

Understanding the Impact of Institutional Support Facilities on Student-Athletes: Basis for a Training Program

Cinderela Regalo Santos, LPT, PhD

Cinderela.regalo@deped.gov.ph/cinderella.regalo@gmail.com

Gov. Felicisimo T. San Luis Integrated Senior High School, Bubukal, Santa Cruz, Laguna, 4009 Philippines

University of Perpetual Help System Dalta, Alabang-Zapote Road- Pampalona Tres, Las Pinas City 1740 Philippines

Abstract

This research examines how institutional support impacts the academic and athletic performance of student-athletes. The study includes participants of varying ages, genders, and experience levels: 29.1% are aged 13-14, 26.2% are 14-15, 25.3% are 15-16, 14.8% are 17, and 4.6% are 11-12. The gender distribution is nearly equal, with 50.2% male and 49.8% female, providing insights into both genders' experiences in athletics. Most respondents (68.8%) have 1 to 3 years of athletic experience, indicating they are early in their careers. The effectiveness of institutional support varies by area, with academic advising rated the highest (mean score of 3.52), followed by counseling services (3.45), administrative support (3.43), and financial aid (3.39). While academic advising is seen as crucial for balancing education and sports, there is a clear need for improved financial aid and service awareness. Athletic performance scores range from 3.29 to 3.64, with strong ratings for coaching and facilities, although consistency in competition outcomes is an area of concern. Academic performance is adequate, with a mean score of 3.41; athletes are engaged in discussions (3.51) and complete assignments on time (3.36), but seeking academic help (3.28) needs attention. Statistical analyses show no significant differences in support perceptions based on age, gender, or experience, with p-values over 0.05. However, strong positive correlations exist between institutional support and academic outcomes, and between athletic and academic performance, all with p-values of .000. In conclusion, institutional support is generally viewed as effective, improvements are needed in financial aid and resources to help student-athletes thrive academically and athletically. This research underscores the importance of support systems in the holistic development of student-athletes, advocating for ongoing enhancements to meet their diverse needs.

Keywords : Institutional Support, Student-Athletes, Academic Performance, Athletic Performance

1. Introduction

Globally, in the interconnection of education and sports, the role of institutional support facilities has become increasingly significant in fostering student-athletes' development. Facilities such as well-equipped gyms, fields, and academic support programs have been recognized as crucial factors in shaping student-athletes' performance and well-being. According to the International Olympic Committee (IOC, 2021), adequate facilities not only enhance physical preparation but also contribute to the mental resilience and

holistic development of student-athletes. Similarly, UNESCO's 2020 framework for Quality Physical Education underscores the importance of institutional infrastructure in creating inclusive and effective learning environments for student-athletes.

Nationally, the Philippines has made strides in improving support for student-athletes, particularly through government initiatives. The Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (Republic Act No. 10533) emphasizes the integration of sports development programs in the K-12 curriculum, aiming to produce well-rounded individuals. The Department of Education (DepEd) has also been proactive, with programs like the "Palarong Pambansa," which highlight the importance of athletic development in schools. However, despite these initiatives, gaps remain in the availability and quality of institutional support facilities, especially in public schools. Recent studies (Delos Santos et al., 2021) reveal that many schools lack the necessary resources, leading to challenges in optimizing student-athletes' potential.

In Santa Cruz, Laguna, these serves as a microcosm of these national challenges. Public high schools in this district grapple with limited sports facilities and resources, affecting student-athletes' performance and engagement. inadequate support facilities often result in decreased motivation, limited opportunities for skill development, and heightened stress among student-athletes.

These challenges motivated the researcher to conduct this study, aiming to understand the impact of institutional support facilities on student-athletes in Santa Cruz, Laguna. The research seeks to explore how these facilities influence student-athletes' academic and athletic performance, their overall well-being, and the potential strategies to address existing gaps. Anchored in the theoretical framework of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory, the study posits that the school environment, as a microsystem, plays a critical role in shaping individual outcomes.

The Philippine Sports Commission Act (Republic Act No. 6847) and the National Sports Development Program further justify the need for this research. These mandates emphasize the state's commitment to providing adequate support for sports development in schools. Recent studies (Garcia & Tan,

2022; Rodriguez et al., 2023) corroborate the claim that institutional support facilities are pivotal in ensuring the holistic development of student-athletes.

This research aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse on sports development in education by providing evidence-based insights specific to Santa Cruz, Laguna. By addressing the gaps and challenges faced by student-athletes, the study aspires to inform policies and practices that enhance institutional support systems in public high schools.

Theoretical Framework

This study was based on Schuetz's Theory of Student Engagement and Well-Being (2019), which focused on how institutional support impacted student engagement and overall well-being. Schuetz's model highlighted that students' involvement in academics, social life, and personal growth was strongly influenced by the support systems provided by their educational institutions. The theory emphasized that a solid support system, such as academic advising, financial aid, faculty support, and extracurricular opportunities, helped improve students' well-being, motivation, and academic success. Schuetz's framework was especially useful for understanding how institutional support helped student-athletes manage both their academic responsibilities and athletic commitments. It suggested that student engagement and well-being were shaped not just by individual efforts but also by the support provided by the institution.

Schuetz's Theory guided this study by exploring how different types of institutional support affected the academic and athletic outcomes of student-athletes. The study looked at how academic advising, financial aid, faculty support, and other resources played a role in student-athletes' success. According to Schuetz, when students had the right support from their institution, they were more likely to succeed both in their studies and in sports, leading to better overall well-being.

The theory was used to examine key factors such as academic advising, financial aid, administrative support, academic development, career counseling, tutoring services, faculty support, quality of coaching, facilities and equipment, coaching and training, and participation in athletic competitions. Schuetz's theory

explained that academic advising was crucial for keeping student-athletes on track with their academic goals while balancing the demands of sports. Financial aid helped ease the financial burdens, allowing student-athletes to focus on academics and sports rather than worrying about money. Administrative support, such as help with scheduling and eligibility tracking, made it easier for students to participate in both academic and athletic activities.

Schuetz also stressed the importance of academic development programs like tutoring and workshops, which helped student-athletes stay engaged with their studies. Career counseling assisted them in planning for life after sports, keeping them connected to their academic and future goals. Faculty support was important because it took into account the unique challenges student-athletes faced, such as scheduling conflicts, helping them stay focused on their studies. The quality of coaching played a key role, as good coaching not only improved athletic performance but also boosted student-athletes' motivation and well-being. High-quality facilities and equipment provided the necessary resources for success, while coaching and training programs helped student-athletes build skills and confidence, both academically and athletically. Finally, participating in athletic competitions boosted student-athletes' self-esteem and motivation, which were vital for their overall engagement and success.

Schuetz's Theory of Student Engagement and Well-Being helped guide this study by offering a clear way to look at how institutional support affected student-athletes. By focusing on the relationship between institutional support and student engagement, this framework helped identify areas where schools could improve their support for student-athletes, ultimately assisting them in succeeding in both academics and sports. The goal was to understand how institutional support influenced student-athletes' overall well-being and to provide recommendations for improving their academic and athletic experiences in public high schools.

Statement of the Problem

The present study on understanding the impact of institutional support facilities on student-athletes in Santa Cruz, Laguna, sought to find answers specifically to the following:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. age;
 - 1.2. sex; and
 - 1.3. years as an athlete?
2. What is the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of:
 - 2.1. academic advising;
 - 2.2. financial aid;
 - 2.3 administrative support; and
 - 2.4 counseling service?
3. What is the student-athlete's level of academic performance in terms of:
 - 3.1. academic development;
 - 3.2. career counseling;
 - 3.3. tutoring services; and
 - 3.4 faculty support?
4. What is the student-athletes level of sports performance in terms of :
 - 4.1. quality of coaching;
 - 4.2. facilities and equipment;
 - 4.3. coaching and training; and
 - 4.4 athletic competitions?
5. Is there a significant difference on the extent of institutional support to student athletes when grouped

according to profile?

6. Is there a significant difference on the student-athlete's level of academic performance when grouped according to profile?

7. Is there a significant difference on the level of performance of athletes in terms of sports and their academic performance when grouped according to profile?

8. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance, as well as the relationship between their athletic performance in sports and their academic achievements?

9. Based on the result of the study, what training program may be proposed?

Research Methodology

This study adopted a quantitative, descriptive research methodology to explore the influence of institutional support on the development of student-athletes. Quantitative research methods were highly valued in the social sciences for their ability to systematically analyze psychological, social, and economic phenomena through numerical data (Coghlan & Brydon-Miller, 2021). This approach proved particularly effective in identifying and describing patterns and relationships between variables in an objective manner.

The descriptive statistical method was employed to examine the relationship between institutional support, specifically the quality of coaching and the availability of sports facilities, and the academic and athletic outcomes of student-athletes. Unlike correlational or experimental research, descriptive studies aimed to provide a clear and accurate picture of the characteristics or relationships of the variables under study, without manipulating or influencing them (Sreekumar, 2023). This method allowed for an in-depth exploration of existing conditions, providing insights into the state of institutional support and its impact on student-athletes.

