JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES
PRINT ISSN: 2984-8288 | ONLINE ISSN: 2984-8385
https://doi.org/10.69569/jip

TWR Publishing

Research Article

Academic Performance and Athletic Engagement among Collegiate Student-Athletes at a Philippine University

Ernesto Jaranilla[1], *Francisco III P. Palma*[2], *Jovin A. Perater*[3], *Julie Ann V. Samonte*[4], *Mercy P. Gestosani*[5], *Johnrie V. Tumlos*[6], *Christian V. Loberas*[7]

Author Information:

[1,2]University of Negros Occidental – Recoletos, Inc., Bacolod City, Philippines

[3]Murcia National High School, Murcia, Negros Occidental, Philippines

[4,5]University of Saint La Salle – Bacolod, Bacolod City, Philippines

[6]Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines

[7]West Visayas State University – HCC Himamaylan City, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

Francisco III P. Palma
Email: palmaiiifrancisco@gmail.com

Article History:

Date received: September 30, 2026
Date revised: October 24, 2026
Date accepted: November 6, 2026

Recommended citation:

Jaranilla, E., Palma, F., III, Perater, J., Samonte, J.A., Gestosani, M., Tumlos, J., & Loberas, C. (2026). Academic performance and athletic engagement among collegiate student-athletes at a Philippine university. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *4*(12), 84-91. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.496

Abstract. Academic and athletic demands can coexist, but evidence on their relationship varies across settings. This study provides context-specific evidence on academic performance and athletic engagement among 110 student-athletes from a private university in Negros Occidental who participated in the Negros Occidental Private Schools Sports, Cultural and Educational Association competition. Using a descriptive-correlational design and convenience sampling, the study measured athletic engagement with a 45-item researcher-made questionnaire and academic performance through respondents' reported general academic averages. Descriptive statistics, independent-samples t tests, one-way analyses of variance, and Pearson's correlation were used. Mean academic performance was 87.58 (SD = 2.54). Engagement ratings were high for training (M = 4.15, SD = 0.43), time management (M = 4.24, SD = 0.42), and facilities and equipment (M = 4.06, SD = 0.54), and very high for perceived actual-performance behaviors (M = 4.58, SD = 0.43). No statistically significant engagement differences were detected by sex, sports category, athletic experience group, college department, or year level. Academic performance and engagement were not significantly linearly associated, $r(108) = -.004$, $p = .968$. These findings apply to this single-institution sample and should not be generalized to student-athletes broadly. The study also highlights the need for stronger measurement validation and independently verified academic and athletic indicators in future research.

Keywords: *Academic performance; Athletic engagement; College student-athletes; Higher education; Philippines.*

Academic performance among college student-athletes matters because institutions are responsible for supporting learning alongside training and competition. However, the relationship between athletic engagement and academic outcomes is not self-evident: sport participation may coexist with academic achievement, while time demands, recovery, and institutional conditions may shape students' experiences. Astin's

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(1984) student involvement perspective provides a useful lens because it conceptualizes involvement in terms of the physical and psychological energy students invest in college. In this study, athletic engagement refers to self-reported time-management practices, perceived access to facilities and equipment, and perceived actual-performance behaviors. It is therefore broader than participation alone, but it is not an objective measure of athletic achievement.

Recent empirical evidence supports a contextual rather than deterministic interpretation of the academic consequences of athletic participation. Tompsett et al. (2023), using a national sample of approximately 5,000 college students, found little difference in academic achievement between high-visibility student-athletes and nonathletes after accounting for background characteristics and collegiate division. Daum et al. (2024) likewise reported no statistically significant differences in grade point average or academic motivation between NCAA Division II student-athletes and nonathletes. Other studies, however, have identified positive academic patterns among athletes. Storm and Eske (2022) reported higher academic achievement among elite student-athletes than nonathletes in Denmark, while Sallen et al. (2023) found strong academic performance among student-athletes in an elite sports school. These differences across populations indicate that the academic-athletic relationship is unlikely to be explained by participation status alone.

