

Reconceptualizing Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Participation as a High Impact Practice

Molly Harry

University of Arkansas

Academic practitioners have promoted the idea of high impact practices (HIPs) in higher education. HIPs are cognitive and social activities designed to prepare students for life after college. Research indicates that college athletes are less involved in HIPs than non-athlete peers; however, limited research has explored the ways in which athletics, if organized and governed appropriately and ethically, can qualify as a HIP. This conceptual article examines the intercollegiate athletics and higher education literature and provides key ways in which athletics participation has components—such as reflection, intentionality, and interaction—present in HIPs. Additionally, this article offers practical implications for athletics leaders to consider in order to further align athletics participation with other traditional HIPs. As critics note the growing divide between academics and athletics, reframing sports as an educational endeavor, such as a HIP, may help alleviate some strain between sport and the academy.

Keywords: intercollegiate athletics, high impact practices, integrated view

Higher education scholars and practitioners promote the idea of high impact practices (HIPs) designed to engage students in beneficial activities that spur cognitive and social development and prepare them for life after college (Kuh, 2008). Empirical data and assessments have found 11 practices in higher education that are HIPs: first year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, ePortfolios, service learning and community-based learning, internships, and capstone projects and courses (Kuh, 2008).

While many college students engage in the HIPs mentioned above, researchers note that college athletes are less able to participate in HIPs (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Haslerig, 2020; Ishaq & Bass, 2019). The inability to engage in internships



and undergraduate research, for example, is often blamed on athletes' regimented schedules and strict time demands stemming from their participation in sports (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Ishaq & Bass, 2019). Thus, the current literature on HIPs in intercollegiate athletics focuses on athletes' inability to engage with Kuh's (2008) HIPs. While this may be true, this literature fails to acknowledge the ways in which athletics, if organized and governed ethically, qualifies as a HIP (Kuh, 2017).

The exclusion of athletics as a HIP likely stems from hyper-critical perspectives of sport, which maintain that limited positives emerge from athletics participation due to the commercialization of the collegiate model and the professionalization and exploitation of athletes, particularly those in the high-profile sports in the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA) Division I football and men's basketball programs (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020). Indeed, neoliberal values—power, capitalism, meritocracy, racism, and competition—in Division I, have raised concerns amongst critical scholars noting that such values challenge the educational opportunities the NCAA claims to provide for athletes (Comeaux, 2018; Gayles et al., 2018).

One exception to the uneasy marriage of education and sport in Division I may come from the eight institutions that comprise the Ivy League (Clotfelter, 2019). Formed in 1954, the Ivy League is home to some of the most prestigious and academically rigorous schools in the country. In order to maintain this academic reputation, the leaders of the schools agreed to only offer aid based on need and academic qualifications (Clotfelter, 2019). Not offering athletic scholarships was a strong move away from the lesser academic standards of peers in Division I. Because of this move, many scholars perceive members of the Ivy League to have a healthier balance between education and athletics (Clotfelter, 2019). In fact, in calls for better academic-athletic coupling at the Division I level, many college sport advocacy groups (e.g., the Knight Commission and the Drake Group) have stated that all institutions should decrease the number of athletic scholarships or transition to the Ivy League model (Gurney et al., 2017; Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2021; Splitt, 2009).

Such reforms have gone unaddressed, and thus, the strain between academics and athletics remains palpable across Division I campuses. Tensions between the advantages and disadvantages of sport participation, especially concerning the nexus of education and athletics, are strongest on Division I campuses. However, it is important to distinguish this level of competition from Divisions II and III. Each NCAA division is seen as having its own relationship between sports and education (Clotfelter, 2019). The NCAA noted Divisions II and III have a stronger educational emphasis with the former offering partial athletic scholarships and the latter offering no athletic scholarships like the Ivy League (NCA Recruiting Facts, 2018). Divisions II and III athletes' experiences may be different than those in Division I due to more manageable time demands and the heightened focus on academic merit. Indeed, the NCAA considered these divisions to have an "integrated environment that focuses on academic success while offering competitive athletics and meaningful non-athletics opportunities" (NCAA Recruiting Facts, 2018, p. 1). So, with its more neoliberal philosophy (Comeaux, 2018; Gayles et al., 2018; Gurney et al., 2017), the strife

between education and sport is heightened in Division I, and is therefore the focus of this article. With this in mind, offering new ways to structure and understand athletics—through the lens of HIPs—could be beneficial to scholars and practitioners in the fields of education and athletics.

Despite some of the problems mentioned above, other research shows educational and developmental benefits from participation in sports (Brand, 2006; Coakley, 2021; Harry, 2021; Weight et al., 2020a). Advantages include heightened critical thinking skills, advanced teamwork and leadership capabilities, increased acceptance of diverse others, and improved employability post-college (Chalfin et al., 2015; Gayles & Hu, 2009; Potuto & O’Hanlon, 2007; Weight et al., 2020a). Importantly, some of the athlete development scholarship notes that athletes of color do not attain similar positive outcomes as white athletes due to experiences with racism, stereotypes, microaggressions, and exploitation (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Jolly et al., 2020); however, other research demonstrates athletes do not have differential outcomes based on race (Gayles & Hu, 2009). In general, the positive findings of educational outcomes stemming from sport participation promote an Integrated View of Division I athletics, or the idea that elite sport participation in and of itself offers educational value (Brand, 2006). Despite these benefits, limited research has explored the ways in which athletics is or could be a HIP (Kuh, 2017). This is a void in the higher education and intercollegiate sports literature that this article works to address.

Additionally, this article offers two other contributions to these fields. First, this work further ties education and athletics by extending higher education perspectives and practices into athletics spaces. Such research was recommended by Springer and Dixon (2021), who noted there is minimal consideration of student development through intercollegiate athletics. Similarly, expanding HIPs into athletics can improve understanding of athletes’ experiences and find ways in which their opportunities align or do not align with education and how to make improvements to adjust misalignment (Springer & Dixon, 2021). Second, such shifts in perspective may change the way scholars and practitioners conceptualize intercollegiate athletics and its role within higher education. Fostering an Integrated View creates appreciation for and coupling of athletics and academics. Enhanced coupling may also help dismantle negative perceptions of athletics and college athletes on Division I campuses (Harry & Weight, 2019). Arguably, the more athletics can be appropriately integrated with academics, the better educational experiences athletes will have (Coakley, 2021; Matz, 2020; Weight et al., 2020a).

While the idea of athletics as education is not a new notion, previous scholarship on HIPs has not provided an in-depth discussion of how restructuring Division I sports as a HIP is beneficial for both the academy and athletics (Kuh, 2017). With this in mind, the purpose of this conceptual research is to articulate the ways in which current scholarship on Division I athletics demonstrates how sport participation could be the twelfth HIP. Through the lens of Brand’s (2006) Integrated View of athletics, this research answers the following questions:

1. How does Division I athletics participation currently qualify as a HIP?
2. How can Division I athletics participation be enhanced to further qualify as a HIP?

Conceptual Model

This research stems from Myles Brand's (2006) Integrated View of intercollegiate athletics. Brand was an academic, university president, and president of the NCAA (Thelin, 2021). With his background, many believe Brand encouraged more education-based perspectives of athletics (Matz, 2021; Weight et al., 2020a). He also proposed a new way to understand sports: The Integrated View. However, to grasp the Integrated View of athletics, one must first understand the Standard View (Brand, 2006).

The Standard View maintains that athletics offer no educational value and distract from higher education's mission trinity of teaching, research, and service (Brand, 2006; Flowers, 2009). Those supporting this perspective tend to undervalue what athletics can offer to campuses, claiming sports have "more educational value than fraternity parties but less than chess club" (Brand, 2006, p. 10). Other scholars argue that although sport may provide some developmental opportunities, it is not a significant component to education. However, this perspective sells athletics short by undervaluing the educational avenues athletics provides for almost 500,000 NCAA participants and disrespecting the learning that takes place on courts and fields of competition. Similarly, the Standard View prevents constructive, valuable, and beneficial components of athletics from impacting the greater campus community (Clotfelter, 2019; Thelin, 2021).

Juxtaposed with the Standard View is the Integrated View. This perspective emphasizes the educational and developmental value inherent in athletics participation. Taking an Integrated View, Clotfelter (2019) contended: "beginning with the ancient Greeks, athletic pursuits have been recognized as a valuable component of a complete education. Through both training and competition, the athlete learns life lessons taught nowhere better than on the field of play" (p. 8). It is coupling of the mind and body that can help stimulate a person's development and education (Hyland, 2017).

Additionally, Brand (2006) proposed that athletics be further conceptualized into institutional missions and structures. This can be accomplished by classifying athletics as a HIP. For example, other HIPs, such as first year seminars, writing-intensive courses, and diversity/global learning are incorporated into departmental programming and curriculum and achieve the missions of teaching, research, and service (Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013). Scholars supporting the Integrated View note that the same structuring can be accomplished with athletics (Brand, 2006; Harry & Weight, 2019; Matz, 2020; Weight et al., 2020a). Restructuring could include academic credit for athletics participation, reflexive assignments coupled with athletics opportunities, or even a minor or major in athletics. In fact, Brand (2006) argued that athletics, due to its performative nature, may play a role similar to that of art and music in higher education.

