

Journal of Issues in **Intercollegiate Athletics**

College Athletes and Crime: The Role of Race, Age, and Peers and the Implications for Social Work Practice in College Sports

Emmett L. Gill, Jr

University of Texas at Austin

Almost every other day there is a news story about a college athletes' involvement in an alleged crime. Indeed, one Sports Illustrated investigation found that, over an eight-month period in 2010, the number of crimes committed by college athletes averaged one every other day (Benedict, 2010). The current study is a secondary data analysis of a sample of 371 media articles documenting the arrests of college athletes between 2010 and 2015. The current study explores differences in the mean number of crimes committed by college athletes' according to their classification, the number of perpetrators, and the perpetrators' race across seven different crime categories. The results did not yield any significant differences across classification or number of perpetrators. However, the results indicated White college athletes committed significantly more property and drug related crimes when compared to Black college athletes. The paper will close with a discussion on how athletic departments think about a) the vulnerability of White college athletes, b) utilizing cost of attendance stipends to deter property crimes, c) removing responsibility for disciplinary decisions for college athletes from athletics, and d) including social workers in counseling and case management services for college athletes.

Keywords: college sports, athlete, crime, social work

There has not been an empirical study that explores college athlete crimes and why they occur, with the exception of sexual assaults, in the last eighteen years. Yet, almost every other day there is a news story about a college athletes' involvement in an alleged crime. Criminal behavior among college athletes appears to be becoming more frequent, if not merely more reported, given the incessant sports media cycle. *Arrest Nation*, an online database that tracks arrest records of pro and college athletes, reported 111 arrests of college athletes in 2010, compared to 279 arrests in 2015 (*Arrest Nation*, 2016). According to Mike Rosen (2015), over the five-year period, between 2010 and 2015, there were over 900 arrests of college athletes in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS).

Greater attention to crimes committed by college athletes is needed given the increasing frequency and seriousness of their offenses. For example, in 2012, seven student athletes from the University of South Dakota were arrested for their connection to a tax-refund fraud ring that defrauded the IRS out of about \$400,000 (Cano, 2015). Between April and May 2015, five current and two former Rutgers's football players were involved in a string of crimes, including three separate home invasions and armed robberies, and one aggravated assault that left a 19-year old male student with a broken jaw (Duggan, 2015). The college athletes targeted drugs and money—in connection to the robberies, police discovered 93 grams of marijuana and approximately \$35,273 in drug sales (Bichao, 2015). All five current players were suspended from the team pending trial. Lastly, in June 2015, three Solano Community College women's basketball players were arrested for felony assault with a deadly weapon, felony vandalism leading to \$50,000 or more in damages, and felony conspiracy to commit a crime (Rogness, 2015).

Although college athletes' crimes have grabbed national attention, neither the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), nor NCAA member institutions have responded with research and evidence-based interventions to deter crime among college athletes (Benedict & Klein, 1998; Nelson, 1994). Traditionally, the NCAA has avoided issues of "crime and punishment" and other aspects of college sports that don't have a direct impact on fairness and competitive advantages (New, 2014). The NCAA has not had a policy related to student-athletes and crime for over four decades—with the exception of gambling. The latest responses have come from athletic conferences in the form of background checks and bans against transfer college athletes with criminal records.

Literature Review

There is only a handful of research on college athletes and crime and the majority of existing studies are descriptive media research and/or the focus is sexual assault crimes (Benedict & Klein, 1998; Crosset, Benedict, & McDonald, 1995; Melnick, 1992; Potrafke, 2006; Teel, 1997). Of the descriptive media studies, that do not focus on athletes and sexual assaults, one investigation indicated that over half of the crimes committed by college athletes were drug and alcohol-related (Martin, 2011). On the other hand, a descriptive analysis by ESPN found that the most frequent crime committed by college athletes was assault and battery, followed by drug and alcohol related crimes, theft and burglary, sexual assault, and weapons related crimes (Lavigne, 2015). Another descriptive analysis by Otto (2009) found that 52% of crimes

committed by athletes were sex crimes or rape, followed by battery (12%), and drugs or weapons charges (11%). The terms used in the literature search included college athletes and theft, fraud, drug crimes, property crimes, and alcohol crimes as well as college students and crime, theft and drug crimes. Nonetheless, the search did not produce any peer-reviewed literature on college athletes and crimes against persons, crimes against property, theft and fraud crimes, or crimes against public order. Due to the limited amount of empirical research on crime and college athletes the literature review will chiefly focus on a conceptual framework to contextualize the research questions.