Data collection involved structured instruments, with random sampling used to ensure that the sample was representative of the broader student-athlete population. This quantitative descriptive approach facilitated the presentation, comparison, and interpretation of data, leading to clear and actionable conclusions about the role of institutional support in the development of student-athletes (Business Research Methodology, n.d.).

The population for this study consisted of 611 student athletes from various public high schools in Santa Cruz, Laguna. To obtain a representative sample, Raosoft sampling was employed for the athletes, with 237 athletes selected to participate in the study.

The data was analyzed using Stata version 12 and Microsoft Excel, utilizing statistical treatments such as frequency count and percentage analysis to construct a comprehensive profile of the respondents. The sample size of 237 athletes was determined using the Raosoft sampling technique. This method proved effective for understanding the impact of institutional support facilities on student-athletes. Additionally, the study calculated mean scores and standard deviations to ensure a thorough analysis of the data.

The respondents of the study were the 237 student-athletes from various grade levels, all enrolled in the selected public high school in the Santa Cruz District, Laguna. They represented a crucial demographic for investigating the relationship between institutional support and athletic development. The focus was on student-athletes participating in multiple sports, ensuring diverse athletic disciplines. The sample size of 237 respondents was determined based on resource availability, the feasibility of data collection, and the need for statistical significance. This number was considered sufficient for identifying meaningful patterns while remaining manageable for analysis. The insights gained from these respondents contributed significantly to understanding the impact of institutional support facilities on student-athletes.

This study's primary data collection tool was a researcher-developed survey questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed as a structured instrument to gather essential data relevant to the research objectives, ensuring alignment with the study's focus. The questionnaire consisted of four distinct sections to

capture the research variables comprehensively. Part I encompassed the demographic profile of the respondents, including their age, sex, and years of experience as athletes. Additionally, Part II evaluated the extent of institutional support available to student-athletes, which included academic advising, financial aid, administrative support, and counseling services. Furthermore, Part III assessed student-athletes' academic performance, particularly in academic development, career counseling, tutoring services, and faculty support. Part IV explored their athletic performance, considering factors such as the quality of coaching, facilities and equipment, coaching and training programs, and participation in athletic competitions.

Respondents were instructed to indicate their responses by placing a checkmark next to their chosen options. A four-point Likert scale was employed to quantify these responses, with each option weighted accordingly. This rating system facilitated quantification and analysis of respondents' perceptions and experiences regarding the research variables, ensuring a structured and systematic data collection and analysis approach.

Legend for the extent of institutional support

Weight	Range	Verbal Description	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.51-4.50	Very Satisfied	To a great extent
3	2.51-3.50	Satisfied	to a moderate extent
2	1.51-2.50	Dissatisfied	To a slight extent
1	1.00-1.50	Very Dissatisfied	Not at all

Legend for the level of academic and athletic performance

Weight	Range	Verbal Description	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.51-4.50	Very high	Very effective
3	2.51-3.50	High	Effective
2	1.51-2.50	Low	Slightly effective
1	1.00-1.50	Very low	Ineffective

The research instrument underwent a comprehensive validation process tailored to the study's focus. The process commenced with consultations with the adviser, incorporating their invaluable feedback into iterative drafts of the questionnaire. Following this initial phase, the researcher-developed questionnaire was rigorously evaluated by faculty members from the University of Perpetual Help System Dalta, who served as validators to ensure the instrument met established standards for effective data collection.

The final validation stage involved pilot testing and a reliability assessment conducted by an expert statistician. Cronbach's alpha was employed to measure the instrument's internal consistency and dependability. This systematic validation process was essential for ensuring that the research instrument accurately captured the constructs related to the study's focus, thereby enhancing the overall credibility and reliability of the study's findings.

The researcher implemented several key methodologies in this study to ensure robust data collection and analysis. Initially, the researcher submitted the standardized survey instrument to their mentor for face validation, establishing its reliability and validity for the study context.

To survey the selected respondents, the researcher sought permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Laguna to engage athletes from the District of Santa Cruz, Laguna. Upon obtaining the necessary approvals, respondents were given clear instructions on how to complete the surveys effectively. The researcher oversaw distributing and retrieving the questionnaires, ensuring that participants received comprehensive explanations regarding the study's objectives and the instructions for completing the survey.

Following the data collection phase, rigorous statistical treatments were applied to examine and interpret the data. This process included tallying and coding the responses using statistical software such as Stata version 12 and Microsoft Excel. The data then underwent various statistical analyses to uncover meaningful insights into understanding the impact of institutional support facilities on student-athletes.

The researcher was responsible for collecting and analyzing the data, categorizing it according to the research questions that guided the study. The data underwent appropriate statistical treatments to ensure that

student-athlete engagement and performance analysis were clear and precise.

To address problem 1, frequency counts and percentage calculations were used to determine the distribution of respondents based on their age, sex, and years as athletes. This provided a comprehensive overview of the demographic characteristics of the study participants.

For problem 2, which focused on the extent of institutional support and the student-athlete's academic performance, weighted means were employed. This method allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the perceived institutional support in various areas, including academic advising, financial aid, administrative support, counseling services, and the student-athletes' academic development, career counseling, tutoring services, and faculty support. Weighted means helped assess these support services' importance and perceived effectiveness in enhancing student-athletes' academic experiences.

To assess problems 3 and 4, the researcher measured the perceived quality of coaching, facilities, coaching and training, and athletic competitions. Again, weighted means were used to quantify the student-athletes' perceptions of these factors, providing a clearer understanding of their impact on athletic performance.

To examine problems 5, 6, and 7, the study used t-tests or ANOVA, depending on the nature of the data. These statistical methods allowed the researcher to explore how the extent of institutional support and the level of academic and athletic performance differed based on age, sex, and years as an athlete.

Lastly, to investigate problem 8, the researcher employed correlational analysis to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance and between their athletic performance and academic achievements. This helped identify any meaningful associations between institutional support and student-athletes' outcomes.

For problem 9, based on the findings, the study proposed a targeted training program to enhance student-athletes' support systems and improve their academic and athletic performance.

Results and Discussion

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:

Tables 1 to 3 provide a comprehensive overview of the demographic profile of the respondents, highlighting key characteristics that are crucial for understanding the study.

1.1. Age

Table 1

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
11 to 12 years old	11	4.60
13 to 14 years old	69	29.10
14 to 15 years old	62	26.20
15 to 16 years old	60	25.30
17 years old	35	14.80
Total	237	100.00

From As described from Table 1, out of 237 respondents, 11 or 4.60% were ages 11 to 12 years old, 69 or 29.10% were ages 13 to 14 years old, 62 or 26.20% were ages 14 to 15 years old, 60 or 25.30% were 15 to 16 years old, and 35 or 14.80% were ages 17 years old.

1.2 Sex

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	119	50.20
Female	118	49.80
Total	237	100.00

As shown in Table 2, out of 237 respondents, 119 or 70.00% were male and 118 or 49.80% were female.

1.3 Years as Athlete

Table 3

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Years as an Athlete

Years in Coaching	Frequency	Percentage
1 to 3 years	163	68.80
4 to 5 years	24	10.10
6 to 8 years	29	12.20
10 years and above	21	8.90
Total	237	100.00

As described from Table 3, out of 237 respondents, 163 or 68.80% had 1 to 3 years of experience as athletes, 24 or 10.10% had 4 to 5 years of experience, 29 or 12.20% had 6 to 8 years of experience, and 21 or 8.90% had 10 years and above of experience as athletes.

2. What is the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of:

Tables 4 to 7 offer a detailed examination of the extent of institutional support available to students, addressing all cited variables. These tables serve to illuminate how various forms of support impact the student experience, providing valuable insights into the effectiveness of institutional resources.

Table 4

2.1 Academic Advising

Mean response of respondents on the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of academic advising

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. Academic advisors are accessible and responsive to the needs of student-athletes.	3.48	To a Moderate Extent

2. The academic advising provided helps student-athletes balance their academic and athletic commitments effectively.	3.52	To a Great Extent
3. Student-athletes receive personalized guidance tailored to their academic and career goals.	3.53	To a Great Extent
4. The institution provides sufficient resources and support through academic advising to ensure the success of student-athletes.	3.47	To a Moderate Extent
5. Academic advisors are knowledgeable about the unique challenges faced by student-athletes and offer appropriate solutions.	3.51	To a Great Extent
Overall Weighted Mean	3.50	To a Moderate Extent

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = To a Great Extent; 2.51 – 3.50 = To a Moderate Extent; 1.51 – 2.50 = To a Slight Extent; 1.00 – 1.50 = Not at all

As described in Table 4, the data revealed that the respondents generally perceived academic advising as effective, particularly in areas that support both academic and athletic success. The respondents gave a response of “To a Great Extent” to the following indicators: “The academic advising provided helps student-athletes balance their academic and athletic commitments effectively” ($M=3.52$), “Student-athletes receive personalized guidance tailored to their academic and career goals” ($M=3.53$), and “Academic advisors are knowledgeable about the unique challenges faced by student-athletes and offer appropriate solutions” ($M=3.51$). These findings align with the assertions of Meyer and Wang (2019), who emphasized that academic advising enables student-athletes to manage their time efficiently and balance their academic and athletic responsibilities. Similarly, Brown et al. (2021) underscored the importance of individualized academic plans tailored to the unique demands of student-athletes, which may include tutoring, flexible schedules, and regular progress monitoring.