The similarities between athletics and art and music are well-documented (Matz, 2020; Weight et al., 2020a). For example, both groups of students can receive special admission to their institutions based on their talent and some will have professional aspirations in their respective areas. Similarly, college students in art and music programs and athletes find their crafts demanding, time intensive, competitive, and year-round. In a comparison of time demands between athletes and music majors, Weight and colleagues (2020a) discovered that athletes spent less time on sports and academics than music students spent on music and educational endeavors. However, if athletics was more integrated (i.e., if athletes received academic credit for their sport participation as music majors did for their performance), the authors noted that the student groups would reach greater parity in time demands (Weight et al., 2020a).

Brand's (2006) comparison of athletics and performative arts is the most controversial part of his Integrated View and this idea is often conflated with the entirety of this perspective. However, this lens is more than a minor/major in athletics. It is about challenging traditional perspectives of sports and athletes and promoting the educational opportunities athletics provides. In this way, this lens can also challenge deficit perspectives of college athletes that have become prominent within the American academy (Gayles et al., 2018).

Still, Brand and his Integrated View have received pushback with some scholars citing hypocritical perspectives held by the former NCAA president (Suggs & Hoffman, 2021). For example, while being an amateurism advocate and promoting its connection to education and athletics, Brand still stated: "amateurism defines the participants, not the enterprise" (Otto & Otto, 2013, p. 260). Thus, while Brand stated he was a proponent of education and amateurism, his actions still promoted commercialized sports. Many critics have noted this is antithetical to his statements about education-centric goals of athletics (Clotfelter, 2019; Flowers, 2009; Gurney et al., 2017). Similarly, other scholars have critiqued the former NCAA president's attempts to connect academics and amateurism (Staurowsky & Sack, 2006). These critics perceived the Integrated View and its relationship with amateurism served as a tool for maintaining the Association's hegemon status over sports, and even control over college athletes (Staurowsky & Sack, 2006). College athletics reform groups have made continuous calls for the NCAA to do away with amateurism and find ways to better support college athletes, particularly in their academic endeavors (Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2021; Splitt, 2009). With such reforms, a more Integrated View of college athletics might be more attainable.

The aforementioned criticisms of Brand are warranted, but one avenue to potentially address such concerns and truly re-center education in sport experiences is through a truly Integrated View. With an Integrated View, scholars and practitioners may be more inclined to shift their understanding of athletics and view it as a practice in which those participating benefit in unusually positive ways (Kuh, 2017). If athletics participation were valued as a HIP, it may be reconceptualized as more educational, and therefore, more integrated into the academy.

Literature Review

This section begins by describing the three main characteristics of HIPs. Next, literature on criticisms of the relationship between education and college sports is provided to give context to why most scholars and practitioners have not reconsidered athletics as a HIP. The section concludes with examples of the limited research on HIPs in relation to college athletics. This leads into the main focus of this article: An analysis of scholarship supporting the idea that athletics is and could be further structured as a HIP.

High Impact Practices (HIPs)

Kuh (2008) noted 11 key practices that are beneficial for students from a variety of different backgrounds as they develop during their time in college. These practices or HIPs include first year seminars and experiences, common intellectual experiences, learning communities, writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, ePortfolios, service learning and community-based learning, internships, and capstone projects and courses. HIPs must promote three main characteristics: (1) reflection, (2) intentionality, and (3) interaction (Kuh, 2008). The components of reflection, intentionality, and interaction should be present in all HIPs; however, depending on the HIP, the components may be present to varying degrees (Clayton-Pedersen & Finley, n.d.; Kuh, 2017).

See Table 1 for a description of the three characteristics of HIPs and their components.

Table 1
Descriptions of High Impact Practices

HIP Characteristic	Description
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent and structured opportunities to reflect and combine learning
Intentionality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent, timely, and constructive feedback • Expectations are high, yet appropriate • Significant investment of effort over time • Opportunities for real-world application of knowledge • Public demonstration of competence
Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meaningful interactions with faculty and peers • Experiences with diversity that encourage new ways of thinking and understanding

Reflection can serve as a basis for student learning. Reflection should be designed as structured and ongoing to help students process knowledge, strategize, and find solutions to problems. While engaging in HIPs, students should have built-in and consistent opportunities to reflect on their experiences with said HIPs. This is a common class structure in first-year seminars and writing-intensive courses. Kuh (2017) noted that students often do not realize they can take what they learn in one HIP and apply it to another. Thus, reflection is key for bolstering students' understanding of transferable skills. Additionally, reflection is critical in connecting the classroom with practical experiences, such as service learning and internships (Kuh, 2008).

Intentionality is the process of establishing a coherent learning experience for students while ensuring the learning goals are transparent. Some components of intentionality include creating educationally purposeful programming, performing meaningful time on task, and communicating appropriately high expectations (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.). The transparency part of intentionality stems from clear objectives and communication between those involved in the HIP, often faculty, mentors, and administrators. Similarly, those establishing HIPs should provide constructive and frequent feedback, offering students time to reflect and improve skills. Two additional key components of intentionality in HIPs are opportunities to apply knowledge to "real world" situations (i.e., internships) and public demonstration of competence (i.e., public speaking or performance). Finally, intentionally designed HIPs are connected to other learning experiences (Kuh, 2017). For example, instructors in a foreign language department could intentionally design their curriculum to complement a study abroad opportunity that is students' culminating experience before graduating.

The third characteristic of HIPs is interaction. Interaction involves students engaging with other students, faculty, and others across campus. Thus, interaction is key for student integration on campus (Kuh, 2009). Such interaction is critical, as Kuh (2017) contended many key HIP interactions happen entirely outside of the classroom (i.e., internships and service learning and community-based learning) or have significant learning components taking place outside of the classroom (i.e., undergraduate research and capstone projects/courses). Importantly, interactions should be meaningful and involve people from diverse backgrounds and experiences, such as through diversity/global learning. This enhances students' understanding of various perspectives and beliefs and offers opportunities for reflection.

Additionally, interactions are main avenues for students, faculty, and others to communicate their support and care for those they are interacting with. Thus, positive interactions through HIPs are linked to student satisfaction, persistence, and matriculation (Tinto, 1997). In a more developmental vein, students' interactions and subsequent engagement in HIPs have been tied to enhanced cognitive development, heightened self-esteem, and increased feelings regarding locus of control (Kuh, 2009; Tinto, 1997).

HIPs are distinct from other involvement opportunities, like extracurriculars such as joining a club, being a member of Greek life, or attending other campus events, as these activities are often not coupled with the classroom and/or do not include the triad of reflection, intentionality, and interaction to foster “deep integrative learning” (Kuh, 2017, 3:24). However, Kuh (2017) noted that the 11 HIPs are “not a pristine, exclusive list that can’t be added to” (0:16), and thus, other areas of campus that foster the three characteristics of HIPs must be considered. Examples of some potential new HIPs include writing for the school newspaper, arts performances, working on campus, and intercollegiate athletic participation (Kuh, 2017). However, unlike the traditional 11 HIPs, there is less research and data from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) on how these latter activities could be reconceptualized as HIPs based on scaffolding reflection, intentionality, and interaction (Kuh, 2008; Kuh & O’Donnell, 2013). Thus, more scholarship is needed on these practices as HIPs, with this work contributing to the field’s understanding of how athletics may be enhanced to become a new HIP.

Academic Criticisms of Division I Athletics

Despite Kuh (2017) positing that athletics could be conceptualized as a HIP, scholars and practitioners have not made significant strides to advocate for this shift. Part of this lack of progress in reimagining athletics as a HIP likely stems from critiques of Division I intercollegiate sports.

The relationship between intercollegiate athletics and higher education has always been tense and many scholars continue to critique the growing divide between academics and athletics, particularly in the NCAA at the Division I level (Clotfelter, 2019; Flowers, 2009; Gayles et al., 2018). Much of this has to do with the conflicting cultures of academics and athletics at institutions with big-time sports programs. Despres et al. (2008) define athletics culture as the “phenomenological environment in which college students who are athletes live and move when they are fulfilling their roles and responsibilities” (p. 200). Characteristics most commonly found in Division I athletics culture include hyper-commercialization, athlete commodification, a “win-at-all-costs” mentality, and a perceived emphasis on eligibility over education (Comeaux, 2018; Gurney et al., 2017). Combined, these factors can foster academic disengagement and isolate athletes from the academic community (Gayles & Hu, 2009; Gurney et al., 2017).

Jayakumar and Comeaux (2016) noted that while athletes in revenue-generating sports, especially athletes of color, are instructed to focus on their education, the culture of athletics and pressure from some coaches and administrators to excel in sports, win, and maintain eligibility, indicate that academics is not a true priority. This concentration on athletics over academics is particularly evident in coaching and athletic director contracts and incentives that reward athletic performance over academic success (Clotfelter, 2019; Gurney et al., 2017; Weight et al., 2015; Wilson, 2014, 2017). Wilson (2017) examined football coaching contract incentive clauses across three different years, finding that academic incentives for coaches did increase. However, this increase was still significantly less substantial than the

incentive for performance on the field (Wilson, 2017). Highlighting this research, in 2014, the University of Florida's head football coach had an athletic bonus—winning a national championship—of an additional \$250,000. However, his contract did not offer a defined academic bonus for his football team's success in the classroom (Wilson, 2014). While financial incentives are not an ideal model, this is the current way and culture of Division I college athletics (Clotfelter, 2019, Wilson, 2017). With this unlikely to change, shifting some of the financial incentives away from athletic performance and toward educational engagement could help the field re-center educational priorities (Wilson, 2014). This may also align coaches more with faculty and academic leaders who are incentivized to focus on student and athlete educational development, even at significantly lower financial rewards (Clotfelter, 2019; Weight et al., 2015; Wilson, 2017). Thus, the current conceptualization of intercollegiate athletics does not consistently center educational values.

