full scholarships. However, female faculty expressed stronger negative feelings than did male faculty

members about nonrevenue student-athletes receiving full scholarships. Also, in this situation, women’s attitudes were increasingly more negative as the groups moved from students to revenue student-athletes to nonrevenue student-athletes. Male faculty members were more negative about full scholarships being awarded to revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes than to students in the general population.

Reliability

In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of the Revised SAS Student-Athlete ranged from .65 to .96 across situations, with a median of .87. The reliability of the neutral form ranged from .70 to .95 across situations, with a median of .84. The reliability of the revenue form ranged from .65 to .96 across situations, with a median of .88. The nonrevenue form had reliability scores ranging from .60 to .97, with a median of .86.

TABLE 3

Patterns of Between Group Significance on Items Showing Overall Significant Differences^a

item No.	Situation ^b	Significant Post Hoc Comparisons*
2	Drives expensive car	Students in general vs. Revenue
3	Gets an A in class	Students in general vs. Revenue Students in general vs. Nonrevenue
5 ^c	Creation of tutoring program	Students in general vs. Nonrevenue Revenue vs. Nonrevenue
6 ^c	Receives full scholarship	Students in general vs. Revenue Students in general vs. Nonrevenue
7	Admitted with lower SATs	Students in general vs. Revenue Students in general vs. Nonrevenue
8	Pursues program at slower pace	Nonrevenue vs. Students in general
9	Featured in campus newspaper	Students in general vs. Revenue Students in general vs. Nonrevenue

Note: First group indicated generated significantly more positive attitudes than the second group listed.

^a Overall F significant (.05 level).

^b See Table 1 for complete wording of situations.

^c Also had a significant form-by-gender interaction effect at the .05 level.

* $p < .05$.

DISCUSSION

This study indicated that at this institution faculty do, in fact, hold prejudicial attitudes and stereotypes toward both revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. When one examines the type of situations in the Revised SAS Student-Athlete that revealed differential attitudes, faculty regarded revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes' academic abilities less positively than they did students, and they expressed more disdain and anger toward situations in which privileges or services were granted to student-athletes. These findings are consistent with the type of prejudice held toward male student-athletes by student peers (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991, 1993).

Specifically, the two situations—“receives full scholarship to college” and “admitted with lower SATs”—elicited stronger feelings of anger, disapproval, and concern toward nonrevenue and revenue student-athletes than students in general. This finding suggests that faculty members may consider individuals in these two groups to be unqualified for or undeserving of admission to their institution. They also expressed more surprise, unexpectedness, and suspicion when revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes made an A in a class than when attained by a student in general. This result supports the premise that faculty question whether male student-athletes are academically prepared or able to meet the expectations in the classroom. This result is consistent with the stereotypes depicted in the literature that student-athletes are “dumb jocks” and lack the abilities and motivation to succeed academically (Edwards, 1984; Zingg, 1982).

Faculty also expressed stronger negative attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes whose feats were recognized in the campus newspaper than those of students. One explanation for this result may be that perhaps faculty members do not consider athletic feats to be as deserving of attention and pride as other types of student accomplishments because athletes have been participating in activities incompatible with the basic academic values of the institution.

It is interesting that the situation “driving an

expensive sports car” elicited significantly different attitudes only between revenue athletes and students in general (feelings toward the latter group being more positive). Perhaps the media's focus on illegal, illegitimate practices in big-time sports, such as giving student-athletes special gifts and money, has affected individuals' perceptions about the legitimacy of “big-time” student-athletes (i.e., those in revenue-producing sports) having extravagant material goods (Telander, 1989). The issues of race and class may be confounding variables in this situation. Perhaps faculty think of members of revenue sports as generally Black and/or disadvantaged and, therefore, unable to enjoy or afford expensive items unless obtained unethically. Do they assume that participants in nonrevenue sports are generally White, or at least are members of a more privileged class and therefore can afford an expensive car? There may be less cognitive dissonance in visualizing a nonrevenue student-athletes in a sports car than in seeing a revenue student-athlete in one.