On the other hand, the respondents expressed a “To a Moderate Extent” level of agreement with the indicators: “Academic advisors are accessible and responsive to the needs of student-athletes” ($M=3.48$), and “The institution provides sufficient resources and support through academic advising to ensure the success of student-athletes” ($M=3.47$). These moderate ratings may reflect the need for more proactive and readily

available support from advisors, as supported by Kelley and Lee (2023), who highlighted the importance of building strong advisor-student relationships to foster trust and ensure that student-athletes feel supported and encouraged to seek guidance.

Furthermore, Jones et al. (2021) found that consistent advising directly contributes to improved academic outcomes and retention, particularly when advisors are accessible and engaged. These results suggest that while academic advising is generally viewed positively, there remains a need for institutions to enhance the accessibility, responsiveness, and comprehensiveness of their academic advising programs for student-athletes.

Table 5

2.2 Financial Aid

Mean response of respondents on the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of financial Aid.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. The institution provides adequate financial aid to support student-athletes' academic and athletic needs.	3.39	To a Moderate Extent
2. The process for applying and receiving financial aid is accessible and straightforward for student-athletes.	3.31	To a Moderate Extent
3. The amount of financial aid provided to student-athletes meets their basic academic and personal expenses.	3.31	To a Moderate Extent
4. Financial aid packages are distributed equitably among all eligible student-athletes.	3.36	To a Moderate Extent
5. The institution offers timely updates and clear communication about financial aid opportunities and policies for student-athletes.	3.38	To a Moderate Extent
Overall Weighted Mean	3.35	To a Moderate Extent

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = To a Great Extent; 2.51 – 3.50 = To a Moderate Extent; 1.51 – 2.50 = To a Slight Extent; 1.00 – 1.50 = Not at all

The data presented in Table 5 reflect the perceptions of respondents regarding the adequacy and

effectiveness of financial aid provided to student-athletes. The findings reveal that financial aid support is perceived "to a moderate extent" across all indicators, with an overall weighted mean of 3.35. This suggests that while financial assistance is present within the institution, it may not fully address the comprehensive needs of student-athletes.

The highest-rated indicator, "The institution provides adequate financial aid to support student-athletes' academic and athletic needs" ($\bar{x} = 3.39$), underscores a moderate level of institutional support. This finding is consistent with the assertion of Becker and Garcia (2021), who highlighted that financial aid plays a critical role in alleviating the economic burdens of student-athletes, thereby enabling them to focus on both academic achievement and athletic performance.

Similarly, the item "The institution offers timely updates and clear communication about financial aid opportunities and policies for student-athletes" received a weighted mean of 3.38, indicating that communication regarding financial aid is reasonably effective. Martin and Parker (2020) emphasized the importance of not only providing financial support but also accompanying it with guidance and resources such as financial literacy programs to ensure optimal usage of aid among student-athletes.

The indicator "Financial aid packages are distributed equitably among all eligible student-athletes" ($\bar{x} = 3.36$) suggests a moderate perception of fairness in distribution. According to Thomas et al. (2022), equitable access to financial aid reduces the necessity for part-time employment, thus enabling student-athletes to better manage their dual roles and responsibilities.

Notably, two indicators "The process for applying and receiving financial aid is accessible and straightforward" and "The amount of financial aid provided meets basic academic and personal expenses" both received the lowest mean score of 3.31. These results may imply limitations in the financial aid system's ability to comprehensively cover student-athletes' financial needs. Zimmerman and Lee (2020) emphasized that effective financial aid systems must cover core expenses such as tuition, educational materials, and travel for competitions to enhance both academic and athletic engagement.

Collectively, the results suggest that while financial aid programs are functional, they require further enhancement in terms of accessibility, sufficiency, and equitable allocation. The findings also align with the insights of Johnson and Taylor (2021), who observed that adequate financial support contributes to improved retention and graduation rates among student-athletes. Moreover, Wang and Roberts (2023) noted that alleviating financial stress through robust aid programs positively impacts student-athletes' mental health and performance outcomes.

In summary, although financial aid is moderately effective in supporting student-athletes, improvements are necessary to ensure that it becomes a more robust mechanism for promoting academic success, athletic development, and overall well-being. These enhancements may include increasing financial allocations, improving communication strategies, and integrating supportive services that guide student-athletes in managing their financial responsibilities effectively.

Table 6**2.3 Administrative Support**

Mean response of respondents on the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of administrative support.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. The institution provides adequate funding and resources to support student-athletes' academic and athletic needs.	3.39	To a Moderate Extent
2. Administrative policies are designed to accommodate the academic schedules and athletic commitments of student-athletes.	3.41	To a Moderate Extent
3. The institution ensures effective communication between student-athletes and administrative offices regarding concerns and needs.	3.46	To a Moderate Extent
4. Administrative staff are approachable and responsive to the unique challenges faced by student-athletes.	3.41	To a Moderate Extent
5. The institution actively seeks feedback from student-athletes to improve administrative support and services.	3.49	To a Moderate Extent

Overall Weighted Mean**3.43****To a Moderate Extent**

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = To a Great Extent; 2.51 – 3.50 = To a Moderate Extent; 1.51 – 2.50 = To a Slight Extent; 1.00 – 1.50 = Not at all

Table 6 presents the assessment of administrative support as perceived by student-athletes. The results reveal that administrative support is generally provided to a moderate extent, with an overall weighted mean of 3.43. Among the indicators, the highest mean rating ($\bar{x} = 3.49$) pertains to the institution's efforts to actively seek feedback from student-athletes to improve administrative support and services, suggesting a moderate level of student involvement in institutional decision-making processes. This is consistent with the findings of Clark and Williams (2021), who emphasized the importance of administrative responsiveness and structured support in enhancing student-athlete engagement and satisfaction.

Similarly, the indicator on effective communication between student-athletes and administrative offices received a relatively high rating ($\bar{x} = 3.46$), reflecting the institution's efforts in maintaining accessible lines of communication an aspect highlighted by Reyes and Macdonald (2020) as essential in bridging the gap between academic and athletic responsibilities. Moreover, the moderately rated item on administrative policies accommodating athletic and academic commitments ($\bar{x} = 3.41$) implies that while policies are in place, there remains room for improvement in aligning institutional structures with the unique schedules and demands faced by student-athletes.

The lowest-rated indicator, concerning the provision of adequate funding and resources ($\bar{x} = 3.39$), suggests that financial and logistical support may be insufficient or inconsistently experienced by student-athletes. According to Smith and Turner (2022), such support is crucial for minimizing the stressors associated with dual-role responsibilities and ensuring overall well-being.

In summary, while the institution demonstrates a moderate level of administrative support through feedback mechanisms and communication, the data indicate the need for further development in areas such as policy design and resource provision to fully support the academic and athletic needs of student-athletes.

Table 7**2.4 Counseling Service**

Mean response of respondents on the extent of institutional support to student athletes in terms of Counseling service.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. The counseling services provided to student-athletes are easily accessible and available when needed.	3.48	To a Moderate Extent
2. The counseling services are effective in addressing the mental and emotional needs of student-athletes.	3.43	To a Moderate Extent
3. The counselors are well-trained and knowledgeable about the unique challenges faced by student-athletes.	3.43	To a Moderate Extent
4. The counseling services provide a safe and confidential environment for student-athletes to discuss their personal issues.	3.47	To a Moderate Extent
5. The counseling services are actively promoted and encouraged for student-athletes at my institution.	3.46	To a Moderate Extent
Overall Weighted Mean	3.45	To a Moderate Extent

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = To a Great Extent; 2.51 – 3.50 = To a Moderate Extent; 1.51 – 2.50 = To a Slight Extent; 1.00 – 1.50 = Not at all

The findings from Table 7 reveal that counseling services for student-athletes are provided to a moderate extent, with an overall weighted mean of 3.45. This suggests that while the services are accessible and somewhat effective, there is room for improvement. The highest rating was given to the accessibility of counseling services ($\bar{x} = 3.48$), which aligns with Fitzgerald and Wright's (2023) assertion that such services are crucial for providing athletes with a confidential space to address mental health challenges like anxiety and stress.

Furthermore, the moderate ratings for the effectiveness of counseling ($\bar{x} = 3.43$) and the knowledge of counselors ($\bar{x} = 3.43$) reflect a need for further enhancement, especially in addressing the unique pressures

faced by student-athletes. Olafson and Bowen (2021) emphasize that counseling is vital for fostering resilience and helping athletes cope with both academic and athletic pressures. These findings align with the data showing that counseling provides emotional support but could benefit from more specialized attention to athletes' unique challenges.

The safe and confidential environment ($\bar{x} = 3.47$) provided by counseling services is a key strength, reflecting Evans and Harris's (2021) view that these services are essential for fostering a supportive space where athletes can manage personal and academic pressures. Additionally, the promotion of counseling services ($\bar{x} = 3.46$) suggests that while they are encouraged, further efforts could be made to increase participation, in line with Johnson and Miller's (2022) recommendation to prevent burnout and support athletes holistically.