More recently, other scholars and critics have claimed that the emergence of name, image, and likeness (NIL) has also further centered athletic incentives for athletes over academic performance (Berardino, 2021). Since 2021, NIL has provided athletes the ability to monetize their rights of publicity (Brutlag Hosick, 2021). While this cannot be “pay-for-play” regarding their athletic performance, athletes generally receive NIL deals because of their athlete status, past sport performance, and predicted future athletic success and social status (Brutlag Hosick, 2021). Thus, athletes may be more financially incentivized now to focus on athletics compared to academics.

This prioritization of athletics can isolate athletes further from the rest of campus, particularly athletes of color at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Jolly et al., 2020). This further hinders athletes' opportunities for growth and HIP participation, with Comeaux and Grummert (2020) explaining involvement may be especially challenging for Black athletes as “engagement in activities are conditional on the campus racial climate and antiblack racism in a highly commercialized athletics industry” (p. 58). Thus, isolation and decreased interaction may be the result of the structure and culture of athletics, institutional racism, the time obligations from sports, or the physical location of athletic buildings away from the rest of the campus (Astin, 1984; Harry, 2021; Huml et al., 2014; Jayakumar & Comeaux, 2016).

Recent scandals have also heightened concerns about the combination of academics and athletics. This tension is arguably most palpable at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (UNC) where a decades-long scandal of academic misconduct was uncovered in 2010 (Smith & Willingham, 2019). An internal investigation into NCAA extra benefits for athletes (i.e., a special arrangement to offer an athlete a benefit not provided to non-athletes or not explicitly authorized by the NCAA) uncovered over-assistance and course clustering executed by members of athletic academic support. Additionally, the investigation noted changed grades for athletes and athletes passing courses without completing meaningful work. The NCAA did not condemn these issues as academic fraud, but rather, posited that offering such courses was part of UNC's institutional academic autonomy. However, much of the

higher education community across the country expressed dismay and frustration over the NCAA's handling of the situation (Smith & Willingham, 2019).

In 2019, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) uncovered a college admissions conspiracy at elite institutions. This was dubbed Operation Varsity Blues (Hextrum, 2019). Affluent families paid the conspiracy organizer to increase test scores and bribe admissions officials. Additionally, many families used the scheme to disguise their children as athletes, even though the children had never participated in sports, as a means to admit them to the institution. It is a widely known practice that, at some institutions, the athletics department can submit a certain number of recruit names to the admissions office, where admissions officers will then view their applications more favorably. This is known as special admissions. While special admissions is available to students from various groups, like legacy students and children of donors, it is most criticized when it involves athletes (Clotfelter, 2019; Hextrum, 2019). Once these disguised athletes enrolled at the school, the coach was paid and the student was dropped from the roster (Hextrum, 2019). Given the above examples, among others, some scholars are increasingly wary of the role of college athletics in higher education, with some even calling for the separation of academics and athletics entirely (Clotfelter, 2019).

HIPs and Athletics

Literature on athletics and HIPs is focused on the ways in which athletes cannot engage in these practices, rather than noting how athletics itself can be improved to be a potential HIP. For example, Harry (2021) explored best practices used by athletics departments to integrate college athletes on campus more effectively, and respondents noted that the culture of athletics, time demands, and pressures for athletes to perform, limited their involvement in traditional HIPs like internships. Similarly, Ishaq and Bass (2019) explored the specific implementation of HIPs in the athletic academic advising space and the obstacles that hindered HIP implementation and athlete engagement. Academic-athletic advisors and/or directors of athlete academic support interviewed in this study concluded that the main barriers preventing HIP implementation were: university control of HIPs, divergent attitudes between advisors and coaches, poor funding/resources, and time demands.

With the institution controlling HIPs, support personnel designing HIP programming specific for athletes had to go through the institution's approval process to establish a first year seminar for athletes (Ishaq & Bass, 2019). Additionally, participants noted that the universities controlled the design and implementation of learning communities and writing intensive courses. Because of this structure, participants highlighted athletes struggled to get involved in these HIPs due to time demands and scheduling conflicts. Ishaq and Bass (2019) also noted that academic-athletic personnel were more concerned with athletes participating in HIPs than coaches, but coaches have the most influence over HIP involvement. This aligns with previous scholarship on coaches lacking financial incentive regarding athletes' educational pursuits (Wilson, 2017). Academic staff also ran into hurdles for HIP engagement regarding funding, with financial support going toward other areas of athletics in-

stead of athlete development. Still, participants emphasized the significance of the relationship between the academics and athletics communities.

Haslerig (2020) continued this discussion of HIPs and intercollegiate athletics through studying the academic pathways of Division I football athletes who also engaged in graduate studies before exhausting their NCAA eligibility. In this study, Haslerig (2020) advocated for graduate coursework to be considered a HIP as it shares some of the promising components of traditional HIPs. Football athletes interviewed noted they did not have opportunities to engage in traditional HIPs such as studying abroad or enrolling in capstone courses as undergraduates. However, they felt that graduate school was an impactful experience for them. Haslerig (2020) argued “graduate study may share key features of HIPs for many students, yet this effect is likely heightened for athletes” because they have fewer opportunities during their undergraduate experience to engage in HIPs (p. 164).

While these studies offer important insight into the role, or missing role, of HIPs in the experiences of college athletes, the scholars did not explore how participation in college athletics itself aligns with the goals and purposes of HIPs and may further integrate academics and athletics (Brand, 2006; Kuh, 2017).

Conceptualizing Division I Athletics as a HIP

This section answers the first research question about how Division I athletics currently qualifies as a HIP by reviewing scholarship bolstering the ways in which participation in intercollegiate athletics satisfies the HIP requirements of reflection, intentionality, and interaction. First, however, it is important to discuss that athletes’ experiences at Division I institutions are not monolithic (Clotfelter, 2019; Gayles & Hu, 2009). Experiences are largely contingent on the institutional cultures, the school’s history with racism and the race of the athlete, the athlete’s sport, athletics’ level of commercialization, and academic-athletic relations on campus just to name a few.

For example, research by Lu et al. (2018) discovered that Division I athletes enrolled at institutions with higher academic rankings were more likely to develop stronger student identities compared to those enrolled at a less academically rigorous institution. On the other hand, Gayles and colleagues (2018) and Harper (2018) noted that Black athletes often encounter racism and experience commodification and financial exploitation. This experience is especially exacerbated for athletes in the revenue-generating sports of football and men’s basketball. These power dynamics often lead to academic-athletic strain, and limit athletes’ development of positive and healthy relationships between sport and education (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Gayles et al., 2018). However, in contexts where institutions have stronger academic-athletic integration, athletic participation may be ripe for classification as a HIP.

Reflection

Reflection is most successful when structured and frequent (Kuh, 2017). Structured and regular opportunities for reflection promote self and situation awareness

that is beneficial in athletics and non-athletics spaces. Reflection is key in all HIPs, especially undergraduate research. For example, when conducting an experiment and the hypothesized results do not emerge, the faculty researcher may ask students to reflect on why the anticipated results differ from the actual results. Additionally, the faculty researcher may have the undergraduate researchers re-do the study to see if the findings change.

Similarly, in their sport participation, athletes are given time to reflect on their experiences during training sessions and practices. For example, athletes go through different plays, routes, and schemes during practices. If the play, route, or scheme is not done correctly, coaches often ask athletes to reflect on what went wrong and why, what they could have done better, and then have them execute the play or scheme again (Weinberg & Gould, 2019). This opportunity to reflect and learn is not only structured and frequent, but also enables athletes to theorize and think critically (Hyland, 2017; Jenkins, 2020). Additionally, such reflection is common during film sessions. Athletes use these reflection opportunities to solidify their understanding of a play or scheme and then execute it in competitions.

Kuh (2008, 2017) contended that skills learned in one HIP are fluid and intersect with other HIPs. A student enrolled in a non-profit finance course while participating in service learning may take what they learn from volunteering with them to their fourth-year internship at a non-profit. This is not unlike an athlete taking what they learn in the weight room with them to an anatomy class and vice versa. Similarly, an athlete could be enrolled in a business leadership course and take strategies and practices gained from coursework and guest speakers with them to working with and leading a team. In this way, athletics is coupled with applicable experiences, a key component of HIPs (Kolb, 2014; Kuh, 2008). Indeed, scholars in sport psychology have noted that, together, practice and reflection enhance performance (Weinberg & Gould, 2019).

Similarly, through coupling sport and education, practitioners emphasize reflection and solidify meaning making (Kolb, 2014). Coffey and Davis (2019) examined college athletes' reflections about their athletics and classroom experiences. Findings indicated that when topics were simultaneously explored with opportunities in the classroom *and* athletics, athletes had better learning outcomes. Thus, classroom instruction offers reflective opportunities that mirror the experiential learning inherent in college sport participation (Coffey & Davis, 2019). Reflection allows athletes to see how transferrable skills gained in education and sports intertwine for a more holistic college experience (Clotfelter, 2019; Harry & Weight, 2019). Reflection is tightly connected to intentionality.