The results of the “creation of an expanded advising and tutorial program” raised some interesting questions. Are female faculty members more tolerant and accepting of the privileges obtained by the revenue student-athletes because they already are sensitive and empathic to these students' plight, a plight that has been well publicized in the public media? This caring, supportive response to a group that has been the victim of negative media attention would be consistent with the posture assumed by women in sorting out moral dilemmas (Gilligan, 1982). These faculty members are supportive about compensating for the injustices faced by revenue student-athletes by offering support services to these students. In addition, perhaps the female faculty members may be less aware of the challenges facing nonrevenue student-athletes since the “stories” of these students are not as frequently reported by the press. On the other hand, male faculty members, who reacted in a similar manner to situations involving revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes, may not be as concerned about compensating for the system's exploitation of revenue student-athletes with support services. Another explanation for the

gender differences among forms could be that there may be more of an identification with the nonrevenue sports among the male faculty members who probably had participated in more of these activities than had the female faculty members and, therefore, they are more appreciative of the obstacles that nonrevenue student-athletes face.

Faculty also indicated that they held more positive attitudes ("less concerned," "more pleased," "more appropriate") about revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes pursuing programs of study at a slower pace than they did about students in general. One can only speculate but it may be that faculty are sensitive to the time demands on the student-athlete and may be more willing to accept that it is reasonable for these students to take a lighter course load, thereby, extending the time until graduation. They were particularly tolerant of male nonrevenue student-athletes choosing this alternative.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study, combined with the findings of two previous studies (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991, 1993), confirm that the student-athletes (both revenue and nonrevenue ones) are susceptible to prejudice in the campus community, particularly regarding issues of academic competency and special services. The results of this study should be of concern to student affairs practitioners, particularly academic advisors and counselors, who are interested in eliminating barriers hindering students' learning and personal development. Administrators, advisors, and faculty may benefit from learning about the type of prejudice and discriminatory attitudes (perhaps unconscious attitudes) exhibited by faculty toward revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. When colleges and universities participate in training about diversity and cultural sensitivity, it is important to discuss "student-athletes" not only as a cultural group prone to prejudice and discrimination from both faculty and students but also as a group that may have problems in adapting to and succeeding in a university system that fails to recognize student-athletes' unique developmental challenges. This study provides data about prejudicial attitudes

but does not predict faculty members' behaviors toward student-athletes. However, Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) contend that awareness and reduction of prejudicial attitudes are two important steps in eliminating institutional discrimination.

Male student-athletes also should be advised about strategies to challenge, rather than perpetuate, negative attitudes that their professors might hold (e.g., demonstrate interest in class by sitting in the front of the class, solicit assistance during faculty office hours). Male nonrevenue student-athletes, in particular, may think that they would not be victims of discrimination because their activities typically are not the focus of the media; often they are not included in the discussion of exploitation in intercollegiate athletics. Nonrevenue student-athletes should be made aware that their academic abilities and special needs may not be recognized or understood and may stir up resentment. The results of this study, along with the findings in two previous SAS Student-Athlete studies (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991, 1993), should be shared with coaches, advising staff from academic support units, and other campus officials (e.g., residence life staff) who regularly interact with the male student-athlete population. Individuals or departments not only should have access to data (e.g., SAT scores, GPAs, and graduation rates of student-athletes) that could contradict some of the biases of faculty but also should widely disseminate this information in the campus community.

Institutional policies and procedures that may reinforce some of the negative attitudes held toward student-athletes (e.g., requiring intercollegiate athletic staff to check on student-athletes' class attendance) should be closely examined for their indirect, but potentially harmful effects on the student-athletes' academic performance and self-esteem. In addition, institutional leaders need to inform other members of the campus community that special services and procedures granted to revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes are indeed supportive of and complementary to the primary academic mission of the institution. By becoming more involved in the governance of intercollegiate

athletics, faculty members could learn about the student-athlete experience and better recognize the impact of policies and procedures developed for this group. Innovative strategies to confront these negative attitudes will be necessary to gain the audience of faculty members who may consider themselves void of prejudice.

Directions for Future Research

Future research should include continued monitoring of faculty attitudes by use of the SAS, interviews, and other methods, particularly with other subgroup variables. In this study, although some of the cell sizes were small, generally, there was homogeneity of variance across cells although future studies might strive to have more respondents per cell. In addition, since this study was conducted at only one institution, additional studies at comparable institutions (Division I) and other institutions would be useful. This study also looked at male student-athletes represented by a range of typical revenue and nonrevenue student-athlete groups found on college campuses. Future work might examine specific sports, particularly if one sport plays a dominant role on a campus. In addition, more exploration is needed to determine if and why female faculty members are more critical of privileges and services being offered to nonrevenue student-athletes than when offered to revenue athletes.