Overall, the results indicate that while the institution offers adequate counseling services, strengthening their accessibility and effectiveness could further enhance student-athletes' emotional and mental well-being, supporting their academic **and** athletic success.

3. What is the student-athlete's level of academic performance in terms of:

Tables 8 to 11 provide an insightful analysis of the relationships and correlations identified in the study. These tables summarize the findings related to student-athlete performance, engagement levels, and the impact of institutional support

Table 8

3.1 Academic Development

Means responses on the student athlete's level of academic performance in terms of Academic development.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. I complete my academic assignments on time despite my athletic commitments.	3.36	Effective

2. I actively participate in class discussions and activities.	3.51	Very Effective
3. I seek assistance from teachers or tutors when I encounter academic challenges.	3.28	Effective
4. I balance my study schedule with my training and competition routines effectively.	3.45	Effective
5. I consistently achieve my academic goals as outlined in my academic development plan.	3.46	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.41	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The results in Table 8 indicate that academic development among student-athletes is generally effective, with an overall weighted mean of 3.41. The highest rating, 3.51 ("Very Effective"), was given for active participation in class discussions, suggesting strong engagement. This aligns with Moore and Peterson's (2022) emphasis on the importance of time management and academic goal-setting for student-athletes.

Ratings for completing assignments on time ($\bar{x}$ = 3.36), balancing study schedules with training ($\bar{x}$ = 3.45), and achieving academic goals ($\bar{x}$ = 3.46) also fall within the "Effective" range, demonstrating that student-athletes manage their dual responsibilities well. These results are consistent with Green and Wilson's (2023) view that academic development programs help athletes balance academics and athletics through tailored support.

The item on seeking academic assistance ($\bar{x}$ = 3.28) showed room for improvement, suggesting that greater encouragement for utilizing support services could benefit student-athletes. According to Thomas and Garcia (2021), providing access to tutoring and mentoring can further enhance academic success.

Table 9

3.2 Career Counseling

Means responses on the student athlete's level of academic performance in terms of Career counseling.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. I receive guidance from career counseling services on balancing my academic and athletic commitments.	3.35	Effective

2. Career counseling sessions help me set clear academic goals related to my future career.	3.41	Effective
3. I feel more motivated to perform well academically after attending career counseling sessions.	3.29	Effective
4. Career counseling provides me with strategies to improve my time management for academic success.	3.39	Effective
5. The career counselor helps me align my academic choices with my long-term career aspirations.	3.41	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.37	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The results in Table 9 indicate that career counseling services for student-athletes are generally effective, with an overall weighted mean of 3.37. This suggests that the services help students balance their academic and athletic commitments, set clear career goals, and develop strategies for success.

The highest-rated item, with a score of 3.41, was career counseling's role in helping students set academic goals aligned with their career aspirations and in assisting them in making informed academic choices for their future careers. This aligns with Thompson and Roberts (2023), who emphasize that career counseling helps student-athletes explore career options and align their skills with job opportunities, bridging the gap between athletic training and professional development.

Additionally, career counseling's effectiveness in helping students manage their time for academic success ($\bar{x} = 3.39$) supports Harris and Jackson (2022), who highlight the importance of career counseling in providing tailored advice to address the unique challenges faced by student-athletes, such as managing limited time for career exploration and gaining work experience.

Although the motivation to perform well academically after career counseling sessions received a moderate rating ($\bar{x} = 3.29$), Johnson and Stevens (2021) suggest that career counseling plays a critical role in helping student-athletes navigate the uncertainties of transitioning out of sports, building confidence in their ability to succeed in post-athletic careers.

In conclusion, career counseling services are effective in helping student-athletes align their

academic and career goals, manage their time efficiently, and plan for successful futures after sports, though further enhancement in motivation could further boost their impact.

Table 10**3.3 Tutoring Services**

Means responses on the student athlete's level of academic performance in terms of Tutoring Services

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. I attend tutoring sessions to help me understand academic topics better.	3.02	Effective
2. Tutoring services provide me with effective support for completing assignments and projects.	3.03	Effective
3. I feel more confident in my academic performance after attending tutoring sessions.	3.12	Effective
4. The tutoring services I receive address the specific challenges I face as a student-athlete.	3.12	Effective
5. My academic performance has improved because of the assistance provided by tutoring services.	3.17	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.09	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The data from Table 10 reveals that tutoring services are effective in supporting student-athletes, with an overall weighted mean of 3.09. The highest-rated indicator, "My academic performance has improved because of the assistance provided by tutoring services" (mean = 3.17), highlights the positive impact these services have on student-athletes' academic outcomes. This aligns with the findings of Larson and Smith (2021), who note that tutoring services provide personalized support that helps students stay on track despite the demands of sports training and competition. Similarly, the ratings for "I feel more confident in my academic performance after attending tutoring sessions" and "The tutoring services I receive address the specific challenges I face as a student-athlete" (mean = 3.12) suggest that tutoring enhances both confidence

and academic understanding, as emphasized by Green and Allen (2022).

Wilson and Carter (2021) also highlight that tutoring services help reduce academic anxiety, providing a supportive environment where student-athletes can build academic skills and manage their dual responsibilities.

Table 11
3.4 Faculty Support

Means responses on the student athlete's level of academic performance in terms of Faculty Support.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. Faculty members provide clear and consistent guidance on managing academic and athletic responsibilities.	3.43	Effective
2. Professors offer flexible accommodation for academic deadlines when conflicts with athletic events occur.	3.43	Effective
3. Faculty members actively encourage student-athletes to seek academic assistance when needed.	3.45	Effective
4. Professors demonstrate an understanding of the unique challenges faced by student-athletes.	3.41	Effective
5. Faculty members are approachable and willing to provide additional academic support outside of regular class hours.	3.43	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.43	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The data in Table 11 reveals that faculty support for student-athletes is rated as Effective, with an overall weighted mean of 3.43. This reflects the positive role faculty members play in assisting student-athletes in balancing their academic and athletic responsibilities.

The high ratings for indicators such as "Faculty members provide clear and consistent guidance on managing academic and athletic responsibilities" and "Professors offer flexible accommodation for academic deadlines when conflicts with athletic events occur" (both with a mean of 3.43) align with Patterson and Thomas's (2021) findings, which emphasize that faculty members serve as mentors and advocates for student-athletes, offering crucial academic advice and flexibility to accommodate their athletic commitments. Similarly, the effective support indicated by "Faculty members actively encourage student-athletes to seek

academic assistance when needed" (mean = 3.45) reflects Anderson and Lee's (2022) argument that faculty support fosters strong relationships with student-athletes, creating an environment of mutual respect and understanding.

The indicator "Faculty members are approachable and willing to provide additional academic support outside of regular class hours" (mean = 3.43) also supports the view of Carter and Green (2023), who highlight the importance of faculty support in helping student-athletes manage time and balance academic and athletic schedules. Faculty members who understand these constraints can offer flexibility, allowing student-athletes to engage fully in both spheres.

In conclusion, the Effective ratings across all indicators suggest that faculty members play a vital role in ensuring student-athletes thrive academically without being overwhelmed by the dual demands of sports and studies, consistent with the views expressed by Taylor and Jackson (2023).

4. What is the student-athlete's level of sports performance in terms of:

Tables 12 to 15 present a comprehensive overview of the statistical analyses conducted in the study. These tables detail the results related to the research questions and hypotheses, showcasing the significance of the findings

Table 12

4.1 Quality of Coaching

Summary of respondents' level of sports performance in terms of Quality of Coaching.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. The coach provides clear and effective feedback to improve my skills in sports.	3.64	Very Effective
2. The coach incorporates strategies to help me balance my academic and athletic responsibilities	3.57	Very Effective
3. The coaching sessions are well-structured and tailored to address both individual and team needs.	3.59	Very Effective

4. The coach motivates me to perform better academically and athletically through encouragement and guidance.	3.58	Very Effective
5. The coach regularly monitors and supports my academic progress while emphasizing the importance of education.	3.59	Very Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.60	Very Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The results in Table 12 demonstrate that student-athletes perceive the quality of coaching they receive as very effective, with a high overall weighted mean of 3.60. This reflects strong satisfaction with their coaches' ability to support both athletic and academic development.

This aligns with Davis and Carter (2021), who emphasized that effective coaches provide not only technical guidance but also emotional and motivational support, which is critical in shaping an athlete's overall growth. The top-rated indicator, "The coach provides clear and effective feedback to improve my skills in sports" ($\bar{x} = 3.64$), reflects what Turner and Greene (2021) described as the importance of constructive feedback and clear goal-setting in fostering a growth mindset.

Additionally, the high ratings for statements like "The coach incorporates strategies to help me balance my academic and athletic responsibilities" ($\bar{x} = 3.57$) and "The coach regularly monitors and supports my academic progress" ($\bar{x} = 3.59$) affirm the idea of holistic coaching practices. As Lee and Yang (2022) noted, quality coaches focus on the overall well-being of their athletes including academic and personal development building trust and commitment.