Intentionality

This feature of HIPs has five components. First, feedback is necessary to engage meaningfully in HIPs and it must be constructive, frequent, and timely. Scholarship notes that for all students to improve their learning they need frequent and timely feedback (Kuh, 2008). Like non-athletes participating in HIPs (e.g., writing intensive courses and capstone projects and courses), athletes receive prompt feedback

from a host of campus leaders, particularly coaches. Feedback from coaches is often immediate, deliberate, and occurs in practice, competition, and film sessions. Feedback may go over execution of specific plays, but it can also cover work ethic, teamwork, and leadership.

John Wooden, an esteemed former men's basketball coach at the University of California-Los Angeles, is known and appreciated as being one of the best college coaches of all time. In an analysis of the coach's teaching philosophy, Gallimore and Tharp (2004) discovered that Wooden was intentional in his basketball practice design so that it included timely feedback that coupled explanation and demonstration to players. This was followed by players' imitation of that explanation and demonstration and followed by repetition (Gallimore & Tharp, 2004). This is not unlike the teaching and feedback that happens in more traditional academic settings (Kolb, 2014).

Thus, frequent and timely feedback from coaches is pivotal in athletes' collegiate careers. Still, it is crucial that the feedback is constructive as this has proven to intrinsically motivate athletes to stay resilient, overcome obstacles, and succeed in athletics and academics (Raabe & Zakrajsek, 2017; Weight et al., 2020b).

Tightly coupled with feedback is setting high/appropriate expectations for students participating in HIPs. Some research indicates that faculty hold lower academic expectations of athletes, compared to non-athletes (Comeaux, 2011), an outcome that likely stems from the dumb jock stereotype (Weinberg & Gould, 2019). This stereotype is a deficit perspective of athletes and contends that this group is not as academically capable as non-athletes, lacks educational motivation, and is only in college for sports. This stereotype is strongest against Black male athletes (Comeaux, 2011, 2018). However, athletes of all racial backgrounds often enter college with high expectations of themselves to succeed in the classroom and in athletic competition (Adler & Adler, 1985; Cooper et al., 2017; Harry, 2021). In fact, in a study of Division I men's basketball athletes, Adler and Adler (1985) discovered athletes in their sample came to college with "optimistic and idealistic goals and attitudes about their impending academic career" (p. 241). However, once they encountered negative climates surrounding their educational endeavors, such as negative stereotypes from faculty and isolation due to sport demands, they felt the need to make adjustments to their academic goals (Adler & Adler 1985). Thus, many resigned to focusing on athletic expectations instead of academic achievements. It can be inferred that the lack of appreciation and integration of athletics may force athletes to lower their own expectations.

Despite obstacles, athletes are held to very high standards and these expectations come from their coaches, teammates, administrators, families, and themselves (Cooper et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2010). The idea of meeting and/or exceeding expectations is instilled in athletes from a young age, often from the time they begin participating in their sport throughout their college athletics careers, and after (Martin et al., 2010). Indeed, coaches will demonstrate their high expectations in their timely feedback. Similarly, Weight and colleagues (2020b) examined the role coaches had in facilitating athletes' self-efficacy belief, which intertwines with self-expectations.

Findings demonstrated athletes who held themselves to high expectations and had coaches who held them to those standards felt their sporting experiences were more successful compared to athletes and coaches who held lower expectations. Similarly, athletes who stated they and their coaches maintained high expectations and aspirations, reflected that these aspirations helped them achieve other career goals after their sport careers (Weight et al., 2020b).

Another indicator of intentionality is the student's significant investment of effort over time. Students who devote significant, yet appropriate effort over time to educationally meaningful activities are more likely to advance their learning. Time on task is particularly evident in writing-intensive courses, ePortfolios, and capstone projects and courses (Kuh, 2017). However, time on task is not only significant for students participating in the 11 traditional HIPs, but also for those participating in athletics. There is no shortage of research highlighting the strenuous time demands placed on college athletes, with recent reports demonstrating athletes often exceed the maximum NCAA limit of 20 hours per week on sport-related activities (NCAA Division I Manual, 2020). For example, the NCAA GOALS (2020) report gathered self-reported data from athletes about their experiences. Track and field athletes reported spending the fewest hours per week on their sport at 27 hours, while baseball athletes reported spending the most time on their sport, dedicating 42 hours to the diamond.

While scholars critique athletes' time demands, noting that time allocated to athletics could/should be devoted to academics (Gurney et al., 2017), few have framed the time athletes dedicate to their sport as an educational experience (Brand, 2006; Harry & Weight, 2019; Hyland, 2017; Jenkins, 2020; Matz, 2020). This lack of reframing athletics as an academic endeavor, likely relates to the academic criticisms discussed in the literature review above. Scholarship has demonstrated some disadvantages when athletes spend too much time on athletics, particularly athlete role engulfment which occurs when the athlete identity becomes so salient that it replaces other identities, and limited career preparation for life after sport (Comeaux, 2018). These are important concerns, especially for athletes in the most commercialized sports of football and men's basketball, who are also predominantly Black men (Harper, 2018). Thus, leaders must consider the aforementioned concerns when working with athletes and coupling athletics and academics in HIP alignment.

However, a host of research also promotes college sport participation as an avenue for gaining life skills. This is akin to the life skills cultivated through the 11 traditional HIPs (Kuh, 2017). In a survey of athletes from 18 Division I programs by Potuto and O'Hanlon (2007), participants reported advantages related to athletics participation. Particularly, athletes noted that sports increased their tolerance for diverse others, honed their ability to take responsibility for their actions, advanced their teamwork and leadership skills, improved their studying and time management, and taught them more about ethics (Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007). Similarly, Chalfin et al. (2015) examined the employability of former college athletes through the perspective of potential employers. Regardless of competition level, gender, or sport of the athlete, employers attached significance to someone who was an athlete, and

attributed to them the following qualities: competitiveness, coachability, self-motivation, mental toughness, time management, and ability to handle pressure. Employers believed these qualities would make athletes better candidates than other student leaders including captains of debate teams, presidents of fraternities, and editors-in-chief at student newspapers. Thus, critics who have noted that athletics is not educational and does not assist athletes in preparing for life after sport, may need to reconsider this idea from a more integrated perspective (Hyland, 2017).

Additionally, other scholarship highlights the cognitive development of college athletes. With data from NSSE, the same survey that is used to determine HIPs, Rettig and Hu (2016) found minimal differences in academic outcomes of athletes compared to non-athletes when considering active and collaborative learning opportunities, faculty interactions, and academic challenges. Athletes in the study also had statistically significantly higher scores for positive interactions with racially diverse others and learning experiences outside of traditional classroom settings (Rettig & Hu, 2016). This lends support to classify athletics as a HIP as such findings support Kuh's (2008, 2017) claims that HIPs often take place outside the classroom.

Engagement and education taking place outside of the classroom offer coupling opportunities for practical application of knowledge, another component of intentionality. As with non-athletes, athletes uncover the relevance of what they have learned from a class, coach instruction, or discussion with a peer, and see how it is transferable to other areas of their lives. In this way, intention is closely linked with transparency because this helps athletes recognize these connections between education and sport (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.). Similarly, this is linked with reflection and the experiential learning process (Kolb, 2014; Weinberg & Gould, 2019).

For example, an athlete may be enrolled in a research methods class and required to submit a proposal at the end of the semester. The athlete could take something they have learned, noticed, or experienced through athletics—such as the underrepresentation of women and people of color in college athletics or the need for more mental health resources due to their own personal experiences with wellbeing—and examine the topic in this assignment. In this example, there is a coupling of the practical application of sport with the classroom and the classroom with sport. As more athletes enroll in graduate school (Haslerig, 2020), with many programs requiring research studies, this athlete could even consider conducting their study in the future. While this would technically not be the HIP of completing undergraduate research, it is likely that graduate research still allows athletes to experience a “sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions” that comes with undergraduate research (Kuh et al., 2013, para. 6).

Similarly, athletes often take something learned in one setting and apply it to another. This is seen as athletes break down game film and execute improved actions or plays in competition. Or an athlete can take an athletics experience, such as working through team turmoil, and apply it to working in group projects with other students. This transferability of skills from the court to the classroom is also beneficial as athletes transition out of sport into new careers (Chalfin et al., 2015; Hyland, 2017; Weight et al., 2020a).

The fifth and final component of intentionality is the public demonstration of competence. HIPs such as collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, and internships capitalize on developing students' public demonstration of competence, often through presentations to peers, faculty, and supervisors. Public competence demonstration is perhaps the most obvious way athletics currently qualifies as a HIP. Athletes demonstrate their unique talents and capabilities on some of the biggest stages (Nocera & Strauss, 2016). These stages include competing in large arenas and stadiums with hundreds to thousands of fans. Similarly, these demonstrations of competence are often televised locally, regionally, or nationally. Arguably, no other group of college students has the same kind or level of demonstration of their competence than athletes do (Jenkins, 2020).

Another unique component to athletes' public demonstration of competence is the fact that they often answer for their proficiency or struggles to the media. This adds a unique level of pressure to athletes' performances and also highlights the fact that they must not only be physically competent, but also in explaining their individual and team performance to the media, be mentally and articulately competent. Few college students showcase their capabilities in such ways, highlighting how athletics participation meets HIP requirements.