The processes surrounding the dual role are equally important. Santos and Sagas (2022), using data from 5,042 student-athletes, found that academic and athletic time use were associated with different dimensions of well-being. Vavassori et al. (2023) found that academic demands affected stress, fatigue, and sleep among female volleyball student-athletes, while structured monitoring supported self-regulation. Storey et al. (2024) similarly linked difficulties in managing daily responsibilities with stress and sleep-related factors among Canadian varsity athletes. Hart et al. (2024) showed that classroom learning behaviors were related to academic and athletic motivation. More recent evidence also points to psychological and institutional conditions: García and Fong (2025) identified self-efficacy and other academic and environmental factors as predictors of college GPA, whereas Kang and Alaeddini (2025) examined psychological well-being and motivation in relation to student-athletes' academic and athletic outcomes.

At the same time, the literature has frequently examined academic achievement against broad indicators such as sport participation, athletic identity, motivation, well-being, or institutional support rather than against a multidimensional measure of sport-related engagement within one collegiate athlete population. Steele et al. (2020) noted that research on academic and athletic identities has emphasized identity development, role conflict, career development, and motivation, while Yukhymenko-Lescroart (2023) demonstrated that academic identity and achievement goals can have different relationships with academic performance than athletic identity. Research in the Philippines remains comparatively limited in the international literature. Rabuya (2024), for example, reported a significant relationship between motivational climate and academic achievement among college athletes, and Caraqui-an et al. (2026) examined time-management practices amid academic and athletic demands. These studies provide relevant local evidence but do not directly resolve whether a multidimensional measure of athletic engagement is statistically associated with academic performance within a private collegiate institution in Negros Occidental.

The present study addresses a specific contextual gap by examining a multidimensional, self-reported measure of athletic engagement alongside reported academic averages among student-athletes from one private university in Negros Occidental who participated in the NOPSSCEA competition. It aimed to describe academic performance and athletic engagement, test engagement differences by sex, college department, year level, sports category, and years of athletic experience, and estimate the linear association between engagement and academic performance. Its contribution is contextual rather than representative: it adds Philippine evidence from one institutional setting while distinguishing perceived engagement from objective academic or sport-performance indicators.

Methodology

Research Design

A quantitative descriptive-correlational design was used to describe the variables, compare engagement across participant groups, and estimate the association between engagement and academic performance without manipulating conditions. The study appears to use a single-period survey, but the available source materials do not establish the exact collection dates; therefore, the cross-sectional timing cannot be independently verified. The

design supports descriptive and associational conclusions, not causal inference.

Participants and Sampling Technique
The sample comprised 110 student-athletes from the Private University of Negros Occidental who participated in the NOPSSCEA competition. Convenience sampling was used; respondents were those available and consenting to participate. The available records do not fully document the recruitment frame, invitation process, precise enrollment-term criteria, or exclusion rules. The sample included 51 males (46.4%) and 59 females (53.6%) and represented four college departments, first- through fifth-year levels, and individual or dual/group sports. Because selection was nonprobability and confined to one institution and one competition context, the sample should not be treated as representative of all collegiate student-athletes.

Research Instrument
A researcher-made questionnaire was used. Part 1 recorded participant characteristics. Part 2 contained 45 five-point Likert-type items: 15 on time management, 15 on facilities and equipment, and 15 on perceived actual-performance behaviors. In the source study, time management and facilities/equipment were treated as components of training, while perceived actual-performance behaviors formed a separate component. Responses ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Part 3 requested respondents' general academic average; the measure was self-reported, but the specific academic term or reporting period is not documented in the available materials. The materials also do not specify reverse-scored items or provide a complete, reproducible scoring algorithm for all composite scores; these details should be checked against the original instrument before final publication. The questionnaire or representative items should be supplied as a supplement if permissions allow.

The instrument underwent expert review using a content-validity procedure described in the source as Lawshe's method. The detailed validation appendix lists five experts and item-level values ranging from 0.20 to 1.00 and reports an overall content-validity value of 0.875. The thesis narrative gives a different validator count and a value of 0.80. These records are inconsistent and cannot be reconciled from the available materials; the values are therefore reported as documented rather than treated as interchangeable statistics. Pilot reliability testing with 31 students from other campuses yielded Cronbach's $\alpha = .963$ and standardized-item $\alpha = .969$. These pilot coefficients indicate high internal consistency in that pilot group but do not establish construct validity or reliability in the analytic sample. No exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis was documented.