This study did not examine whether attitudes actual' & led to certain behaviors. There is no evidence from this study that faculty are causing harm to male student-athletes. It would be interesting to examine the classroom environment to see whether student-athletes are being treated differently, often inadvertently, by faculty or

by other students. Studies that involve the observation of actual classroom dynamics or ones involving questionnaires taken by or interviews conducted with student-athletes to inquire about the treatment they receive may be helpful in determining whether the attitudes influence the treatment of students. Related issues of academic freedom and the impact of faculty holding negative attitudes toward student groups might also be explored, particularly if it is found in future studies that negative attitudes lead to harmful behaviors.

Race as a confounding variable affecting faculty members' attitudes toward student-athletes also should be explored. The literature suggests that race would have been a confounding variable. Since the percentage of Blacks participating in revenue sports is significantly higher than Whites who participate, and the reverse is true for nonrevenue sports, one might have anticipated more negative attitudes toward male revenue athletes and more positive feelings toward nonrevenue student-athletes. Also, this study addressed the type of situations in which male student-athletes might encounter prejudice. The attitudes of faculty and other campus constituents toward female student-athletes in diverse situations also deserve examination.

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Cathy McHugh Engstrom, 350 Huntington Hall, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, 13244. Copies of the Revised SAS Student-Athlete are available from William E. Sedlacek, Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. This study is based on the doctoral dissertation of the senior author.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58, 241-250.
- 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.
- Edwards, H. (1984). The Black "dumb jock": An American sports tragedy. *College Board Review*, 131, 8-13.
- Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of prejudice toward college student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 189-193.
- Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1993). Attitudes of residence hall students toward student-athletes: Implications for advising, training, and programming. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 23, 28-33.
- Funk, G. D. (1991). *Major violation: The unbalanced priorities in athletics and academics*. Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.
- Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 61-90). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hamilton, D. L., & Trolie, T. K. (1986). Stereotypes and stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 127-163). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lawrence, M. (1985). A comparative study of student development levels of varsity athletes at the Florida State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 10A.
- Leach, B., & Conners, B. (1984). Pygmalion on the gridiron: The Black student-athlete in a White university. In A. Shriberg & F. R. Brodzinski (Eds.), *Rethinking services for college athletes* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 28, pp. 31-49). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Minatoya, L. Y., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1983). The SASW: A means to measure environmental sexism. *Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, 47(1), 26-30.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. J. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Roper, L. D., & McKenzie, A. (1988). Academic advising: A developmental model for Black student-athletes. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal*, 26, 91-98.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). Noncognitive indicators of student success. *Journal of College Admissions*, 1, 2-9.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (in press-a). An empirical method of determining nontraditional group status. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (in press-b). Issues in advancing diversity through assessment. *Journal of Counseling and Development*.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Adams-Gaston, J. (1992). Predicting the academic success of student-athletes using SAT and noncognitive variables. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 724-727.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C. (1970). Measuring racial attitudes in a situational context. *Psychological Reports*, 27, 971-980.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C. (1976). *Racism in American education: A model for change*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sellers, R. M. (1992). Racial differences in the predictors for academic achievement of student-athletes in Division 1 revenue producing sports. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 9, 48-59.
- Sergent, M. T., Woods, P., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1992). University student attitudes toward Arabs: Interventions, implications. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 20, 23-131.
- Shriberg, A., & Brodzinski, F. R. (Eds.) (1984). *Rethinking services for college athletes* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 28). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Telander, R. (1989). *The hundred yard. The corruption of college football and what we can do to stop it*. New York: Simon and Simon.
- White, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). White students' attitudes toward Blacks and Hispanics: Programming implications. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 15, 171-182.
- Wittmer, J., Bostic, D., Phillips, T., & Waters, W. (1981). The personal, academic, and career problems of college student athletes: Some possible answers. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60, 52-55.
- Zingg, P. J. (1982). Advising the student-athlete. *Educational Record*, 63, 16-19.