Interaction

"Learning does not occur in a vacuum; students interact with faculty, other campus educators, other students, as well as communities and the public/private agencies within them" (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d., p. 3). Importantly, athletics participation, while not explicitly mentioned by these scholars, involves interacting with faculty, other campus educators—like coaches, advisors, and mentors, students, and stakeholders in the campus and local communities (Clotfelter, 2019; Comeaux & Harrison, 2011; Weight et al., 2015). Kuh (2008) contended that there are two key components to interaction: (1) meaningful interactions with faculty and peers and (2) experiences with diversity that lead to new ways of understanding. These components of interaction are significant across HIPs, but may emerge strongest in diversity/global learning, undergraduate research, learning communities, and first year seminars and experiences (Kuh, 2008). These components are also present in intercollegiate athletics.

First, some scholarship notes faculty have more negative perceptions of athletes compared to non-athletes (Comeaux, 2011; Harry, 2021). These relationships vary based on faculty and athlete race and gender identity. Comeaux (2011) discovered that faculty of color, women faculty, and faculty in education-related disciplines were more likely to have positive perceptions of athletes. This context is important as negative perceptions from faculty who identify as white and/or men may discourage athletes from seeking out interactions with these faculty, further limiting their growth and development in college (Comeaux, 2011; Comeaux & Harrison, 2011). Still, there is a growing body of literature discussing positive athlete-faculty interactions.

For example, more than two-thirds of NCAA athletes have self-reported having a close relationship with at least one professor at their institution (NCAA GOALS,

2016). In a similar vein, Harry (2021) examined over 500 exit interviews and surveys of graduating Division I athletes and found that 80% of athletes who were asked about their faculty interactions said professors were positively impactful in their academic careers. In interviews with Division I athletes discussing their identity development, Bell (2009) also found most athletes talked about strong and beneficial relationships with faculty. This was most common for athletes in their final years of college (Bell, 2009), which may indicate a need to encourage more athlete-faculty interactions early in college or that these interactions take time to develop.

Positive interactions with faculty might be even more critical for athletes of color (Harrison, 2007; Jolly et al., 2020). Jolly and colleagues (2020) analyzed the current scholarship on culturally responsive programming for Black college athletes and where that programming was housed. Some were run through athletics departments, while others were managed by the NCAA and included Life Skills or the Scholar-Baller model (Harrison, 2007). Jolly et al. (2020) found the most culturally responsive programs were managed by faculty. These programs were more interdisciplinary, comprehensive, relevant, and led to stronger retention for Black athletes. The results from Jolly et al. (2020) highlight how important faculty interaction and integration are for athletes, especially Black athletes.

Historically, education research has been limited in examining how other campus leaders outside of faculty (e.g., advisors, student affairs professionals, coaches) influence the experiences of students, particularly athletes (Patton et al., 2016). However, athletes cultivate meaningful interactions and relationships with coaches during their time participating in sport (Weight et al., 2015; Weight et al., 2020b). These relationships may be critically important in educating athletes as this population spends much of its time in college working with and developing relationships with coaches (NCAA GOALS, 2016; Weight et al., 2020b).

While coaches are not faculty, some scholars have acknowledged their roles as educators and their significance in influencing athletes in similar ways that faculty often do (Brand, 2006; Weight et al., 2015; Weight et al., 2020b). Positive student-faculty interactions have been shown to assist students in persisting through college, developing confidence, and planning for goals post-graduation (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Patton et al., 2016). This is not unlike the role coaches play in athlete-coach relationships (Comeaux & Harrison, 2011).

Similarly, research by Weight and colleagues (2015) used the Integrated View to explore how Division I coaches perceived academic-athletic integration. Some of the key findings demonstrated that coaches saw themselves as educators, even if that was not the common perception of them on campus. With that, almost half of the coaches believed further academic-athletic integration could “amplify the educational foundation of intercollegiate athletics and reverse the increasing competitive and commercial pressure” (Weight et al., 2015, p. 514). Thus, many stakeholders within athletics arguably already consider sport participation to be educational, but this perspective is not valued by the academy. One avenue to promote this athletics-as-education lens is to further incentivize coaches toward athletes’ engagement with HIPs (Wilson, 2014). A second avenue may be to shift higher edu-

cation's epistemological understanding of athletics and consider designs that mirror other HIPs (Brand, 2006; Hyland, 2017; Jenkins, 2020; Kuh, 2017).

The second component to interaction is experiences with diversity, which can result in new ways of thinking (Kuh, 2008). Athletics can be a diverse space regarding racial and ethnic identities, gender identities, abilities, and athletes coming from different regions/countries and socio-economic statuses (Coakley, 2021; Harrison, 2007). With this context, scholarship has demonstrated that due to their sport participation, college athletes tend to have more diverse interactions than their non-athlete peers (Comeaux & Fuentes, 2015; Harrison, 2007; Potuto & O'Hanlon, 2007; Rettig & Hu, 2016). Additionally, the NCAA GOALS 2020 study found that 81% of Division I athletes report that their college sport experiences have made them more understanding of others who are different from them (Durham, 2020).

Exposure to diversity was amplified through the recent rise in activism since the murder of George Floyd in 2020. Rather than "sticking to sports," athletes opted for the frontlines of activism concerning racial/social justice (Harry, 2023; Kluch, 2020). The ability of athletes—from all backgrounds—to come together to fight for causes is significant and indicates not only exposure to diversity, but an appreciation for diversity. Such activism actions also demonstrate new ways of understanding sports in society and how sports are connected to social issues (Coakley, 2021; Harry, 2023). This engagement is coupled with reflection on these issues and situations, and conversations with meaningful mentors, educators, and leaders on campus (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.). Thus, this intersects across the various characteristics of traditional HIPs, and shows how athletics can be conceptualized potential 12th HIP.

Discussion and Implications

This section answers the second research question concerning how practitioners in/around athletics can work to further enhance sports to meet HIP qualifications.

Practical Implications

Previous research has noted that athletics personnel struggle to get athletes involved in impactful programming due to university control of HIPs and athlete time demands (Ishaq & Bass, 2019). Similarly, research with athlete development and support personnel, who are tasked with creating programming for athletes' growth and preparation for life after sport, has shown that these leaders may struggle with navigating the institution's approval process for HIP sport programming, such as athlete-specific first year seminars (Harry, 2021; Ishaq & Bass, 2019; Jolly et al., 2020). This lack of collaboration between academic programs and athletics departments to coordinate HIPs for athletes may indicate a more Standard View at Division I institutions (Brand, 2006; Haslerig, 2020).

This lack of collaboration is problematic as athletes are not considered in greater institutional design and programming, which may limit their growth and preparation and their ability to capitalize on both traditional HIPs and the developmental ben-

efits of sport participation (Berardino, 2021; Brand, 2006; Comeaux & Grummert, 2021; Jolly et al., 2020; Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013; Springer & Dixon, 2021). As Ishaq and Bass (2019) stated: "When HIPs are unsystematic, it becomes very difficult to reap the positive outcomes associated with their implementation" (p. 189). While the academic arms of the universities may control the current 11 HIPs, leaders in the athletics department can control how sports are structured to either hinder or enhance athletes' growth and development. If the design of college sport further emphasized the educational triad of teaching, research, and service, the academic arms of campuses may be more inclined to devote enhanced financial support to athletics and collaborate to further center the educational components of participation in athletics (Clotfelter, 2019; Springer & Dixon, 2021; Weight et al., 2015). This would also allow for a stronger Integrated View (Brand, 2006; Weight et al., 2020a).

An Integrated View can flip the focus of HIP and sport research to center how athletics is already impactful or how athletics can be designed to further qualify as a HIP. Additionally, athletics departments and institutions focusing on reconceptualizing athletics as a HIP, may help mitigate some of the concerns of NIL suppressing educational endeavors and values (Berardino, 2021). This athletics-as-education lens may be particularly important for athlete support staff and coaches, who are seen as having the most influence in athletes' involvement and meaning making when it comes to educational experiences (Harry, 2021; Ishaq & Bass, 2019; Weight et al., 2020b). The remainder of the practical implications in this article offers avenues for athletics practitioners to enhance reflection, intentionality, and interaction to further structure Division I athletics as a HIP.

Reflection

Reflection is a key component to HIPs (Kuh, 2008, 2017), and reflection in athletics spaces is linked with growth in athlete autonomy (Harry & Weight, 2019; Weinberg & Gould, 2019). A common critique of Division I intercollegiate athletics is that athletes are hyper-surveilled by administrators and coaches and therefore often lack agency to make their own decisions, such as which courses to enroll in and engagement in activities outside of sport (Comeaux, 2018; Jayakumar & Comeaux, 2016). Thus, offering more opportunities for personal reflection in athletics participation is one way leaders can lessen surveillance practices and further structure college sport for HIP alignment.

For example, athlete support staff can have athletes write personal reflections as part of their development programming. Coaches could even consider incorporating reflections—written or mental reflections—as part of their practices after particular drills or watching film. Indeed, such educational components could be included in coaching contracts as a means to center education and HIPs in athletics. Reflections are beneficial in promoting active engagement, rather than passive learning (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.; Kolb, 2014). Indeed, reflection encourages athletes to understand how skills gained in their education and sports are not context-dependent, but rather move across contexts to provide a more holistic college experience (Coffey & Davis, 2019; Harry & Weight, 2019). This connection between reflecting,

learning, and doing is one of the reasons reflections and opportunities for journaling are prominent components in other HIPs, like first year seminars, diversity/global learning, and e-portfolios (Finley, 2019).