There are two broad frames of reference important to research exploring college athletes' criminal behavior – psychosocial and age-related explanations. Snyder, Yiannakis, and Melnick (1994) proposed four reasons for criminal behavior among college athletes. The first identified cause was flawed character traits. Some college athletes were described as immature and others were characterized as “followers” with a poor self-image. Peer pressure was identified as a third explanation for deviant behavior among the athletes. Snyder and colleagues pointed out that there was an element of prestige that comes with committing crimes. The quest for excitement or the idea that the danger of committing a crime is thrilling to college athletes was Snyder and colleagues' final explanation for their criminal behavior.

In a related, but slightly different perspective, Hughes and Coakley (1991) explored positive deviance among college athletes and pointed out that they may engage in such behaviors because of a sense of duty and honor. Hughes and Coakley's perspective suggests that athletes' commitment to the norms of sport causes extreme behavior and could produce an excessive commitment towards deviance. Additionally, college athletes' vulnerabilities to athletic group demands and a strong desire to reaffirm their membership to the group can lead to over-conformity followed by positive deviance. The end result was that college athletes, in highly visible positions, may develop a self-image of superiority and the perception that they are above the law. The “win-at-all-costs” attitude of some college athletes may be related to their law breaking behavior. Smith and Stewart (2003) explored the role of competitive nature of sports in crime and found that a student athlete's competitive nature was a meaningful factor in crimes.

The second broad frame of reference important to the current study is the notion of the age distribution of crime including median age, peak ages, variations in crimes by age, and involvement in specific crime categories by age. Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) theorize that no criminological variables can account for the age distribution of crime. Sweeton, Piquero, and Steinber (2013) aimed to examine this theory in their longitudinal study of 1,354 serious adolescent offenders, between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, over a seven-year span. Contrary to Hirschi and Gottfredson, Sweeton and colleagues found that decreases in crime could be explained by co-occurring sociological and psychological changes. The strongest predictor of increases and decreases in crime are adolescents' peers. These findings are consistent with the notion that peer pressure (Snyder, Yiannakis, & Melnick, 1994) and positive deviance (Hughes & Coakley, 1991) influences crime among college athletes. Steffensmeier, Allan, Harer and Streifel (1989) explored the age-crime distribution over time and by offense type. The findings indicate that within the four offense-type groupings that there are offenses that peak early and decline quickly and others that peak later and decline more slowly. People under the age of 25 commit 75 percent of property crimes, but when it comes to crimes against persons, the median age was over 26 years of age. With respect to substance abuse crimes, in particular public drunkenness and driving under the influence, the median age was over 34 years of age. Steffensmeier, Allan, Harer and Streifel's (1989) results are consistent with Sampson and Laub's

(2003) finding of significantly differing peak ages for property and violent (mid-20's). as well as drug/alcohol (mid-30's). crimes. The aforementioned empirical findings and the conceptual frames are reflected in the following research questions.

Method

Research Questions

1. Is there a significant difference in the mean number of crimes committed by college athletes' according to their classification (Fr., Soph., Jr., and Sr.)?
2. Is there a significant difference in the mean number of crimes committed by college athletes' according to their classification and the type of crime?
3. Is there a significant difference in the mean number of crimes committed by individual college athletes versus crimes that include two or more college athletes (i.e., a group)
4. Is there a significant difference in the mean number of crimes committed by Black college athletes versus White college athletes?

Research Design

The current study was a secondary data analysis of a sample of 371 media articles documenting the arrests of college athletes between 2010 and 2015. In college football and basketball, the top conferences across the country are called the "Power 5" conferences.ⁱ

Sampling

The inclusion criteria included alleged crimes committed by student-athletes between 2010 and 2016 who competed in one of the five power conferences. Further, the articles had to include the alleged crime, the alleged perpetrator's name, the alleged perpetrator's sport, and their university. The exclusion criteria include alleged crimes committed by athletes outside of the power conferences and alleged crimes involving sexual assault.

The data were collected from several different credible national (i.e., information could be validated using one additional news source) and local news services.ⁱⁱ Descriptive and inferential analyses were completed using SPSS. The first inferential statistical method was Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). A series of ANOVA's were completed to explore the first two research questions because it is the appropriate inferential analysis to explore differences in means between two or more groups on one or more variables (Salkind, 2000). A *t*-test was used to explore research questions three and four because it is the appropriate inferential statistic to use when group means for two groups, on one or more variables, are compared to one another (Salkind, 2000).