Moreover, the structured and individualized coaching sessions ($\bar{x} = 3.59$) resonate with Collins and Brown's (2023) assertion that tailoring coaching methods to individual athlete needs enhances performance and reduces burnout. These findings underscore the critical role of high-quality coaching in creating a balanced and supportive environment for student-athletes to excel both in the classroom and in sports.

Table 13

4.2 Facilities and Equipment

Summary of respondents' level of sports performance in terms of Facilities and Equipment.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. The availability of well-maintained sports facilities supports my performance in both sports and academics.	3.49	Effective
2. The equipment provided for sports activities is sufficient and meets the needs of training and competitions.	3.40	Effective
3. Access to sports facilities is scheduled and managed in a way that does not conflict with my academic commitments.	3.46	Effective
4. The quality of sports equipment contributes to my ability to perform well in athletic activities.	3.41	Effective
5. The school's provision of adequate facilities and equipment positively impacts my academic performance and focus.	3.49	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.45	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

The data presented in Table 13 shows that student-athletes generally perceive the school's facilities and equipment as effective, with an overall weighted mean of 3.45. This rating reflects a positive evaluation of the physical resources supporting both academic and athletic performance.

The indicators with the highest weighted means “The availability of well-maintained sports facilities supports my performance in both sports and academics” and “The school's provision of adequate facilities and equipment positively impacts my academic performance and focus” both scored 3.49, suggesting that the physical training environment plays a critical role in shaping student-athletes' holistic development.

This aligns with the view of White and Carter (2020), who emphasized that access to modern, well-maintained facilities enables athletes to train safely and effectively. The proper maintenance and availability of these facilities ensure that training is conducted in an optimal environment, promoting skill development and reducing injury risks (James & Taylor, 2020).

The availability of sufficient and quality sports equipment, while rated slightly lower at 3.40, still

falls within the "Effective" range. This suggests that while the current resources are adequate, there may be a need for further upgrades or more consistent provision to fully meet athletes' needs. According to Harrison and Lee (2022), the provision of specialized tools such as fitness equipment and training aids is essential for developing athletic strength, endurance, and precision.

Moreover, Smith and Peterson (2021) noted that investment in high-quality facilities and equipment demonstrates institutional support for athlete development, which in turn can boost motivation and performance. Additionally, modern training environments that integrate technological tools like video analysis and motion tracking can elevate the training experience by offering real-time feedback and performance insights (Wang & Adams, 2023).

In summary, the table indicates that the facilities and equipment provided are generally effective in meeting the needs of student-athletes. However, continuous enhancement and integration of modern resources may further improve training quality and academic-athletic balance.

Table 14

4.3 Coaching and Training

Summary of respondents' level of sports performance in terms of Coaching and Training.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. I feel that the coaching I receive helps me perform at my best during sports activities.	3.57	Very Effective
2. The training I undergo positively influences my academic performance by improving my focus and discipline.	3.61	Very Effective
3. I am able to balance my sports and academic responsibilities effectively due to the support I receive from my coach.	3.53	Very Effective
4. My coach provides me with the necessary guidance and feedback that enhances both my sports performance and academic outcomes.	3.54	Very Effective
5. The skills I gain from sports coaching, such as time management and teamwork, contribute to my success in academic tasks.	3.60	Very Effective

Overall Weighted Mean**3.57****Very Effective**

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

Table 14 presents the respondents' evaluation of the effectiveness of coaching and training in supporting both their athletic and academic responsibilities. The overall weighted mean of 3.57, interpreted as "Very Effective," reflects a strong agreement among student-athletes that the coaching and training they receive play a pivotal role in their overall development.

The highest-rated item, "The training I undergo positively influences my academic performance by improving my focus and discipline" ($\bar{x} = 3.61$), highlights the broader impact of athletic training beyond physical improvement. According to Jackson and Bell (2021), high-quality coaching encompasses not only physical conditioning but also psychological preparation—building focus, resilience, and mental toughness that are vital to excelling in both sports and academics.

In addition, the item "The skills I gain from sports coaching, such as time management and teamwork, contribute to my success in academic tasks" ($\bar{x} = 3.60$) supports the view of Robinson and King (2020), who emphasize that adaptive coaching, tailored to an athlete's strengths and learning preferences, helps develop essential life skills like time management and collaboration. These skills are highly transferable to academic environments, aiding in better performance and balance.

Indicators such as "My coach provides me with the necessary guidance and feedback that enhances both my sports performance and academic outcomes" ($\bar{x} = 3.54$) and "I am able to balance my sports and academic responsibilities effectively due to the support I receive from my coach" ($\bar{x} = 3.53$) further reflect the effectiveness of holistic coaching approaches. Davis and Walker (2020) advocate for personalized training programs that support steady progress while reducing injury risks mirroring the student-athletes' experiences of feeling well-supported across domains.

Moreover, Johnson and Harris (2022) stress the importance of guidance on areas like nutrition, rest, and recovery elements that may indirectly support academic engagement through improved health and energy

levels. The result “The coach motivates me to perform better academically and athletically through encouragement and guidance” ($\bar{x} = 3.58$) aligns with this integrated model of coaching.

Lastly, Miller and Thompson (2023) emphasize that specialized, sport-specific training not only prepares athletes physically but also equips them with strategies and endurance needed for peak performance evident in how respondents view their training experiences as enhancing both sport and academic capacities.

Table 15

4.4 Athletic Competition

Summary of respondents' level of sports performance in terms of Athletic Competition.

Indicators	Respondents' Rating	
	$\bar{x}$	VI
1. I consistently perform well in athletic competitions.	3.29	Effective
2. My academic performance is positively influenced by my involvement in athletic competitions.	3.37	Effective
3. I manage to balance my athletic training and academic responsibilities effectively.	3.41	Effective
4. Competing in sports motivates me to perform better academically.	3.45	Effective
5. I feel that my athletic achievements enhance my academic performance and vice versa.	3.50	Effective
Overall Weighted Mean	3.41	Effective

Legend: $\bar{x}$ = weighted mean; VI = Verbal Interpretation; 3.51 – 4.50 = Very Effective; 2.51 – 3.50 = Effective; 1.51 – 2.50 = Slightly Effective; 1.00 – 1.50 = Ineffective

Table 15 presents the respondents' assessments of how athletic competition influences their performance in both academics and sports. With an overall weighted mean of 3.41, verbally interpreted as "Effective," the findings suggest that student-athletes view their involvement in athletic competitions as a meaningful contributor to their personal development and academic focus.

The highest-rated item, “I feel that my athletic achievements enhance my academic performance and vice versa” ($\bar{x} = 3.50$), indicates a strong perceived interconnectedness between success in sports and

academics. This supports the claim by Jones and Clark (2023) that athletic competitions are essential platforms for athletes to showcase skills, track progress, and build a competitive mindset that benefits multiple areas of life, including academics.

Similarly, the statement “Competing in sports motivates me to perform better academically” ($\bar{x} = 3.45$) highlights how competition drives student-athletes to maintain a disciplined lifestyle and academic motivation, echoing Miller and Edwards’ (2021) assertion that the pressure and intensity of sports enhance an athlete’s resilience, discipline, and self-confidence.

The item “I manage to balance my athletic training and academic responsibilities effectively” ($\bar{x} = 3.41$) suggests that student-athletes are developing the necessary time management and prioritization skills to handle dual roles effectively. As Davis and Green (2022) note, learning to cope with setbacks and pressure during competitions contributes significantly to an athlete’s mental toughness and personal growth.

Although the lowest-rated item, “I consistently perform well in athletic competitions” ($\bar{x} = 3.29$), still falls within the “Effective” range, it may reflect challenges related to performance consistency. This could be influenced by the competitive level, pressure, or external factors. As Smith and Roberts (2020) point out, competition fosters teamwork and shared goals, suggesting that strengthening peer support systems could help athletes improve performance confidence.

5. Is there a significant difference on the extent of institutional support to student athletes when grouped according to profile?

Tables 16 to 18 provide an analysis of the statistical comparisons evaluating the extent of institutional support available to student-athletes based on age, sex, and years of experience in sports. These tables present the results from one-way ANOVA and t-tests, revealing any significant differences concerning academic advising, financial aid, administrative support, and counseling services.

Table 16

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the extent of institutional support to student athletes when grouped according to Age.

Areas of Extent	Age (in years)					F	p-value	Interpretation
	11-12	13-14	14-15	15-16	17			
Academic Advising	3.36	3.45	3.54	3.56	3.49	0.68	.61	Not significant
Financial Aid	3.07	3.38	3.36	3.36	3.33	0.77	.55	Not significant
Administrative Support	3.11	3.41	3.46	3.46	3.46	1.48	.21	Not significant
Counseling Services	3.38	3.42	3.50	3.50	3.45	0.55	.70	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 4/232$

Table 16 presents a summary of the one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes when categorized by age. The table includes computed p-values reflecting the distinctions regarding various types of support: academic advising ($F=0.68$, $p=.61$), financial aid ($F=0.77$, $p=.55$), administrative support ($F=1.48$, $p=.21$), and counseling services ($F=0.55$, $p=.70$). All p-values exceeded the threshold of $p=0.05$, indicating that the results were statistically non-significant. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that there is no significant difference in the extent of institutional support available to student-athletes based on their age.