Adding reflective elements to athletics is one avenue to ensure educational components of sports are coupled with the athletics experience. Similarly, including academic-style assignments (e.g., short essays, discussion posts, etc.) in sport may help establish a more Integrated View of athletics particularly highlighting the teaching component inherent in sport and the importance of coaches in facilitating athlete development through reflection and teaching (Brand, 2006; Harrison, 2007; Hyland, 2017; Weight et al., 2015). Reflection often intertwines naturally with intentionality and interaction (Finley, 2019; Kuh, 2008, 2017).

Intentionality

Intentionality includes five parts: feedback, high expectations, time investment, knowledge application, and public demonstration of competence. One unique way to add more intentionality to intercollegiate athletics is to establish an athletic-centric curriculum—similar to the major in athletics proposed by Brand (2006)—that includes all five of the aforementioned components. An athletic-centric curriculum has been proposed by various scholars advocating for a more Integrated View of Division I athletics, with the belief that such a design could reimagine the role of athletics within education and provide more coupling of academics and athletics opportunities (Harry & Weight, 2019; Hyland, 2017; Matz, 2020, 2021; Weight et al., 2020a, 2020b). Indeed, other scholars have created a curriculum—the Scholar Baller model—specifically for athletes of color (Fuller et al., 2020; Harrison, 2007; Jolly et al., 2020). Instead of being recognized as just a “baller,” successful Black athletes who thrive on and off the court are labeled “scholar ballers” to appreciate their development across identity domains (Fuller et al., 2020). In combining the triad of education, athletics, and entertainment, this perspective repositions the “current model of sport in American society to place as much emphasis on succeeding in the classroom as is placed on the playing field” to address the lack of integration of athletics, academics, and entertainment (Fuller et al., 2020, p. 828). A similar concept emerges when considering an athletic-centric curriculum.

Coffey and Davis (2019) noted reflective learning occurs when instructors coupled classroom and athletics opportunities for active learning. Similarly, through the lens of the Integrated View, Harry and Weight (2019) surveyed athletics’ stakeholders’ perspectives of an athletic-centric minor. The majority of participants (66%) surveyed were supportive of such a curriculum, with athletes and coaches most in favor, and faculty being the least supportive (Harry & Weight, 2019). Traditionally, faculty hold a more Standard View of athletics (Brand, 2006; Matz, 2020; Sperber, 2000); however, 42% of faculty included in the survey were still interested in implementing the minor. One faculty member surveyed argued that the minor could assist in helping “athletes and others (faculty, staff, students, community) better understand competencies gained through participation in athletics, especially if this experiential education was paired up with a more traditional academic course in a classroom/lab setting” (Harry & Weight, 2019, p. 25).

Thus, there is potential for more faculty interest and involvement in designing and implementing an athletic-centric curriculum than previously believed. This could help address the concerns raised by athletics administrators in the study by Ishaq and Bass (2019) who noted that the academic arms of campuses do not collaborate in getting athletes involved in HIPs. Additionally, academic-athletic collaboration is important for not only promoting the Integrated View, but also limiting athletes' experiences with isolation as they have more intentional interactions with faculty, peers, and others involved in the curriculum (Comeaux & Harrison, 2011; Huml et al., 2014; Kuh, 2009). If athletics is included in a curriculum, it could be more aligned with the traditional HIPs and the curriculum could even include some HIPs such as first year seminars, collaborative assignments/projects, service and community-based learning, and internships (Kuh, 2017). This inclusion of HIPs in the curriculum also links intentionality to interaction, further decreasing athlete isolation (Astin, 1984).

In this curriculum, athletes' demonstration of competence would remain a key component in the classroom and in sport competition. Faculty and coach feedback would remain prompt and constructive, and both groups of educators would maintain high and reasonable expectations for the athletes' work (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Weight et al., 2020b). One piece of these expectations could be more autonomy for athletes, which also ties into the reflection quality of HIPs discussed earlier. This autonomy, the ability to explore, fail, discover, and apply new knowledge is key to other HIPs and would need to be included in athletics participation and the associated curriculum (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d; Comeaux, 2018; Finley, 2019; Harrison, 2007; Haslerig, 2020; Kuh, 2017). Regarding time commitment, HIPs are most successful and advantageous for students when there is faculty involvement and when university leaders and the campus community understand the time, energy, and resources that are necessary to support the activities (Ishaq & Bass, 2019; Jolly et al., 2020; Kuh, 2008; McCormick et al., 2017).

The research that has explored this style of curriculum and the combination of the court and classroom has highlighted the interdisciplinary design of education through athletics (Fuller et al., 2020; Harry & Weight, 2019; Jenkins, 2020; Matz, 2020, 2021; Weight et al., 2020a). Interdisciplinary components are common across the traditional 11 HIPs as they contribute to new ways of knowing (Kuh, 2008, 2017), while also connecting intentionality to reflection and interaction (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d). Curricula and academic practices that span across a host of areas decrease programmatic siloing, enhance cooperation, and increase engagement (Kuh, 2009). Indeed, Clayton-Pederson and Finley (n.d.) contended that reaching learning goals across HIPs involves intentionally "integrating elements of the curriculum traditionally treated as separate" (p. 2).

Athletics practitioners in athlete development/support could consider intentional changes to their programming that touch on the five parts of intentionality. In doing so, athletics practitioners are taking more of the onus of designing athletics as a HIP and ensuring they have control over at least one type of HIP athletes can engage in on their campus (Ishaq & Bass, 2019).

Athlete development programming should be more intentional in demonstrating to athletes how their participation in sports is transferrable to other settings (Jolly et al., 2020). These settings include college contexts like participation in classes and other HIPs and career preparation. For example, Chalfin and colleagues (2015) showed athletes' ability to translate skills from sports to careers made them more coveted by potential employers (Chalfin et al., 2015). Thus, programming can focus on encouraging athletes to develop autonomously while finding ways to communicate these beneficial qualities through resumes and interviews.

Similarly, athletics practitioners should seek more ways to intertwine athletics with other HIPs as HIPs are scaffolded together and influenced by one another (Kuh, 2008, 2017). Athletics participation can be coupled with writing-intensive courses, undergraduate research, capstone courses and projects, service learning, and even diversity/global learning. For example, in the spring of 2017 the University of Michigan football team took a trip to Italy (Seidel, 2017), offering the players a chance to engage in the traditional HIP of diversity/global learning, while also participating in athletics. The athletes on the trip experienced educational and cultural tours to historic churches, museums and the opera, and the Colosseum (Seidel, 2017). They engaged with local residents and learned some of the language and ate authentic food. This is a clear demonstration of coupling athletics and education, engaging in learning outside of the classroom, and promoting the Integrated View.

Interaction

Interaction is the third characteristic of HIPs and is comprised of meaningful interactions with others, along with diverse experiences that encourage new pathways for meaning making (Kuh, 2008). Meaningful interactions with coaches can be further centered in the experiences of college athletes by hiring coaches who see athletics as educational and want to place that principle at the forefront of their work (Weight et al., 2015). Coaches are arguably some of the most influential people in athletes' lives before, during, and after college; thus, athletes are likely to trust and consider the words and actions of their coaches perhaps more than other people on campus (Harry, 2021; Weight et al., 2020b). So, a coach who promotes the importance of coupling academics and athletics may have a stronger influence on an athlete's holistic development compared to a coach with a Standard View who cares more about athletic achievement (Weight et al., 2015).

Additionally, just as athletes receive developmental programming, coaches can receive education on how to foster even stronger and healthier relationships with their athletes, both as individuals, and as a team. To bring this to fruition, participation in such educational opportunities could also be included in or incentivized through coaching contracts.

Through such educational opportunities, some coaches may go from simply providing athletics oversight to better understanding their athletes' lives and modeling respectful engagement with diverse others (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.; Weight et al., 2020b). This enhanced interaction will foster trust and appreciation within the athlete-coach relationship, which, like strong student-faculty relationships in HIPs,

leads to growth during college and preparation for life after college/sport (Kuh, 2017; Weight et al., 2020a, 2020b).

Finally, another way to enhance interaction in designing athletics participation as a HIP is to create more opportunities for diversity training and improve the representation of athletes of color and athletics leaders of color, especially on certain historically white teams (e.g., coaches and administrators) (Coakley, 2021; Comeaux & Fuentes, 2015; Gayles & Hu, 2009; Jolly et al., 2020). For training purposes, more components of the Scholar Baller model—which centers the experiences of Black athletes—should be included in various athletics HIP programming to enhance athletes' understanding of and appreciation for diversity (Harrison, 2007). Additionally, some sports, like hockey, equestrian, and lacrosse, favor white athletes from affluent backgrounds; thus, there is a smaller representation of athletes of color and those from lower socio-economic statuses on these teams (Coakley, 2021; Hextrum, 2019). Improving the compositional diversity of these teams, and others, will expose athletes on these teams but also on teams across the department to more diverse cultures and ways of thinking. This enhances the interaction component of sports, aligning athletics participation with HIPs (Clayton-Pederson & Finley, n.d.; Kuh, 2008, 2017). While previous scholarship demonstrated athlete involvement outside of sports is challenging (Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Haslerig, 2019; Ishaq & Bass, 2019), further structuring athletics participation as a HIP may negate some of those concerns since participation in sport is a HIP in and of itself.