In addition to the *t*-test for independent samples, the study included a descriptive analysis of college athlete demographic variables and the crime categories (The crimes under each category are listed in Appendix A). Seven "categories" of crimes were created including crimes against persons (25 crimes), crimes against property (9 crimes), theft and fraud crimes (11 crimes), crimes against public order (20 crimes), drug related crimes (14 crimes), traffic crimes (11 crimes), and weapon and alcohol crimes (11 crimes). There were 101 unique crimes

committed by college athletes, which the researcher separated into seven different categories, based on those used by the FBI Uniform Crime Reports, to simplify the dataset. The categories also help identify what areas of crime athletes were more likely to commit, which proves more helpful in analysis than simply listing out all the individual crimes.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

There were a total number of 362 males and nine females in the sample of 371 media accounts of alleged crimes by college athletes. White college athletes accounted for 34% of the arrests, Black college athletes accounted for 47.7% of the arrests, and 18% of the college athletes race could not be identified. Case deletion was used to address missing data. Twenty-one percent of the college athletes in the sample were freshmen, 25.6% were sophomores, 23.4% were juniors, 24.7% were seniors, and 4% were graduate students. Ninety-five percent of the sports college athletes in the sample participated in were concentrated in three sports - football, men's basketball, and women's basketball. Football athletes accounted for 73.6% of the arrests, men's basketball athletes 20.8% of the arrests, and women's basketball athletes 1.1% of the arrests. When looking at the "Power" Conferences 22.6% of the athletes arrested competed for Southeastern Conference (SEC) schools, 15.3% athletes competed for Big 10 schools, 11.3% athletes competed for Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) schools, 9.4% athletes competed for Big 12 schools and 8.0% athletes competed for Pacific Athletic Conference (PAC)-12 schools. Further, the descriptive analysis indicates that 54.2% of the arrests involved one athlete, 18.7% of the arrests involved two athletes, and 11.1% of the arrests involved three athletes. Out of the 371 total arrests, there were a total of 542 crimes committed – 29% were crimes against persons, 23% were drug related crimes, 13% were crimes against public order, 12.9% were theft and fraud crimes, 10% traffic crimes, 4% were crimes against property, and 4% were weapon and alcohol crimes (See Table I).

The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicate there were no significant differences, $F_{(4, 307)} = .285, p > .05$, in the number of crimes committed by college athletes according to their classification in school (freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate student). Although there were no significant differences, it is important to point out that the mean number of crimes for juniors and seniors were higher than the mean number for sophomores and juniors and the mean number of crimes declined for fifth-year athletes. Next, an ANOVA was conducted using each type of crime (crimes against property, theft and fraud crimes, crimes against public order, drug-related crimes, traffic crimes, and weapons and alcohol crimes) as the dependent variable and the college athletes' classification as the "factor". The results indicated that there were no significant differences in the mean in each of the seven types of crimes according to the college athletes' classification in school.

To answer research questions three and four, t-tests were conducted using total crimes, and then each type of crime, as the test variable and race as the grouping variable. Race was of interest given the disproportionate number of Black college athletes in sports compared to their non-sport peers on campus. The results indicate there are significant differences in the total number of crimes allegedly committed by White college athletes when compared to Black college athletes. Although the sample included a higher number of Black college athletes ($n=177$), White college athletes ($n=52$) had a significantly higher ($t_{(227)}=2.45, p < .01$) mean number of crimes, 1.75 to 1.42. Secondly and with respect to college athlete's race and its

relationship to the type of crime, there were significant differences between Black and White college athletes in two crime categories – crimes against property and drug related crimes. White college athletes mean number of property crimes (1.50) were significantly higher ($t_{(12)}=2.92$, $p<.05$) than Black college athletes mean number of property crimes (1.00). Furthermore, White college athletes mean number of drug-related crimes (2.15) were significantly higher ($t_{(54)}=3.70$, $p<.001$) than Black college athletes mean number of drug-related crimes (1.23).

Discussion

One objective of the current study is to help universities and athletic departments further cultivate college athlete development strategies that will help reduce criminal transgressions. The results of the inferential analyses may be more insightful if contextualized using qualitative data from media reports used to develop the database. The results indicating White college athletes allegedly commit more property crimes than Black college athletes is counter-intuitive to college sports journalists, researchers, and stakeholders. According to noted sports in society scholar activist Richard Lapchick (2000, para. 12):

It's not that there's a higher percentage of African American athletes who are crossing the lines than White players, but the media have created two perceptions—that athletes in general are more inclined to be violent against women and use drugs, and that Black athletes are more inclined to do both. And neither is true.