Pilot reliability testing was conducted with 31 students from other campuses of the source institution. The 45-item instrument produced Cronbach's $\alpha = .963$ and a standardized-item $\alpha = .969$. These coefficients indicate high internal consistency in the pilot group, but they do not establish construct validity or reliability equivalence in the present analytic sample. No exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, or measurement-invariance analysis was reported in the source materials.

Data Gathering Procedure
Institutional permission was obtained before data collection. The questionnaire was administered through Google Forms, and a Facebook Messenger group was used to communicate with respondents. The source materials state that participants were informed about the study, consented to participate, and were assured that information would be confidential and used for academic purposes. The exact collection dates or duration, electronic-consent workflow, and procedures for identifying duplicate or incomplete submissions are not documented in the available records and have not been inferred.

Data Analysis Procedure
Means and standard deviations summarized academic performance and engagement. Independent-samples t tests were reported for sex, sports category, and athletic-experience group; one-way ANOVAs were reported for college department and year level; Pearson's product-moment correlation assessed the linear association between academic performance and engagement. The significance threshold was $\alpha = .05$. The source materials do not identify the statistical software, document missing-data handling, or provide verifiable assumption-check results. The cut-point defining "shorter" and "longer" athletic experience is also undocumented. The year-level ANOVA included a fifth-year subgroup of one respondent according to the reported degrees of freedom; this subgroup has no estimable within-group variance, and the result should be interpreted cautiously. Because respondent-level

data were unavailable, tests and assumptions could not be independently reconstructed.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was described as voluntary and based on informed consent. Institutional permission and confidentiality assurances are documented in the source materials. However, the available records do not identify a research ethics committee, an approval number, a data-retention procedure, or a de-identification protocol. This manuscript does not claim formal ethics-board approval without documentary evidence. Before publication, the authors should confirm the applicable institutional ethics requirements and disclose the verifiable approval or exemption status to the journal.

Results and Discussion

Participant Characteristics

Table 1. *Profile of the Respondents*

Variables	n	%
College		
CAS	6	5.5
COED	45	40.9
CIT	53	48.2
COEng	6	5.5
Sex		
Male	51	46.4
Female	59	53.6
Year Level		
First Year	5	4.5
Second Year	44	40.0
Third Year	54	49.1
Fourth Year	6	5.5
Fifth Year	1	0.9
Sports Category		
Individual	34	30.9
Dual/Group	76	69.1
Number of Years		
Shorter Years	71	64.5
Longer Years	39	35.5
Total	**110**	**100.0**

The sample was concentrated in the College of Information Technology (48.2%) and College of Education (40.9%); 69.1% participated in dual/group sports. Third-year students formed the largest year-level group (49.1%). These characteristics describe the respondents rather than the broader student-athlete population. Several groups were small, particularly fifth-year students (n = 1), limiting the stability and generalizability of subgroup estimates. Corrected counts and percentages are presented in Table 1.

Academic Performance

The respondents reported high academic performance overall (M = 87.58, SD = 2.54). Mean scores were within the source study's high category across all reported subgroup classifications. The largest departmental group, the College of Information Technology, had M = 87.14 (SD = 2.33), whereas the College of Education had M = 89.02 (SD = 2.86). The fifth-year category had the highest observed mean (M = 89.00), but this estimate was based on one respondent and therefore has no meaningful estimate of within-group variability. The finding of generally high academic performance is compatible with studies showing that athletic participation does not automatically correspond to poorer academic outcomes. Tompsett et al. (2023) found little difference in academic achievement between high-visibility student-athletes and nonathletes after accounting for background and collegiate division, and Daum et al. (2024) reported similar GPA and academic-motivation outcomes for NCAA Division II student-athletes and nonathletes. At the same time, positive associations have been reported in other contexts. Kuroda et al. (2023) found that school-level athletic results were positively associated with academic performance, whereas Sallen et al. (2023) reported strong academic performance among student-athletes in an elite sports-school setting. These differences reinforce the importance of context, intensity, support structures, and the specific definition of athletic participation when interpreting

academic outcomes.