The implication of these findings indicates that age does not play a significant role in the perception or availability of institutional support among student-athletes. This lack of variability suggests that institutions may need to examine other factors, such as academic standing or the specific needs of different age groups, to enhance the effectiveness of their support services. Addressing any underlying issues or barriers that could influence how various age groups perceive and access support may ultimately lead to improved outcomes for all student-athletes.

Table 17

Summary of t-test results comparing the significant difference on the extent of institutional support to student athletes when grouped according to Sex.

Areas of Extent	Sex		t value	p-value	Interpretation
	Male	Female			
Academic Advising	3.54	3.47	1.04	.30	Not Significant
Financial Aid	3.33	3.37	-0.46	.65	Not significant
Administrative Support	3.44	3.42	0.38	.70	Not Significant
Counseling Services	3.47	3.44	0.40	.69	Not Significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 235$

Table 17 presents a summary of the t-test results comparing the significant differences in the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes when categorized by sex. The table includes the computed p-values regarding various types of support: academic advising ($t=1.04$, $p=.30$), financial aid ($t=-0.46$, $p=.65$), administrative support ($t=0.38$, $p=.70$), and counseling services ($t=0.40$, $p=.69$). All p-values are statistically non-significant as they exceed the threshold of $p=0.05$.

These findings suggest that sex does not significantly influence the level of institutional support available to student-athletes. This indicates a uniformity in how support services are perceived and accessed by male and female athletes. While this may reflect positively on the equitable distribution of resources across genders, it also raises questions about whether specific gender-related needs are being adequately addressed within these support services. Thus, institutions may need to further investigate the qualitative aspects of how support is provided and ensure it aligns with the distinct challenges faced by male and female student-athletes, ultimately enhancing their overall experience and success.

Table 18

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the extent of institutional support to student athletes when grouped according to Years as an Athlete.

Areas of Extent	Years as an Athlete				F	p-value	Interpretation
	1 to 3	4 to 5	6 to 8	10 above			
Academic Advising	3.49	3.53	3.53	3.49	0.08	.97	Not significant
Financial Aid	3.35	3.37	3.38	3.29	0.13	.94	Not significant
Administrative Support	3.42	3.50	3.50	3.30	0.95	.42	Not significant
Counseling Services	3.45	3.51	3.44	3.45	0.11	.96	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 3/233$

Table 18 reveals the summary of the one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes when categorized by years of participation in athletics. The results consist of computed p-values for various types of support: academic advising ($F=0.08$, $p=.97$), financial aid ($F=0.13$, $p=.94$), administrative support ($F=0.95$, $p=.42$), and counseling services ($F=0.11$, $p=.96$). All p-values exceed the significance level of 0.05, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference in the extent of institutional support received by student-athletes based on their years of experience in sports. This suggests that the level of support offered by the institution is perceived as consistent, regardless of the duration of athletic involvement.

These findings indicate that institutions may be providing a uniform level of support to all student-athletes, irrespective of how long they have been competing. While this consistency can be seen as a positive aspect, it raises the question of whether the needs of both novice and seasoned athletes are being adequately addressed. More experienced athletes may require different types of support or resources suited to their advanced stage in sports, such as specialized guidance for career transitions or elite performance enhancement. Therefore, it is essential for institutions to evaluate and tailor their support systems to ensure they meet the diverse and evolving needs of student-athletes throughout their athletic careers.

6. Is there a significant difference on the student-athlete's level of academic performance when grouped according to profile?

Tables 19 to 21 present a comprehensive overview of advanced statistical analyses conducted to explore the relationships between institutional support and various outcomes for student-athletes. These tables summarize findings from correlation analyses and regression models, highlighting how different forms of support relate to academic performance, athletic achievements, and overall student well-being.

Table 19

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the student-athlete's level of academic performance when grouped according to Age.

Areas of Difference	Age (in years)					F	p-value	Interpretation
	11-12	13-14	14-15	15-16	17			
Academic Development	3.38	3.33	3.55	3.44	3.29	1.71	.15	Not significant
Career Counseling	3.24	3.28	3.46	3.47	3.26	1.48	.21	Not significant
Tutoring Services	2.73	2.94	3.17	3.27	3.06	2.33	.06	Not significant
Faculty Support	3.42	3.39	3.48	3.48	3.34	0.62	.65	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 4/232$

Table 19 presents the summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in student-athletes' academic performance when grouped according to age. The results show the computed p-values for the following variables: academic development ($F=1.71$, $p=.15$), career counseling ($F=1.48$, $p=.21$), tutoring services ($F=2.33$, $p=.06$), and faculty support ($F=0.62$, $p=.65$). Since all p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in student-athletes' academic performance across the different age groups. This indicates that the level of academic performance, in terms of the areas studied, does not vary significantly based on the age of the student-athletes.

These findings suggest that age does not play a crucial role in influencing academic performance among student-athletes. This uniformity may indicate that institutions provide comparable levels of support and resources across age groups, promoting a consistent academic performance. However, it also highlights the need for schools to consider whether other factors, such as individual motivation or specific support requirements, may be influencing academic outcomes. Tailoring support strategies to address the unique needs of student-athletes, regardless of age, could enhance their overall academic success.

Table 20

Summary of t-test results comparing the significant difference on the student-athlete's level of academic performance when grouped according to Sex.

Areas of Difference	Sex		t value	p-value	Interpretation
	Male	Female			
Academic Development	3.41	3.41	-0.05	.96	Not Significant
Career Counseling	3.39	3.35	0.41	.68	Not significant
Tutoring Services	3.19	2.99	2.02	.04	Significant
Faculty Support	3.41	3.45	-0.59	.56	Not Significant

Legend: $p < .05$; df = 235

Table 20 presents the summary of t-test results comparing the significant differences in student-athletes' level of academic performance when grouped according to sex. The results show the computed p-values for the following variables: academic development ($t=-0.05$, $p=.96$), career counseling ($t=0.41$, $p=.68$), tutoring services ($t=2.02$, $p=.04$), and faculty support ($t=-0.59$, $p=.56$). Since the p-value for tutoring services is less than 0.05, there is a significant difference in academic performance between male and female student-athletes concerning tutoring services. However, for academic development, career counseling, and faculty support, the p-values are greater than 0.05, indicating no statistically significant differences in academic performance based on sex.

In summary, only the tutoring services variable shows a significant difference, suggesting that sex influences academic performance in this area. **The null hypothesis is rejected** for tutoring services, indicating that male and female student-athletes perform differently.

Overall, while academic performance may not vary significantly based on sex in most areas, the observed difference in tutoring services highlights the need for institutions to evaluate and potentially enhance these services. Tailoring tutoring approaches to better meet the distinct needs of male and female student-athletes could lead to improved academic outcomes and a more equitable educational environment.

Table 21

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the student-athlete's level of academic performance when grouped according to Years as an Athlete.

Areas of Difference	Years as an Athlete				F	p-value	Interpretation
	1 to 3	4 to 5	6 to 8	10 above			
Academic Development	3.40	3.63	3.30	3.41	1.51	.21	Not significant
Career Counseling	3.38	3.48	3.32	3.26	0.50	.68	Not significant
Tutoring Services	3.06	3.44	3.04	2.98	1.89	.13	Not significant
Faculty Support	3.44	3.44	3.40	3.41	0.05	.99	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 3/233$

Table 21 presents the summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in student-athletes' level of academic performance when grouped according to years of experience as an athlete. The results reveal the computed p-values for the following variables: academic development ($F=1.51$, $p=.21$), career counseling ($F=0.50$, $p=.68$), tutoring services ($F=1.89$, $p=.13$), and faculty support ($F=0.05$, $p=.99$). Since all p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in student-athletes' academic performance across the different groups based on their years of athletic participation. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected**, indicating that the level of academic performance, in the areas studied, does not significantly vary depending on how long the students have been involved in athletics.

Overall, the institutional support and resources related to academic performance appear to be uniformly effective across varying levels of athletic experience. This suggests that all student-athletes, regardless of tenure, face similar academic challenges and have access to comparable support services. However, it also highlights a potential oversight in addressing the unique needs that different stages of athletic experience may bring. Institutions may want to consider developing targeted support strategies that cater to the specific requirements of both novice and experienced athletes to enhance their academic performance.

7. Is there a significant difference on the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to their profile?

Tables 22 to 24 examine whether there is a significant difference in the level of student-athletes'

performance in sports when grouped according to their demographic profiles. These tables present the findings from various statistical analyses, including one-way ANOVA and t-tests, assessing how factors such as age, sex, and years of athletic experience influence performance outcomes.

Table 22

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to Age.