Berry and Smith (2000) concur with Lapchick in that there is no known data that definitively establishes that Black sports figures engage in crime more than White sports figures. Frisby and Wanta (2009) found that more stories are written about White athletes; but that Black athletes are overrepresented in crime stories and that overall twice as many stories involving Black athletes had a negative tone when compared to story tones about White athletes.ⁱⁱⁱ Typically and from a practical standpoint, athletic departments, via their academic support and career development unit (ASCDU), establish programs for at-risk college athletes. Oftentimes, the majority of college athletes in risk-reduction programming are Black college athletes. The focus on managing the Black athletes can lead to ignoring transgressions by White athletes (Hughes, 2004). The results from the current study suggest that some White college athletes are also vulnerable and that they are in need of case management, counseling, and other services that will help with their significant involvement in drug and property related crimes. Further, It is important to examine prevailing views on athletes, race, and crime and to contemplate how these perspectives impact college athlete development approaches by athletic departments.

Further, and with respect to crimes against property, a meaningful number of arrests were the result of college athletes who stole drugs, robbed classmates of money, textbooks, laptops, other electronics, and/or credit cards. The types of property crimes suggest economic need. Huma and Staurowsky (2011) found that over 80% of college athletes live below the poverty line and on average college athletes complete each academic year \$3,222 in debt or \$12,888 in arrears over four years. Less than two percent of athletes across all college sports (excluding baseball) will be employed as a professional athlete (New, 2015). These realities are concerning considering a) only about 50 percent of college athletes competing in revenue sports graduate and b) a high school graduate can forgo college sports and earn an average of \$30,627 per year (Brislow, 2012). This suggests there is a need for NCAA member institutions to develop more

ways—beyond the recently implemented cost of attendance (COA) stipends to financially support college athletes (Sherman, 2015). Universities and athletic departments have a greater obligation to the college athletes who they remove from urban and rural communities and embargo from earning any type of income while using their labor to generate millions of dollars (Hawkins, 2000). Lastly, it is important to note that a meaningful number of property crimes were armed robbery or criminal wrongdoings that included some sort of weapon. Multiple athletes were involved in over one-half of all property crimes.

Although there were no significant differences between freshman, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students' crimes committed, this is an area that warrants more investigation. ASCDU's tend to focus their interventions on freshmen and sophomore athletes. ASCDU's may need to recalibrate their counseling, programming, and other supports, so that athletic staffers can continue to develop the identity and abilities of older college athletes, not just first and second year student athletes. When providing support services for college athletes in their last two years of college, athletic departments must be creative in their programming. Juniors, seniors, and graduate students often have more autonomy and they may believe that their seniority warrants more freedom from athletic department supervision. Nonetheless, ASCDU's tend to have some difficulty with providing career services to upperclassmen. Focusing on crime prevention from a strengths-based perspective might be an opportunity for athletic departments to a) address the economic needs/fears of upperclassmen (Etzel & Pickney, 1992; Hill, Burch-Ragan & Yates, 2001) and b) outsource this task to creative experts on campus. Programming that discusses potential careers and salaries, while integrating conversations about the importance of maintaining a clean background (check) and model citizenship, could help deter thoughts that might lead to criminal behavior. Oftentimes athletic departments are challenged when it comes to providing career development services, but this shortfall provides an opportunity to partner with university-wide career preparation services to integrate athletes into activities with non-college athlete peers.

To address college athletes and drug related crimes, athletic departments should strengthen programming to deter drug use and examine the connection between drug-related crimes and economic need. A recent study conducted by the NCAA found that 22% of college athletes used drugs recreationally, while 80% of college athletes reported alcohol use (Rexroat, 2014). Driving under the influence alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs or being arrested after purchasing drugs from an undercover informant are common arrest charges among college athletes. On the other hand, we rarely hear about a college athlete's failing drug tests or departing school to enter inpatient or outpatient alcohol rehabilitation facilities. The revelation of drug use via arrest, rather than treatment need, should be cause for concern. If an athlete is arrested during traffic stops, there is the danger in operating motor vehicles under the influence, and if they are arrested purchasing drugs from undercover informants, use of firearms is a concern. Moreover, what the mode of arrest suggest is that schools are failing to detect drug use and abuse among college athletes. As of late several athletic departments have come under scrutiny because athletes claimed they have failed multiple drug tests and/or leave school substance addicted (Dunleavy, 2015). Other athletic departments have decided to increase the number of times a college athlete can test positive for street drugs before being suspended and/or dismissed. Universities and athletic departments must improve drug testing and the enhancements should commence with universities removing the responsibility for drug testing from athletic departments and placing responsibility under the umbrella of student affairs. Lastly, the perception that drug related crimes are strictly related to drug abuse also should be dispelled.