Table 2. *Academic Performance of the Student-Athletes*

Variables	N	M	SD	Interpretation
Whole	110	87.58	2.54	High
College				
CAS	6	88.17	1.94	High
COED	45	89.02	2.86	High
CIT	53	87.14	2.33	High
COEng	6	87.62	2.59	High
Sex				
Male	51	87.25	3.00	High
Female	59	87.89	2.01	High
Year Level				
First Year	5	87.86	0.98	High
Second Year	44	87.52	2.79	High
Third Year	54	87.74	2.33	High
Fourth Year	6	86.11	3.51	High
Fifth Year	1	89.00		High
Sports Category				
Individual	34	87.79	2.65	High
Dual/Group	76	87.49	2.51	High
Numbers of Years				
Shorter Years	71	87.64	2.56	High
Longer Years	39	87.46	2.53	High

Note. Academic-performance interpretation followed the source study's scale: 93.00–100.00 = very high; 86.00–92.99 = high; 79.00–85.99 = average; 72.00–78.99 = low; 65.00–71.99 = very low.

Athletic Engagement

Athletic engagement was high across the instrument's main components. Training had a mean of 4.15 (SD = 0.43), time management a mean of 4.24 (SD = 0.42), and facilities and equipment a mean of 4.06 (SD = 0.54). Perceived actual-performance engagement was very high (M = 4.58, SD = 0.43). The training mean corresponds to the average of the time-management and facilities/equipment components in the source instrument. The results therefore indicate strong self-reported engagement in preparation, resource use, and competition-related behaviors.

Table 3. *Athletic Engagement of the Student-Athletes*

Engagement	M	SD	Interpretation
Training	4.15	0.43	High
Time Management	4.24	0.42	High
Availability of facilities and equipment	4.06	0.54	High
Perceived actual-performance behaviors	4.58	0.43	Very high

Note. Engagement scale: 4.50–5.00 = very high; 3.50–4.49 = high; 2.50–3.49 = average; 1.50–2.49 = low; 1.00–1.49 = very low.

The relatively high time-management rating is relevant because managing academic and athletic demands is a recurring issue in student-athlete research. Santos and Sagas (2022) found that academic and athletic time use were associated with different aspects of well-being among a large sample of college athletes. Caraqui-an et al. (2026) likewise examined time management amid competing academic and athletic commitments. Vavassori et al. (2023) found that academic demands affected stress, fatigue, and sleep among volleyball student-athletes, illustrating why high perceived time-management capacity should not be interpreted as evidence that competing demands are absent.

The very high score for perceived actual-performance engagement requires particular caution. The source items assess behaviors and perceptions such as exerting effort, following coaching instructions, sportsmanship, preparation, and contribution to team success. They do not objectively measure athletic performance, such as competition times, scores, rankings, win-loss records, or verified performance statistics. Accordingly, the construct is best interpreted as perceived actual-performance engagement rather than objective athletic performance.

Differences in Athletic Engagement Across Participant Characteristics

Engagement did not differ statistically by sex, sports category, or years of athletic experience. The male group had M = 4.34 and the female group M = 4.26, t(108) = 1.16, p = .247. Individual-sport participants had M = 4.31 and dual/group-sport participants M = 4.29, t(108) = 0.22, p = .830. The shorter-experience group had M = 4.28 and the longer-experience group M = 4.33, t(108) = −0.62, p = .538. These results indicate that the observed group differences were small and not statistically distinguishable under the analysis used.

Table 4. *Differences in Athletic Engagement by Sex, Sports Category, and Years of Athletic Experience*

Variables	N	M	df	*t*	*p*	Interpretation
Sex						
Male	51	4.34	108	1.16	.247	Not Significant
Female	59	4.26				
Sports Category						
Individual	34	4.31	108	0.22	.830	Not Significant
Dual/Group	76	4.29				
Numbers of Years						
Shorter Years	71	4.28	108	-0.62	.538	Not Significant
Longer Years	39	4.33				

One-way analyses likewise showed no statistically significant differences by college department, F(3, 104) = 0.63, p = .594, or year level, F(4, 103) = 1.11, p = .355. The corresponding eta-squared values calculated from the reported F statistics are .02 and .04, respectively, indicating small between-group proportions of variance. These derived effect-size estimates are included only to aid interpretation of the reported omnibus tests; no respondent-level data were used to recompute the tests.