Areas of Difference	Age (in years)					F	p-value	Interpretation
	11-12	13-14	14-15	15-16	17			
Quality of Coaching	3.89	3.59	3.65	3.57	3.44	1.74	.14	Not significant
Facilities and Equipment	3.62	3.42	3.48	3.49	3.30	0.93	.45	Not significant
Coaching and Training	3.78	3.61	3.59	3.56	3.40	1.45	.22	Not significant
Athletic competitions	3.49	3.37	3.51	3.42	3.24	1.19	.32	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 4/232$

Table 22 presents the summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to age. The results include the computed p-values for the following variables: quality of coaching ($F=1.74$, $p=.14$), facilities and equipment ($F=0.93$, $p=.45$), coaching and training ($F=1.45$, $p=.22$), and athletic competitions ($F=1.19$, $p=.32$). Since all p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in student-athletes' performance in sports across the different age groups. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected,** indicating that performance levels in sports, concerning the studied areas, do not vary significantly based on the age of the student-athletes.

The implication of these findings suggests that age does not significantly influence the performance of student-athletes in sports. This uniformity may indicate that all age groups receive similar levels of coaching, access to facilities, and participation in competitions, contributing to a consistent performance outcome across athletes. However, it also raises the question of whether the unique experiences and needs of different age groups are being addressed adequately. Institutions might consider implementing age-specific

strategies to foster development and enhance performance, ensuring that both younger and older student-athletes receive tailored support that may lead to improved athletic achievements.

Table 23

Summary of t-test results comparing the significant difference on the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to Sex.

Areas of Difference	Sex		<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> -value	Interpretation
	Male	Female			
Quality of Coaching	3.54	3.64	-1.39	.17	Not Significant
Facilities and Equipment	3.42	3.48	-0.79	.43	Not significant
Coaching and Training	3.51	3.63	-1.61	.11	Not Significant
Athletic competitions	3.38	3.43	-0.63	.53	Not Significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 235$

Table 23 presents the summary of t-test results comparing the significant differences in the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to sex. The results show the computed *p*-values for the following variables: quality of coaching ($t=-1.39$, $p=.17$), facilities and equipment ($t=-0.79$, $p=.43$), coaching and training ($t=-1.61$, $p=.11$), and athletic competitions ($t=-0.63$, $p=.53$). Since all *p*-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in student-athletes' performance in sports between male and female athletes. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected,** indicating that performance levels in sports, concerning the studied areas, do not significantly vary between male and female student-athletes.

In summary, both male and female student-athletes experience similar levels of performance across the assessed variables. This indicates that institutional support, such as coaching quality and access to

facilities, is likely provided equitably, contributing to consistent performance outcomes in sports regardless of sex. However, it also raises the need for further analysis to ensure that both genders are receiving adequate resources, attention, and tailored training programs that consider potential differences in approach or engagement. Institutions may want to investigate whether there are other influences, such as individual motivation or psychological factors, that could impact performance beyond the scope of the examined variables.

Table 24

Summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant difference on the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to Years as an Athlete.

Areas of Difference	Years as an Athlete				<i>F</i>	<i>p</i> -value	Interpretation
	1 to 3	4 to 5	6 to 8	10 above			
Quality of Coaching	3.57	3.60	3.53	3.88	2.20	.09	Not significant
Facilities and Equipment	3.43	3.49	3.37	3.61	0.78	.51	Not significant
Coaching and Training	3.57	3.59	3.43	3.70	1.09	.35	Not significant
Athletic competitions	3.40	3.55	3.28	3.49	0.95	.42	Not significant

Legend: $p < .05$; $df = 3/233$

Table 24 presents the summary of one-way ANOVA results comparing the significant differences in the level of student-athletes' performance in sports when grouped according to years of experience as an

athlete. The results indicate the computed p-values for the following variables: quality of coaching ($F=2.20$, $p=.09$), facilities and equipment ($F=0.78$, $p=.51$), coaching and training ($F=1.09$, $p=.35$), and athletic competitions ($F=0.95$, $p=.42$). Since all p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, there is no statistically significant difference in student-athletes' performance in sports across different years of experience. **Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected**, indicating that performance levels in sports, concerning the studied areas, do not significantly vary based on how long the student-athletes have participated in sports.

Overall, the duration of experience as an athlete does not have a significant impact on performance outcomes in the assessed areas. This uniformity may indicate that all student-athletes, regardless of their experience, are receiving similar levels of coaching and support, leading to comparable performance results. However, this also prompts a consideration of whether additional variables, such as individual training methods or personal motivation, play a more critical role in performance than mere years of participation. Institutions may want to explore how to enhance or differentiate training approaches to ensure that both novice and experienced athletes continue to develop their skills effectively, potentially leading to improved performance across all levels of experience.

8. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance, as well as the relationship between their athletic performance in sports and their academic achievements?

Tables 25 and 26 explore the significant relationships between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance, as well as the relationship between athletic performance and academic achievements. These tables present the results of correlation and regression analyses, revealing how various dimensions of institutional support influence both academic outcomes and athletic success.

Table 25

Significant relationship between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance.

Institutional Support	Correlation	Academic Performance				
		Academic Development	Career Counseling	Tutoring Services	Faculty Support	Overall
Academic Advising	Pearson r	.369**	.375**	.352**	.449**	.386**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Financial Aid	Pearson r	.259**	.396**	.337**	.398**	.348**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Administrative Support	Pearson r	.371**	.533**	.412**	.524**	.460**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Counseling Services	Pearson r	.394**	.529**	.375**	.581**	.470**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Overall	Pearson r	.348**	.458**	.369**	.488**	.416**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant

Note: **. Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Data from Table 25 reveals the relationship between the extent of institutional support provided to student-athletes and their academic performance, as perceived by the respondents. Computed correlations demonstrate significant relationships: academic advising ($r=.386$), financial aid ($r=.348$), administrative support ($r=.460$), and counseling services ($r=.470$) all show a statistically significant p-value of .000 when related to various aspects of academic performance, including academic development, career counseling, tutoring services, and faculty support. Given these strong correlations, **the null hypothesis is rejected**, indicating that there is a significant positive relationship between institutional support and academic performance.

Overall, stronger institutional support is associated with improved academic performance among student-athletes. This underscores the importance of providing comprehensive support services, such as quality academic advising, financial aid, administrative assistance, and counseling, to enhance student outcomes. Institutions should consider investing in and prioritizing these support systems, as they play a crucial role in facilitating not only academic success but also the overall development of student-athletes.

Table 26

Significant relationship between the athletic performance in sports and their academic achievements.

Sports Performance	Correlation	Academic Performance				
		Academic Development	Career Counseling	Tutoring Services	Faculty Support	Overall
Quality of Coaching	Pearson r	.502**	.521**	.354**	.608**	.496**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Facilities and Equipment	Pearson r	.580**	.648**	.425**	.692**	.586**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Coaching and Training	Pearson r	.566**	.579**	.321**	.651**	.529**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Athletic Competitions	Pearson r	.656**	.612**	.502**	.647**	.604**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant
Overall	Pearson r	.576**	.590**	.401**	.650**	.554**
	p-value	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant

Note: **. Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Data from Table 26 reveals the relationship between athletic performance in sports and academic achievements, as perceived by the respondents. The computed r values indicate strong positive correlations: quality of coaching ($r = .502$), facilities and equipment ($r = .580$), coaching and training ($r = .566$), athletic competitions ($r = .656$), and overall sports performance ($r = .576$) all show statistically significant relationships with various dimensions of academic performance, including academic development, career

counseling, tutoring services, faculty support, and overall academic performance, with a p-value of .000.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating a significant positive relationship between athletic performance and academic achievements.

These findings suggest that improvements in athletic performance are strongly linked to academic success among student-athletes. This underscores the importance of providing comprehensive resources such as quality coaching, adequate facilities, and supportive athletic environments, as they not only enhance sports performance but also positively impact academic outcomes. Institutions should recognize the interconnection between athletics and academics and consider strategies that foster both areas simultaneously, prioritizing integrated support systems that benefit student-athletes holistically. By advocating for policies that bolster athletic programs, schools may find that fostering athletic excellence contributes significantly to academic achievements, creating a complementary environment for student-athlete success.

9. Based on the result of the study, what training program may be proposed?

Athletic-Academic Development Training Program for Student-Athletes

Summary of Findings

Based on the analysis and interpretation of data, the following are the findings of the study:

The demographic profile of the respondents reveals a diverse range of characteristics, with significant representation across various age groups, a nearly even split between male and female athletes, and a wide range of experience levels. This diversity offers a broad perspective on the impact of institutional support on student-athletes at different stages in their careers.

Respondents rated institutional support, including academic advising, financial aid, administrative support, and counseling services, as moderately effective. While academic advising received the highest rating, highlighting its positive influence on balancing academic and athletic commitments, other areas like

financial aid and counseling services indicated room for improvement to better address the comprehensive needs of student-athletes.

In terms of academic performance, student-athletes demonstrated effective engagement, particularly in class participation and balancing study with training. However, there remains a need for improvement in seeking academic assistance. Similarly, sports performance was rated as generally effective, with coaching quality recognized as a significant factor, indicating a strong relationship between effective coaching and student achievement.

The analysis showed no significant differences in the level of institutional support, academic performance, or sports performance when grouped according to age, sex, or years as an athlete. This suggests a consistent level of support and performance across different demographic factors, indicating that institutional resources are accessible and applied uniformly among student-athletes.