Several drug related crimes in the current study involved drug distribution charges – which could suggest economic need. For example, as a result of the sale of the illicit drugs stolen during the home invasions committed by the Rutgers football players, police estimated the players made some \$35,273 in drug sales (Bichao, 2015). Again, a number of drug-related arrests in the sample, that included distribution charges, were the result of traffic stops where athletes had large quantities of drugs.

Freshmen and sophomore college athletes are adolescents and in an analysis using the 2012 National Survey on Drug Use and Health shows that 6.6% of White adolescents and young adults sold drugs, compared to just 5.0% of Black adolescents and young adults (Ingraham, 2014). The issue of college students and substance abuse is further complicated because drug use, in particular marijuana use, is increasingly acceptable and even legal to use in Colorado, Nevada, California, Washington, Alaska, Main, Massachusetts, and Oregon. With respect to drug distribution by college athletes it may be time to head calls for schools to rely more heavily on criminal background checks for athletes, despite the reluctance of others to single out a subset of students. The responsibility for this preventative measure should also be the responsibility of another department outside of athletics. Background checks, prior to awarding scholarships, may help to identify athletes with a history of criminal behavior and provide athletic departments with objective information that may help prevent coaches from recruiting athletes with a negative background. Conversely, background checks could inform efforts to establish early intervention programming that will help to insure they abstain from unlawful behavior and thrive in the university setting.

The current research also explored peer influence on crimes or whether there are significant differences in the number of crimes athletes commit as a group compared to the number of crimes committed individually. Although there were no significant differences in the number of crimes committed as a group versus those committed individually, there are some noteworthy considerations based on the descriptive data. The profound number of crimes committed by athletes as a group supports the need for greater exploration of the impact of the homogeneous nature of athletic teams – in particular the way their uniformity is maintain off-the field (i.e., all athletes living spaces). Student development professionals and critics of college athletics have long argued that it is in college athletes' best interest to experience greater integration into the university setting and increase their interactions with the non-athlete student body (Comaeux & Harrison, 2011; Wiggins, 1991). Perspectives on integration do not infer that non-athletes on college campuses do not commit crimes. Instead further integrating athletes into the fabric of the university reflects that idea that if college athletes join more heterogeneous alliances, then some of the sport-specific factors that influence crime, such as the win-at-all-cost attitude, might be neutralized. Coaches, especially those in the revenue sports, might better serve the development of their college athletes if they encouraged and even facilitated opportunities for them to socialize with their non-athlete peers.

Implications for Social Work Practice in Athletics

Social work is a profession that seeks to improve the quality of life and enhance well-being of people, families, and communities through direct practice and crisis intervention (Barker, 2003). Almost two decades ago former Nebraska Cornhuskers football coach Tom Osborne suggested that the breakdown of American families was to blame for college athletes who commit crime. "We have a tremendous breakdown in our families. When I first started

recruiting 34 years ago, we seldom saw a player from a single-parent family” (Teel, 1997, para. 31). Twenty years not only have college athletes from single parent households become the norm, but so have first generation college athletes engulfed by communications, media, and digital technologies. Traditionally, athletic departments, via their academic support and career development units (ASCDU’s), have tried to address some of the life challenges of college athletes, but many of the programs do not go far enough. Many athlete development initiatives are limited to guest speakers, have no stated outcome goals, and do not incorporate evaluation methods or efforts for determining their success.

To help better understand today’s college athletes there has been a trend towards hiring sports psychologists to provide counseling services for college athletes. The American Psychological Association estimates that 20 Division I athletic programs have a sports psychologist on staff, while somewhere between 70-100 contract out these services (Voelker, 2012). Conversely, there are approximately eleven social workers working within or contracted by athletic departments (National Alliance of Social Workers in Sports, 2017). Social work can be instrumental in college athlete development because it is a helping profession that considers the person in the environment. Social workers focus on how to formulate and implement plans in order to provide help the individual adapt to their condition and environment. Social work practitioners are equipped to help college athletes navigate the freedom university life provides and the peer pressure that accompanies athletics. A social worker’s expertise in the formulation of case plans and dealing with public systems are constructive in college athletics because college athletes are involved in multiple systems when crimes have been committed (i.e., student conduct, counseling, criminal justice). Social workers can also provide college athletes with the clinical structure and support necessary to help them overcome the personal vulnerabilities and situational susceptibilities that can contribute to propensities to engage in crime. Foremost, social workers can help collegiate athletes help themselves.

Limitations

The current study has some limitations. First, the race of 41 college athletes was missing from the data because the articles did not include a picture of the athlete or the perpetrator was of a different race other than White or Black. This data was excluded from the analyses. Secondly, 38 total athletes did not have data entered for their classification due to the articles not reporting the perpetrators year in school and instead reporting the age of the individual. Lastly, this database includes arrests, but not the actual outcomes of those arrests, which means it is possible the charges were dropped or that the college athlete was found not guilty.