Table 5. *Differences in Athletic Engagement by College Department and Year Level*

Variables	M	df	*F*	*p*	Interpretation
College					
CAS	4.49				
COED	4.27	3, 104	0.63	.594	Not Significant
CIT	4.32				
COEng	4.32				
Year Level					
First Year	4.35				
Second Year	4.33	4, 103	1.11	.355	Not Significant
Third Year	4.29				
Fourth Year	4.22				
Fifth Year	4.76				

Note. Effect sizes calculated from reported omnibus statistics: college $\eta^2 = .02$; year level $\eta^2 = .04$. The fifth-year subgroup contained one respondent.

The absence of statistically detectable subgroup differences should not be interpreted as evidence that sex, academic department, sport category, or athletic experience has no substantive relevance to student athletes. Rather, within this sample and with these measures, the observed differences were not statistically significant. This interpretation is consistent with research showing that student-athlete outcomes are multifactorial. Moleski et al. (2023) identified institutional, academic, and athletic characteristics associated with academic success among NAIA athletes, while García and Fong (2025) highlighted the roles of academic mindset, self-efficacy, and environmental conditions. Hart et al. (2024) also demonstrated relationships among learning behavior and academic and athletic motivation. The present study did not measure these variables and therefore cannot determine whether they explain the relatively similar engagement scores across groups.

Relationship Between Academic Performance and Athletic Engagement

Pearson's product-moment correlation showed a near-zero, statistically nonsignificant association between academic performance and athletic engagement, r(108) = −.004, p = .968. The 95% confidence interval for the correlation, calculated from the reported coefficient and sample size using Fisher's z transformation, is approximately [−.19, .18]. Thus, the observed coefficient is consistent with a very small negative or positive population association under the assumptions of the correlational model. The result does not demonstrate that academic performance and athletic engagement are unrelated in all student-athlete populations; it indicates that this sample provided no evidence of a linear association between the measures used.

Table 6. *Relationship Between Athletic Engagement and Academic Performance*

Variables	N	*r*	*p*	Interpretation
Engagement * Academic Performance	110	−.004	.968	Not significant

Note. The 95% confidence interval for r is approximately [−.19, .18], calculated from the reported r and N.

The finding adds to a heterogeneous literature. Daum et al. (2024) found similar academic outcomes for student-athletes and nonathletes in an NCAA Division II setting, whereas Tompsett et al. (2023) reported limited GPA differences after adjustment. In contrast, Rabuya (2024) found a significant relationship between motivational climate and academic achievement among college athletes, and Yukhymenko-Lescroart (2023) showed that academic identity and achievement goals were associated with academic performance while athletic identity had a different pattern. These findings suggest that the academic-athletic relationship is more plausibly understood through multiple mechanisms than through athletic engagement as a single predictor.

The null correlation also needs to be interpreted in relation to measurement. Athletic engagement was assessed with a researcher-made self-report instrument whose pilot reliability was high, but whose construct validity was not tested through factor analysis. Academic performance was based on a reported academic average rather than independently verified institutional records. The study was also cross-sectional and used convenience sampling. Consequently, measurement error, restricted variability, sample composition, and unmeasured variables may have contributed to the near-zero observed correlation. The result should therefore be regarded as evidence about this sample and operationalization, not as a general claim that academic and athletic domains are independent.

Conclusion

This study adds context-specific evidence on reported academic performance and perceived athletic engagement among student-athletes at one private university in Negros Occidental. In this sample, the two outcomes were both rated relatively highly, but the measured engagement score was not significantly associated with academic performance, and no statistically significant group differences were detected. These results should not be interpreted as evidence that academic and athletic outcomes are universally unrelated or that the participant groups are equivalent.

For practice, institutions should support academic and athletic development together rather than infer academic standing from athletic engagement. Two proportionate actions are to provide structured time-management support and to monitor academic progress regularly, with assistance based on each student's identified needs. Future studies should use multisite and longitudinal designs, refine and validate the engagement measure through factor analysis, and obtain academic averages from registrar records alongside objective sport-performance indicators. Psychological and institutional variables, including stress, athletic identity, motivation, coaching conditions, and time use, may be tested as potential mediators or moderators in adequately powered models. The current data do not permit these mechanisms to be tested.