Furthermore, a correlation analysis uncovered significant relationships between institutional support and academic performance, and between athletic performance and academic achievements. This highlights the interconnectedness of academic and athletic success, emphasizing the importance of comprehensive support strategies that cater to both domains for student-athletes. Overall, the findings suggest that while current support systems are effective, there are opportunities for enhancement to further bolster both academic and athletic outcomes.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study from the gathered data, the following conclusions were formulated:

The findings suggest that the demographic diversity among student-athletes contributes to a broad understanding of how institutional support impacts performance. The nearly balanced representation of genders indicates that both male and female athletes receive equitable opportunities, fostering an inclusive athletic environment.

The moderate effectiveness ratings for institutional support services reveal that while some areas, such as academic advising, are positively impacting student-athletes, others, like financial aid and counseling, could be improved to better meet their diverse needs. This necessitates a reassessment of these services to ensure comprehensive support for academic and athletic balance.

The effective engagement of student-athletes in academic activities, coupled with generally effective sports performance ratings, indicates that the dual focus on academics and athletics is resonating well with the athletes. However, the need for improvement in seeking academic assistance suggests that student-athletes might not fully utilize available resources, pointing to a gap in promoting awareness and accessibility of academic support.

The consistency of support levels and performance across different demographic groups underscores the institution's commitment to providing equal opportunities, regardless of age, sex, or experience. This suggests that the current institutional framework is effectively maintaining uniformity in support of accessibility, thus promoting inclusivity.

Finally, the significant correlations between institutional support and academic performance, and between athletic performance and academic achievements, highlight the interconnected nature of these domains. This reinforces the importance of implementing integrated support strategies that address both academic and athletic needs, ultimately leading to enhanced outcomes for student-athletes in both areas.

Recommendations

Based on the formulated conclusions, the following recommendations were formulated for specific beneficiaries of the study:

1. **Coaches and Trainers.** Coaches should adopt a balanced approach to coaching, focusing on time management and communication to help student-athletes balance academics and sports. Regular

workshops on coaching techniques and awareness of institutional support services should be implemented.

2. **Educational Institutions.** Schools should improve institutional support, focusing on financial aid, counseling services, and enhanced academic advising. Schools should also strengthen the integration of sports programs with academic support systems to help student-athletes manage both responsibilities.
3. **Sports Program Coordinators.** Coaches should adopt a balanced approach to coaching, focusing on time management and communication to help student-athletes balance academics and sports. Regular workshops on coaching techniques and awareness of institutional support services should be implemented.
4. **Athletes and Student-Athletes.** Student-athletes should actively engage in academic support services and time management workshops. They should also seek mentoring from coaches and peers to balance academic and athletic demands effectively.
5. **Sports Organizations and Governing Bodies.** Sports organizations should collaborate with schools to offer better support, including scholarships and mentorship programs. They should emphasize inclusive practices and gender diversity in sports activities.
6. **Policy Makers and Education Authorities.** Policy makers should focus on providing equitable resources for student-athletes, particularly in financial aid and mental health services. Policies should also promote better coordination between academic and athletic support systems.
7. **Institutional Administrators.** Administrators should improve awareness of support services and implement a feedback system for student-athletes to enhance support effectiveness.
8. **Parents and Guardians of Student-Athletes.** Parents should encourage their children to utilize support services and help foster a balance between academic and athletic responsibilities at home.

9. **Community Leaders and Local Government Units (LGUs).** LGUs should provide resources for training and academic development for student-athletes. They can also collaborate with schools to offer community-based sports programs and scholarships.

References

- Anderson, D., & Lee, M. (2022). Faculty support for student-athletes: Building relationships and providing guidance. *Journal of Higher Education*, 45(3), 123-135.
- Anderson, G. (2020). The impact of personalized academic advising on student retention and graduation rates. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 22(3), 267-286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869319831272>
- Bahr, P. R. (2020). Proactive advising models and their effect on student outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 91(4), 434-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1734568>
- Becker, M., & Garcia, R. (2021). The role of financial aid in supporting student-athletes' academic and athletic goals. *Journal of College Student Affairs*, 39(4), 201-215.
- Brow, L., & Parker, J. (2023). Administrative support and retention rates among student-athletes. *College and University Review*, 61(2), 154-167.
- Carter, S., & Thompson, P. (2020). The impact of academic advising on student-athletes' attitudes toward education. *Journal of Academic Advising*, 27(1), 76-88
- Evans, T., & Harris, R. (2021). Counseling services: Addressing the personal challenges of student-athletes. *Journal of Student Counseling*, 34(4), 209-221.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Wright, K. (2023). Mental health support for student-athletes: The role of counseling services. *Psychology of Sports*, 48(5), 334-346.
- Finn, R., Reyes, G., & Macdonald, P. (2020). Administrative support in student-athlete success: A holistic approach. *Athletic Administration Quarterly*, 14(2), 50-65.
- Green, A., & Allen, L. (2022). The role of tutoring services in supporting student-athletes' academic success. *Journal of Educational Support*, 22(3), 99-112.
- Green, A., & Walker, T. (2023). Counseling services for diverse student-athletes: Addressing cultural and social factors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling*, 36(1), 66-78.
- Green, A., & Wilson, L. (2023). Academic development programs for student-athletes: Overcoming academic challenges. *Educational Leadership Journal*, 60(2), 147-160.
- Habley, W. R., & Bloom, J. L. (2021). The effects of academic advising on student learning outcomes: The role of advising in academic and personal development. *NACADA Journal*, 41(1), 7-19.

<https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-19-38>

- Habley, W. R., & McClanahan, R. (2019). Academic advising as a key to student success: Aligning academic goals with institutional objectives. *Journal of College Student Development*, 60(2), 181-194. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0021>
- Johnson, P., & Miller, K. (2022). Counseling services and burnout prevention for student-athletes. *Journal of Sports Psychology*, 41(2), 121-134.
- Johnson, T., Wilson, D., & Lee, M. (2021). Financial aid and student-athlete success: A comprehensive analysis. *Journal of College Athletics*, 39(5), 189-202.
- Jones, D., Wilson, L., & Carter, S. (2021). Academic advising and student-athletes: The link to improved academic outcomes. *Journal of Educational Success*, 53(4), 145-159.
- Kim, S., & Xu, D. (2021). Variations in academic advising models and their effectiveness across institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 62(5), 557-576. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-021-09613-2>
- Larson, T., & Smith, P. (2021). Tutoring services for student-athletes: A personalized approach to academic success. *Journal of Academic Support Services*, 30(3), 113-126.
- Leach, M., & Drew, S. (2019). Academic advising practices and student retention rates at a public university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy*, 42(2), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1506583>
- Martin, R., & Robinson, L. (2022). Administrative support for student-athletes: Ensuring equitable access to resources. *Journal of Sports Administration*, 24(2), 75-88.
- McCluskey, J., & Schmitz, K. (2022). Faculty-driven academic advising and its impact on student outcomes. *NACADA Journal*, 42(1), 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-21-45>
- Moore, D., & Peterson, S. (2022). Academic development programs: Building skills for student-athletes' success. *Journal of Academic Coaching*, 17(4), 198-210.
- Nodoushan, M. A. (2021). Academic advising and its effects on student engagement at a large university. *Journal of Student Engagement*, 8(4), 25-40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSE-04-2021-0145>
- Patterson, R., & Thomas, H. (2021). Faculty support for student-athletes: Mentoring and accommodations. *Journal of Higher Education*, 49(6), 233-245.
- Perkins, D. L., & Hossler, D. (2021). Early academic advising interventions for at-risk students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 62(3), 272-283. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2021.0025>
- Peterson, R., & Carter, S. (2021). Administrative support and collaboration: Enhancing the student-athlete experience. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 32(4), 88-101.
- Robinson, K. A., & Jones, A. (2020). Academic advising and career decision-making among undergraduates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 61(4), 369-382. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0025>

- Smith, C., & Walker, T. (2021). Technology-enhanced academic advising: Virtual tools for enhancing student engagement. *Journal of Academic Advising*, 24(2), 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42598-021-00045-y>
- Smith, J., & Jones, A. (2020). The emotional support role of academic advising for student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Advising*, 28(3), 94-106.
- Taylor, M., & Foster, C. (2021). Administrative support: Helping student-athletes build professional skills for the future. *Journal of College Career Services*, 22(2), 56-70.
- Taylor, M., & Jackson, R. (2023). Faculty support for student-athletes: Frameworks of accountability and encouragement. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 41(5), 212-225.
- Thompson, R., & Jackson, K. (2023). Counseling services: Building resilience and emotional regulation for student-athletes. *Sports Psychology Journal*, 34(1), 70-82.
- Tinto, V. (2020). Student persistence and academic advising: A critical link. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 21(2), 107-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869319854684>
- Wilson, J., & Carter, P. (2021). The role of tutoring services in promoting student-athletes' academic confidence. *Journal of Educational Support*, 35(2), 143-157.
- Zimmerman, A., & Lee, J. (2020). The long-term impact of financial aid on student-athlete success. *Journal of College Success*, 55(2), 78-91.