Conclusion

The results of the current study indicate the need for further exploration into the influence of age and peer influence on college athletes and crime. Still, this study provides some constructive insight into the influence of race. Over time athletic departments, the media, students and fans have become more accepting of transgressions by the likes of Johnny Manziel, Todd Marinovich, and Ryan Leaf, while levying harsher criticism on the likes of Marcus Vick, Jeremy Stevens, or Damon Thronton. Universities and athletic departments have an ethical responsibility to prevent, intervene and deter criminal behavior by the college athletes they assume responsibility for educating and developing their potential as a student and as an athlete.

For athletic departments to fulfill their promise to all their college athletes they must accept the realization that they also have vulnerable White athletes on their sports teams who would benefit from licensed social work professionals. This investigation is also important to research on college athletes because the literature is truly lacking in this area. Although there is a news story about college athletes and crime almost every other day, there are few peer-reviewed articles on college athletes and crime when studies on sexual assault are excluded. Lastly, college athletes need services and deterrents that will help reduce and hopefully end their involvement in crime because, with the mitigating circumstances surrounding their crimes, they are just one crime away from expulsion, permanently damaging their employability, or something much, much worse.

References

- Arrest Nation. (2016). *2015 stats*. Retrieved from <http://arrestnation.com/2015-stats/>.
- Barker, R. L. (2003). *The social work dictionary*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Benedict, J. (2010, Sep 8). An alarming number of college athletes charged with serious crime. *Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved from <https://www.si.com/more-sports/2010/09/08/athletes-crime>.
- Benedict, J., & Klein, A. (1998). Arrest and conviction rates for athletes accused of sexual assault. *Issues in Intimate Violence, 14*, 169-179.
- Berry, B., & Smith, E. (2000). Race, sport, and crime: The misrepresentation of African Americans in team sports and crime. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17*, 171-197.
- Bichao, S. (2015, Sep 9). Prosecutor: Rutgers players took photos of loot, sent texts. *My Central New Jersey*. Retrieved from <http://www.mycentraljersey.com/story/news/local/2015/09/09/rutgers-football-players-court-appearance/71929436/>.
- Brislow, J. (2012, September 12). By the numbers: Dropping out of high school. *Public Broadcasting Service*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/education/dropout-nation/by-the-numbers-dropping-out-of-high-school/>.
- Comeaux, E., & Harrison, C. K. (2011). A conceptual model of academic success for student-athletes. *Educational Researcher, 40*(5), 235-245.
- Cano, R. G. (2015, July 10). University of South Dakota athletes ran tax-fraud scheme, made \$400,000. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.africanamerica.org/topic/university-of-south-dakota-athletes-ran-tax-fraud-scheme-made-400-000>.
- Crosset, T. W., Benedict, J. R., & McDonald, M. A. (1995). Male student-athletes reported for sexual assault: A survey of campus police departments and judicial affairs offices. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues, 19*(2), 126-140.
- Duggan, D. (2015, September 3). Who are the Rutgers players that were arrested? *New Jersey*. Retrieved from http://www.nj.com/rutgersfootball/index.ssf/2015/09/who_are_the_rutgers_players_that_were_arrested.html#incart_story_package.
- Dunleavy, R. (2015, October 3). Just say no: Rutgers drug test policy compared to Big Ten, NCAA. *Asbury Park Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.app.com/story/sports/college/rutgers/2015/10/03/just-say-no-rutgers-drug-test-policy-compared-big-ten-ncaa/73271014/?from=global&sessionKey=&autologin=>.
- Etzel, E. F., & Pinkney, J. W. (1992). Counseling college student athletes: Issues and interventions. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 14*, 414-416.
- Frisby, C., & Wanta, W. (2009). Effects of media use on athletes' self-perceptions. In *Mass Communication & Society Division at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual conference, Boston, MA*.
- Hawkins, B. J. (2000). *The new plantation: The internal colonization of black student-athletes*. Winterville, GA: Sadiki Publishing.
- Hill, K., Burch-Ragan, K. M., & Yates, D. Y. (2001). Current and future issues and trends facing student athletes and athletic programs. *New Directions for Student Services, 2001*(93), 65-80.

- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, 89(3), 552-584.
- Hughes, G. (2004). Managing Black guys: Representation, corporate culture, and the NBA. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 21, 163-184.
- Hughes, R., & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive deviance among athletes: The implications of overconformity to the sport ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8(4), 307-325.
- Huma, R., & Staurowsky, E. J. (2011). *The price of poverty in big time college sport*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncpanow.org>.
- Ingraham, C. (2014, September 30). White people are more likely to deal drugs, but black people are more likely to get arrested for it. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/09/30/white-people-are-more-likely-to-deal-drugs-but-black-people-are-more-likely-to-get-arrested-for-it/>,
- Lapchick, R. E. (2000). Crime and athletes: New racial stereotypes. *Society*, 37(3), 14-20.
- Lapchick, R. E. (2014). *The 2014 Associated Press sports editors racial and gender report card*. Retrieved from <http://nebula.wsimg.com/038bb0ccc9436494ebee1430174c13a0?AccessKeyId=DAC3A56D8FB782449D2A&disposition=0&alloworigin=1>.
- Lavigne, P. (2015). Lawyers, status and public backlash aid college athletes accused of crimes. *ABC News*. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/Sports/lawyers-status-public-backlash-aid-college-athletes-accused/story?id=31754517>.
- Martin, D. (2011, March 10). NCAA student-athletes and criminal history: An analysis of SI and CBS's study. *Bleacher Report*. Retrieved from <http://bleacherreport.com/articles/631641-ncaa-student-athletes-and-criminal-history-an-analysis-of-sicbs-investigation>.
- Melnick, M. (1992). Male athletes and sexual assault. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 63(5), 32-36.
- National Alliance of Social Workers in Sports. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved from <https://www.naswis.org/about-us>.
- Nelson, M. B. (1994). *The stronger women get, the more men love football: Sexism and the American culture of sports*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- New, J. (2014, November 4). Looking the other way? *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/11/04/should-ncaa-prevent-convicted-criminals-playing-college-sports>.
- New, J. (2015, January 27). A long shot. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/27/college-athletes-greatly-overestimate-their-chances-playing-professionally>.
- Otto, K. A. (2009). Criminal athletes: An analysis of charges, reduced charges and sentences. *Journal of Legal Aspects Sport*, 19, 67-101.
- Potrafke, L. M. (2006). Checking up on student-athletes: A NCAA regulation requiring criminal background checks. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 17, 427-450.
- Rexroat, M. (2014). NCAA national study of substance use habits of college student-athletes. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/Substance%20Use%20Final%20Report_FINAL.pdf.
- Rogness, J. (2015, January 16). Solano college women's basketball players expelled. *The Reporter*. Retrieved from <http://www.thereporter.com/general-news/20150116/solano>

- college-womens-basketball-players-expelled.
- Rosen, R. (2015, August 18). *The most arrested college football teams in America*. Retrieved from <http://www.outkickthecoverage.com/the-most-arrested-college-football-teams-in-america-081815>.
- Salkind, N. J. (2000). *Statistics for people who hate statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2003). Life-course desisters? Trajectories of crime among delinquent boys followed to age 70. *Criminology*, *41*(3), 555-592.
- Sherman, M. (2015, January 17). Full cost of attendance passes 79-1. *ESPN*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/12185230/power-5-conferences-pass-cost-attendance-measure-ncaa-autonomy-begins.
- Smith, D., & Stewart, S. (2003). Sexual aggression and sports participation. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *26*(4), 384-395.
- Snyder, E. E., Yiannakis, A., & Melnick, M. J. (1994). Interpretations and explanations of deviance among college athletes: A case study. *Contemporary Issues in Sociology of Sport*, *11*, 375-386.
- Steffensmeier, D. J., Allan, E. A., Harer, M. D., & Streifel, C. (1989). Age and the distribution of crime. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*(4), 803-831.
- Sweeten, G., Piquero, A. R., & Steinberg, L. (2013). Age and the explanation of crime, revisited. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(6), 921-938. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9926-4
- Teel, D. (1997, March 2). Crime and college athletes -- Players over the edge or over-reported? *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://community.seattletimes.nwsourc.com/archive/?date=19970302&slug=2526458>.
- Voelker, R. (2012). Hot careers: Sports psychology. *American Psychological Association*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2012/11/sport-psychology.aspx>
- Wiggins, D. K. (1991). Prized performers, but frequently overlooked students: The involvement of Black athletes in intercollegiate sports on predominantly White university campuses, 1890-1972. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *62*(2), 164-177.