Interpretation is constrained by the single-institution convenience sample, the historical 2020 competition context, self-reported measures, small subgroup sizes, the undocumented athletic-experience cut-point, unresolved inconsistencies in the instrument-validation records, and the absence of documented formal ethics approval in the materials available for this revision. These limitations should be resolved or transparently disclosed before final publication.

Contributions of Authors

Author 1: Conceptualization, methodology, and supervision.
Author 2: Data analysis, interpretation, and manuscript writing.
Author 3: Literature review and data collection.
Author 4: Research instrument preparation and validation.
Author 5: Data collection and organization.
Author 6: Statistical analysis and results verification.
Author 7: Manuscript editing, proofreading, and final review.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of Interests

The author declared no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

The researchers thank everyone who supported this study's successful completion.

References

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(4), 297–308.S

Caraqui-an, L., Paimalan, I.G., Retiza, A., Sison, J.M., Meliston, S.M., & Taja-on, E. (2026). Academic demands and athletic commitments: A cross-sectional study on student-athletes' time management. American Journal of Sports Science and Innovation, 1(1), 32–37. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajssi.v1i1.6706

Daum, H.T., Daum, L.T., & Scholten, S. (2024). Academic achievement among NCAA Division 2 student-athletes and non-athletes. Youth, 4(3), 1260–1270. https://doi.org/10.3390/youth4030079

García, A., & Fong, C. (2025). Sociodemographic, campus support, and psychological factors predicting academic achievement of community college athletes. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice. https://doi.org/10.1177/15210251251366665

Hart, K., Madrigal, L., Ede, A., & Fogaca, J. (2024). Examining classroom learning behaviors and academic and athletic motivation in collegiate athletes. Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 17(2). https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v17i2.21308

Kang, S., & Alaeddini, A. (2025). Student-athletes' road to success in college life: Factors influencing psychological well-being, athletic, and academic performance. Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 18(3). https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v18i3.22764

Kuroda, Y., Ishihara, T., & Kamijo, K. (2023). Balancing academics and athletics: School-level athletes' results are positively associated with their academic performance. Trends in Neuroscience and Education, 33, 100210. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2023.100210

Moleski, K., Ridpath, B.D., & Yang, L. (2023). Factors that influence the academic success of college athletes participating in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 16(3). https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v16i3.20082

Palma, F. (2026). Engagement and self-efficacy in Physical Education among Filipino college students. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Viewpoints, 2(3), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.64612/ijiv.v2i3.102

Rabuya, R. (2024). Motivational climate and academic achievement of student athletes: Basis for development program. Davao Research Journal, 15(3), 90–99. https://doi.org/10.59120/drj.v15i3.249

Sallen, J., Wendeborn, T., & Gerlach, E. (2023). Talented athletes as high achievers—only in sports? Analysis of academic performance and the impact of dual career assistance programmes in upper secondary school. German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research, 53, 410–419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-023-00878-7

Santos, J., & Sagas, M. (2022). Effects of time utilization on the well-being of college athletes. The Open Sports Sciences Journal, 15, e1875399X2208101. https://doi.org/10.2174/1875399X-v15-e2208101

Steele, A., van Rens, F.E.C.A., & Ashley, R. (2020). A systematic literature review on the academic and athletic identities of student-athletes. Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 13(1), 69–92. https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v13i1.13502

Storey, Q., Hewitt, P., & Ogrodniczuk, J. (2024). Managing daily responsibilities among collegiate student-athletes: Examining the roles of stress, sleep, and sense of belonging. Journal of American College Health, 72(6), 1834–1840. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2022.2093610

Storm, R., & Eske, M. (2022). Dual careers and academic achievements: Does elite sport make a difference? Sport, Education and Society, 27(6), 747–760. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2021.1919070

Tompsett, J., Mcdossi, O., & Roscigno, V. (2023). Collegiate sports participation, academic achievement, and bachelor's degree completion. Sociological Forum, 38(4), 1266–1287. https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12967

Vavassori, R., Moreno, M.P., & Ureña Espa, A. (2023). The perception of volleyball student-athletes: Evaluation of well-being, sport workload, players' response, and academic demands. Healthcare, 11(11), 1538. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11111538

Yukhymenko-Lescroart, M. (2023). The role of achievement goals and identity in academic performance and misconduct of college athletes: Considering sport-to-school spillover. Heliyon, 9(2), e13435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13435