Similarly, increasing the representation of coaches and administrators of color across the athletics departments can provide athletes with more meaningful interactions. For athletes who are white, engaging with more diverse leaders can expand their respect for and understanding of diversity (Comeaux & Fuentes, 2015). It may even challenge any preconceived biases they bring to college concerning race, ethnicity, gender, and those with other historically marginalized identities. For athletes of color, seeing leaders who look like them in positions of power demonstrates that such positions are achievable for them. Additionally, research shows that when women and people of color are in positions of power, the athletics culture features more diversity, inclusion, and enhancements to the psychological climate (Comeaux & Fuentes, 2015).

Through highlighting the two components of interaction, athletics departments not only structure sport participation like other HIPs in the academy, but also promote an Integrated View of athletics in which academics and athletics are aligned, and the educational mission of sport participation is pushed to the forefront (Brand, 2006).

Conclusion

This conceptual scholarship addressed two research questions: (1) how does Division I athletics participation currently qualify as a HIP, and (2) how can Division I athletics participation be enhanced to further qualify as a HIP? There are some limitations associated with this conceptual research. First, this research did not em-

pirically test athletics as a HIP, but future research can seek to expand into this arena (Kuh, 2017). Thus, more empirical evidence of designing Division I athletics as a HIP in and of itself is necessary to further advance the idea of sport as a HIP. Second, this research only examined Division I athletics due to the unique power dynamics between athletes and sport leaders and the heightened strain between education and sport at this level (Comeaux, 2018). Athletic competition at other levels and their potential design as a HIP should be explored in the future, including at the recreation and club sport levels. Springer and Dixon (2021) argued that extracurricular sport programs, unlike intercollegiate sports, tend to be more “philosophically driven by a mixture of educational, accessibility, and competitive considerations” (p. 192). Thus, recreational sport participation may already be closely aligned with HIPs (Kuh, 2008).

Third, there can be detractors regarding athletics participation. These can include—but are not limited to—racial tensions and lack of representation of traditionally minoritized athletes on certain teams, athlete exploitation, noncompliance with gender equity laws and policies, chronic and life-threatening injuries and displays of violence, and other unseemly qualities (Clotfelter, 2019; Comeaux, 2018; Gayles et al., 2018). These should not be ignored, and addressing these concerns may further align athletics participation with other HIPs on campuses.

There are also concerns related to the traditional HIPs such as access to these practices favoring students from affluent backgrounds (Armstrong & Hamilton, 2013; Comeaux & Grummert, 2020; Kuh & O’Donnell, 2013). For example, unpaid internships exclude students from less affluent backgrounds who cannot afford to do an internship for free or forego a campus job for such internship. Similarly, equipment necessary for ePortfolios can exclude students who cannot afford the necessary technology for this HIP. Along similar lines, NSSE data from 2016 revealed that 53% of white college seniors completed an internship compared to only 41% of Black college seniors (McCormick et al., 2017). Additionally, due to longstanding racial biases and stereotypes in the academy, students of color may be shuffled away from certain HIPs due to faculty perceptions (Patton et al., 2015). Students of color who do participate in HIPs may also experience racism and microaggressions, undercutting the benefits of these engagement opportunities (Patton et al., 2015). To address this HIP limitation, it is critical practitioners center race and equity when considering more ways to couple sport and education.

Still, at the heart of this research is shifting the epistemological understanding of athletics as something that is purely extracurricular and lacking in educational purpose and value (Brand, 2006; Gurney et al., 2017; Weight et al., 2020a). In challenging this longstanding Standard View of athletics, Fort (2015) posited:

So let’s get to the heart of the criticism that the attention paid to athletics is overblown, almost always coupled with skepticism over its academic contribution. The dominant argument goes that sports pull students away from their studies without adding anything academically legitimate. But to what extent is that simply an observation about the particular niche that sports has been driven to at the university, rather than an invitation to open

the discussion about the academic legitimacy of college sports (p. 145)? Accepting the legitimacy of college sports as an educational avenue, such as through the lens of HIPs, is a step in adopting a more Integrated View. Additionally, this new perspective allows the field of higher education to better understand the ways athletics intertwines with teaching, research, and service, while also challenging deficit and stereotypical viewpoints of college athletes. Athletes are students in their lectures and labs, but also in the gym and on their courts of competition. Thus, considering the components of reflection, intentionality, and interaction, athletics participation can be appreciated as a HIP and even further designed to align with HIPs (Kuh, 2017).

References

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58(4), 241-250. [10.2307/2112226](https://doi.org/10.2307/2112226)
- Armstrong, E. A., & Hamilton, L. T. (2013). *Paying for the party*. Harvard University Press.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Bell, L. F. (2009). Examining academic role-set influence on the student-athlete experience. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 19(4), 19-41.
- Berardino, M. (2021, July 31). NIL could complicate matters on the academic side, educator warns. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/mikeberardino/2021/07/31/nil-could-complicate-matters-on-the-academic-side-educator-warns/?sh=18d73db378c9>
- Brand, M. (2006). The role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(1), 9-20. DOI: 10.1080/00948705.2006.9714687
- Brutlag Hosick, M. (2021, June 30). NCAA adopts interim name, image and likeness policy. *NCAA*. <https://www.ncaa.org/news/2021/6/30/ncaa-adopts-interim-name-image-and-likeness-policy.aspx>
- Chalfin, P., Weight, E., Osborne, B., & Johnson, S. (2015). The value of intercollegiate athletics participation from the perspective of employers who target athletes. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 8, 1-27.
- Clayton-Pederson, A. R., & Finley, A. (n.d.). Making excellence inclusive tool: Intensity dimensions of high intensity, high impact practices. University of Colorado. <https://docplayer.net/224782395-Making-excellence-inclusive-tool-intensity-dimensions-of-high-intensity-high-impact-practices-in-search-of-high-intensity-high-impact-practices.html>
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2019). *Big-time sports in American universities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coakley, J. (2021). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies*. McGraw Hill.
- Coffey, L., & Davis, A. (2019). The holistic approach to academia: Traditional classroom instruction and experiential learning of student-athletes. *Education Sciences*, 9(2), 125-148. [10.3390/educsci9020125](https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9020125)

- Comeaux, E. (2011). Examination of faculty attitudes toward Division I college student-athletes. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 30(1), 75-87.
- Comeaux, E. (2018). Stereotypes, control, hyper-surveillance, and disability of NCAA division I Black male athletes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2018(163), 33-42. [10.1002/ss.20268](https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20268)
- Comeaux, E., & Fuentes, M. V. (2015). Cross-racial interactions of Division I athletes. In E. Comeaux (Ed.), *Introduction to intercollegiate athletics* (pp. 179-192). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Comeaux, E., & Grummert, S. E. (2020). Antiblackness in college athletics: Facilitating high impact campus engagement and successful career transitions among Black athletes. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, Fall 2020, 56-72.
- Comeaux, E., & Harrison, C. K. (2011). A conceptual model of academic success for student-athletes. *Educational Researcher*, 40(5), 235-245. [10.3102/0013189X11415260](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11415260)
- Cooper, J. N., Porter, C. J., & Davis, T. J. (2017). Success through community cultural wealth: Reflections from Black female college athletes at a historically Black college/university (HBCU) and a historically White institution (HWI). *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 10(2), 129-156. doi.org/10.1123/jis.2017-0006
- Despres, J., Brady, F., & McGowan, A. S. (2008). Understanding the culture of the student-athlete: Implications for college counselors. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 47(2), 200-211. [10.1002/j.2161-1939.2008.tb00058.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1939.2008.tb00058.x)
- Durham, M. (2020, January 23). 2020 GOALS study results shared at NCAA Convention. *NCAA*. <https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/2020-goals-study-results-shared-ncaa-convention>
- Finley, A. (2019). *A comprehensive approach to assessment of High-Impact Practices*. [Paper presentation]. National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. Urbana, IL. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED604467.pdf>
- Flowers, R. D. (2009). Institutionalized hypocrisy: The myth of intercollegiate athletics. *American Educational History Journal*, 36(1/2), 343-360.
- Fort, R. (2015). College sports spending decisions and the academic mission. In E. Comeaux (Ed.), *Introduction to intercollegiate athletics* (pp. 135-146). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fuller, R. D., Harrison, C. K., Bukstein, S. J., Martin, B. E., Lawrence, S. M., & Gadsby, P. (2020). That smart dude: A qualitative investigation of the African American male scholar-baller identity. *Urban Education*, 55(5), 813-831. [10.1177/004208591666689](https://doi.org/10.1177/004208591666689)
- Gallimore, R., & Tharp, R. (2004). What a coach can teach a teacher, 1975-2004: Reflections and reanalysis of John Wooden's teaching practices. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18(2), 119-137. [10.1123/tsp.18.2.119](https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.18.2.119)
- Gayles, J. G., Comeaux, E., Ofoegbu, E., & Grummert, S. (2018). Neoliberal capitalism and racism in college athletics: Critical approaches for supporting student-athletes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2018(163), 11-21. [10.1002/ss.20266](https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20266)