Appendix A

Crimes Included In Seven Crime Categories

1. Crimes Against the Person

- a. Simple Assault
- b. Misdemeanor Assault
- c. Sodomy
- d. Aggravated Assault
- e. Assault
- f. Rape
- g. Fighting
- h. Harassment
- i. Battery
- j. Aggravated Battery
- k. Murder
- l. 1st Degree Murder
- m. Attempted Murder
- n. 3rd Degree Murder
- o. Sex Offense/Sex crime
- p. Sexual Assault
- q. 1st Degree Assault
- r. Dating Violence
- s. Aggravated Stalking
- t. Robbery
- u. Aggravated Robbery
- v. Conspiracy to Commit Robbery
- w. Armed Robbery
- x. 1st Degree Robbery
- y. Unlawful imprisonment

2. Crimes Against Property

- a. Vandalism
- b. Breaking and Entering
- c. Criminal Trespassing
- d. Burglary
- e. 1st Degree Burglary
- f. 2nd Degree Burglary
- g. Armed Burglary
- h. Burglarize Dorm Rooms
- i. Aggravated Burglary

3. Theft and Fraud Crimes
 - a. Misdemeanor Theft
 - b. Attempted Theft
 - c. Theft
 - d. Purse Snatch
 - e. Larceny
 - f. Shoplifting
 - g. Stolen Credit Card
 - h. Fraud
 - i. Forgery
 - j. Counterfeit Scam
 - k. Theft Service

4. Crimes Against Public Order
 - a. Disorderly Conduct
 - b. Loitering
 - c. Soliciting
 - d. Prostitution
 - e. Criminal Soliciting
 - f. Noise Violation
 - g. Public Intoxication
 - h. Indecent Exposure
 - i. Public Intimidation
 - j. Criminal mischief
 - k. Resisting Arrest
 - l. 2nd Degree Escape
 - m. Hindering Prosecution
 - n. Aiding and Abetting
 - o. Failure to pay child support
 - p. Jump Bail
 - q. Failure to appear
 - r. 2nd degree breach of peace
 - s. Bribery
 - t. Reckless Endangerment
 - u. Contributing to delinquency of a minor

5. Drug-Related Crimes
 - a. Marijuana Sales
 - b. Cocaine Sales
 - c. Ecstasy Sales
 - d. Prescription Drug Sales
 - e. Heroin Sales
 - f. Possession of Controlled Substance
 - g. Possession of Drug Paraphernalia
 - h. Marijuana Possession

- i. Mushroom Possession
 - j. Cocaine Possession
 - k. Drug Possession
 - l. Narcotics Possession
 - m. Marijuana Trafficking
 - n. Drug Trafficking
6. Traffic Charges
- a. Driving while intoxicated
 - b. Operating while intoxicated
 - c. Careless driving
 - d. Driving under the influence
 - e. Uninsured vehicle
 - f. Possession of fraudulent license
 - g. Driving without a license
 - h. Driving with suspended license
 - i. Hit and Run
 - j. Traffic Charge
 - k. Possession of a canceled license
7. Weapon and Alcohol Charges
- a. Alcohol possession
 - b. Minor zero tolerance
 - c. Purchasing/ possessing alcohol
 - d. Brandishing firearm
 - e. Possession stolen handgun
 - f. Hand gun without a license
 - g. Sale and/or use of a rifle
 - h. Possession or sale of weapons
 - i. Shooting
 - j. Weapon possession
 - k. Underage drinking

Table 1

Arrests by Race, Type of Sport, Conference, Number of Athletes and Type of Crime

Classification	Percent
Race	
-White	34%
-Black	47.7%
-Missing	18%
Type of Sport	
-Football	73.6%
-Men's Basketball	20.8%
-Women's Basketball	1.1%
Arrests By Conference	
-SEC	22.6%
-ACC	11.3%
-Big 10	15.3%
-Big 12	9.4%
-Pac-12	8.0%
Arrests By Number of Involved College Athletes	
-One	54.2%
-Two	18.7%
-Three	11.1%
Type of Crime	
-Against Persons	29%
-Against Property	4%
-Theft and Fraud	12.9%
-Traffic Crimes	10%
-Weapon and Alcohol Crimes	4%
-Drug Crimes	23%
-Public Order	13%

ⁱ In college football, the Power Five conferences are athletic conferences in NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) or the highest level of collegiate football. The Power Five Conferences include the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), the Southeastern Conference (SEC), the Pacific-12 (Pac-12), the Big 12, and the Big 10.

ⁱⁱ Due to the number of new sources (N=371) it is not practical to provide every news source. Nonetheless, some of the news sources include: *PBS, Huffington Post, CBS Sports, Washington Post, ABC News, Bleacher Report, The (Chicago) Final Call, The (California) Reporter, ESPN, The Seattle Times, and New York Times.*

ⁱⁱⁱ Lapchick (2014) found that only 14.7% of all Associated Press Sports Editors (APSE) staff were people of color.