- Gayles, J. G., & Hu, S. (2009). The influence of student engagement and sport participation on college outcomes among Division I student athletes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3), 315-333. [10.1080/00221546.2009.11779015](https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2009.11779015)
- Gurney, G., Lopiano, D. A., & Zimbalist, A. (2017). *Unwinding madness: What went wrong with college sports and how to fix it*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Harper, S. R. (2018). *Black male student athletes and racial inequities in NCAA Division I college sports*. USC Race and Equity Center. Los Angeles. <https://race.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Pub-2-Harper-Sports-Report.pdf>
- Harrison, C. (2007). “Drop it like it’s hot”: Releasing Scholar-Baller™ voices and changing the “character of the discourse” in North America’s post-secondary institutions. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 1(1), 77-88.
- Harry, M. (2021). NCAA exit interviews and surveys: Academic experiences of college athletes. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 14(1), 66-93.
- Harry, M. (2023). College athlete activism: A Critical Race Theory analysis of perceptions of support in the fight for social justice. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, Spring 2023 Special Issue*, 7-31.
- Harry, M. & Weight, E. A. (2019). Education through athletics: Interest in an athletics performance curriculum. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 11(4), 15-28. <https://doi.org/10.18666/JASM-2019-V11-I4-9608>
- Haslerig, S. (2020). Engaging college athletes in and through graduate study: Academic trajectories and implications. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, Fall 2020 Special Issue*, 148-169.
- Hextrum, K. (2019). Operation Varsity Blues: Disguising the legal capital exchanges and white property interests in athletic admissions. *Higher Education Politics & Economics*, 5(1), 15-32. [10.32674/hepe.v5i1.1359](https://doi.org/10.32674/hepe.v5i1.1359)
- Huml, M. R., Hancock, M. G., & Bergman, M. J. (2014). Additional support or extravagant cost?: Student-athletes’ perceptions on athletic academic centers. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 7, 410-430.
- Hyland, D. A. (2017). The sweatiest of the liberal arts: Athletics and education. In H. L. Reid & E. Moore (Eds.), *Reflecting on modern sport in ancient Olympia: Proceedings of the 2016 meeting of the International Association for the Philosophy of Sport at the International Olympic Academy* (pp. 1-20). Parnassos Press.
- Ishaq, F. J., & Bass, J. (2019). High impact educational practices and the student athlete experience: The implementation and barriers of HIPs in the student athlete support setting. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 12, 178-204.
- Jayakumar, U. M., & Comeaux, E. (2016). The cultural cover-up of college athletics: How organizational culture perpetuates an unrealistic and idealized balancing act. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 87(4), 488-515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.11777411>
- Jenkins, S. (2020, September 7). Colleges should offer a major in sports. It could solve some problems. *New York Times*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/2020/09/07/college-sports-major/>
- Jolly, S., Cooper, J. N., & Chepyator-Thomson, J. R. (2020). An examination of culturally responsive programming for Black student-athletes’ holistic develop-

- ment at Division I Historically White Institutions (HWIs). *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, Fall 2020 Special Issue*, 56-72.
- Kluch, Y. (2020). "My story is my activism!": (Re-) definitions of social justice activism among collegiate athlete activists. *Communication & Sport*, 8(4-5), 566-590. [10.1177/2167479519897288](https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479519897288)
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2021, August 13). Knight Commission recommends financial changes, cutting football scholarships. *The Gazette*. <https://www.thegazette.com/iowa-hawkeyes/knight-commission-recommends-financial-changes-cutting-football-scholarships/>
- Kolb, D. A. (2014). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Pearson.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. [Paper presentation]. American Association of Colleges & Universities, Washington, D.C.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). What student affairs professionals need to know about student engagement. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(6), 683-706. [10.1353/csd.0.0099](https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0099)
- Kuh, G. D. (2017, October 26). Potential high-impact practices that merit further research. *YouTube*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rH5QbFwxAw>
- Kuh, G. D., & O'Donnell, K. (2013). Ensuring quality and taking high-impact practices to scale. *Peer Review*, 15(2), 32.
- Lu, L., Heinze, K. L., & Soderstrom, S. (2018). Playing multiple positions: Student-athlete identity salience and conflict. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 11(2), 214-241. [10.1123/jis.2018-0034](https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2018-0034)
- Martin, B., Harrison, C., & Bukstein, S. (2010). "It takes a village" for African American male scholar-athletes. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 4(3), 277- 295. [10.1179/ssa.2010.4.3.277](https://doi.org/10.1179/ssa.2010.4.3.277)
- Matz, L. (2020). Turning intercollegiate athletics into a performance major like music. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 47(2), 1-18. [10.1080/00948705.2020.1771188](https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2020.1771188)
- Matz, L. (2021). Myles Brand: Intercollegiate athletics within the limits of the academic mission alone. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 14(3), 80-85. [10.17161/jis.v14i3.15656](https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v14i3.15656)
- McCormick, A. C., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2017). *High-impact practices: Is the impact positive or negative for students of color?*. Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Conference, Houston, Texas.
- NCAA Division I Manual (2020). *NCAA Publications*. <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D121.pdf>
- NCAA GOALS Study of the student-athlete experience: Initial summary of findings (2016). *NCAA*. http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/GOALS_2015_summary_jan2016_final_20160627.pdf
- NCAA Recruiting Facts. (2018). *NCAA*. <https://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Recruiting%20Fact%20Sheet%20WEB.pdf>
- Nocera, J., & Strauss, B. (2016). *Indentured: The inside story of the rebellion against the NCAA*. Portfolio.

- Otto, K. A., & Otto, H. R. (2013). Clarifying amateurism: A logical approach to resolving the exploitation of college athletes dilemma. *Sport, Ethics and Philosophy*, 7(2), 259-270. [10.1080/17511321.2012.762036](https://doi.org/10.1080/17511321.2012.762036)
- Patton L. D., Harper S. R., Harris J. (2015). Using critical race theory to (re)interpret widely studied topics related to students in U.S. higher education. In A. M. Martínez Alemán, E. M. Bensimon, & B. Pusser (Eds.), *Critical approaches to the study of higher education* (pp. 193-219). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Patton, L. D., Renn, K. A., Guido, F. M., & Quaye, S. J. (2016). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. Jossey-Bass.
- Potuto, J. R., & O'Hanlon, J. (2007). National study of student-athletes regarding their experiences as college students. *College Student Journal*, 41, 947-966.
- Raabe, J., & Zakrajsek, R. A. (2017). Coaches and teammates as social agents for collegiate athletes' basic psychological need satisfaction. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 10(1), 67-82. [10.1123/jis.2016-0033](https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2016-0033)
- Rettig, J., & Hu, S. (2016). College sport participation and student educational experiences and selected college outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(4), 428-446. DOI: [10.1353/csd.2016.0054](https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0054)
- Seidel, J. (2017, April 30). Michigan football's Rome trip a true learning experience. *Detroit Free Press*. <https://www.freep.com/story/sports/columnists/jeff-seidel/2017/04/30/michigan-wolverines-football-rome-trip/101066404/>
- Smith, J. M., & Willingham, M. (2019). *Cheated: The UNC scandal, the education of athletes, and the future of big-time college sports*. Potomac Books.
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports has crippled undergraduate education*. Macmillan.
- Splitt, F. G. (2009, December 2). The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics: Why it needs fixing. A collection of related commentaries. *The Drake Group*. https://drakegroupblog.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/splitt_knight_commission.pdf
- Springer, D., & Dixon, M. A. (2021). College student development within the context of formalized sport in American higher education. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 14(1), 189-201. [10.17161/jis.v14i1.11755](https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v14i1.11755)
- Staurowsky, E. J., & Sack, A. L. (2006). Reconsidering the use of the term student-athlete in academic research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(2), 103-116.
- Suggs, W., & Hoffman, J. L. (2021). Myles Brand's collegiate model and the post-amateurism world of college sports. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 14(3), 86-118. [10.17161/jis.v14i3.15674](https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v14i3.15674)
- Thelin, J. (2021). From chaos to coherence: Myles Brand and the balancing of academics and athletics. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 14(3), 8-15. [10.17161/jis.v14i3.15620](https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v14i3.15620)
- Tinto, V. (1997). Colleges as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 599-623. [10.1080/00221546.1997.11779003](https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1997.11779003)

- Weight, E. A., Cooper, C., & Popp, N. K. (2015). The coach-educator: NCAA Division I coach perspectives about an integrated university organizational structure. *Journal of Sport Management, 29*(5), 510-522. [10.1123/jism.2014-0006](https://doi.org/10.1123/jism.2014-0006)
- Weight, E., Harry, M., & Navarro, K. (2020a). Integrating athletics within the academy: Educational experiences of athletes, musicians, and traditional students. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 13*, 143-169.
- Weight, E. A., Lewis, M., & Harry, M. (2020b). Self-efficacy belief and the influential coach: An examination of collegiate athletes. *Journal of Athlete Development and Experience, 2*(3), 4, 198-216.
- Weinberg, R. S., & Gould, D. (2019). *Foundations of sport and exercise psychology*. Human Kinetics.
- Wilson, M. (2014, September 17). Academics vs. athletics: Shining the spotlight on incentives. *Forward Florida*. <https://forwardflorida.com/florida-education/academics-vs-athletics-shining-the-spotlight-on-incentives/>
- Wilson, M. (2017). NCAA Division I football coaching contracts: A comparative analysis of incentives for athletic and academic team performance from 2006, 2009, and 2011. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics, 11*(4), 237-255.