Analysis of Worries and Solution Strategy Type of College Athletes

Yong-Kuk Lee[1] and Ill-Gwang Kim[2*]

[1]Department of Physical Education, Korean National Sport University, Korea;
94zzang@gmail.com
[2]Department of Leisure Sport, Seowon University, Korea;
whyhow1023@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the worries and solution strategy types of college athletes. To this aim, 326 college athletes were selected for collecting data for the study. The collected data were analyzed for the frequencies and percentages, separated by worries and solution strategy types of college athletes, and were χ^2 verified for the difference by the background variables. The conclusions obtained in this study are as follows. College athletes have worries of performance factors, career factors and lifestyle factors; types to solve these troubles include independent type, dependent type and abandonment type. Secondly, worries vary in accordance with athletic career and career path after graduation, and do not vary in accordance with sex, kinds of sports and significant others deciding the careers. Thirdly, there are differences in the solution strategy types depending on the college athletes' genders, athletic careers and significant career decision others, and no difference in accordance with the kinds of sports and the after-graduation courses.

Keywords: College Athletes, Dilemmas, Solution Strategy, Worries

1. Introduction

In February 2008, the once-famous baseball player named Ho Seong Lee killed 4 people (the mother and three daughters). In May 2012, the former South Korean national soccer player named Dong Hyun Kim kidnapped the woman. These two incidents gave a huge shock to the South Korean society. Unlike them, the former high school baseball player named Jong Hoon Lee passes the final phase of national bar examination in November 2009. Now, he is working at South Korea's biggest law firm called Kim and Chang. Also, the lawyer named Jung Jae Lee is a former soccer player. All of them have skipped a significant amount of school classes in order to improve their athletic competitiveness during their school days. This fact was confirmed in many previous studies[1–4]. This serious problem associated with learning deficit is derived from the student athlete system through which students can advance to higher education institutes by performing well in a national sport tournament regardless of their academic performance[5].

The reason why student athletes and parents can endure abnormal operation of sports club in school, which deprives students of their right of learning, is that they expect to become a world renowned professional athlete just like Chan Ho Park and Ji Sung Park. However, a lot of student athletes have dropped out due to this pyramid-based advancement structure to higher education institutes. Furthermore, they experience game burden of excessive competitive structure, burden of future career and burden of study in the process leading to their drop-out[6,7].

Student athletes start exercise at early age. They spend most of their time on exercise. Thus, they cannot have many opportunities to receive various socio-cultural educations[1,8,9]. On this account, they have an inadequate level of basic learning ability and problem-solving ability that are required for their social life. Thus, they believe that their future career path is very limited[10,11]. However, it was found that student athletes wanted to become a physical education teacher, professor, national athlete or corporate team athlete[12,13]. Such occupations as physical

education teacher and professor require a significant amount of learning process. However, student athletes are forced to have a life of exercise machine whose learning right is deprived in the regular learning process[14].

Those student athletes are learning for solving their career dilemma and self-development[14]. On that account, it is important to examine this matter from the perspective of education consumers such as student athletes in order for the future-oriented student athlete education related policies and educational content development to be effective[15]. However, there have been several studies on the career of student athletes, including the career awareness[13], the career process[16], the career discovery type of non-popular sport student athletes[15], the occupations of student athletes who dropped out[17] and the dilemmas of non-outstanding student athletes[18]. In addition, those Olympics medalists have experienced social mal adjustment due to learning deficit during their school days. Also, they have not had a sufficient amount of opportunities to get a job in the fields other than the sports field[19, 20].

Therefore, it is necessary to examine carefully from a student perspective about what dilemmas those student athletes have and what efforts they make to solve these dilemmas before graduation from university regardless of whether they are an outstanding athlete of a popular sports field or not.

This study can be a starting point to develop another Jong Hoon Lee or Jung Jae Lee while it can also provide preliminary data that can be reflected in the future assistance policies for student athletes.

2. Research Method

2.1 Research Subject

This study selected the 350 4-year student athletes enrolling in the universities in the capital region through the convenience sampling method (one of the non-probabilistic sampling method) after setting the student athletes from in the universities registered in the Korea Sports Council as the target group. This study utilized the data from a total of 326 students after excluding the questionnaires with incomplete responses among the collected data. The general characteristics of the subjects in this study are as shown in (Table 1).

2.2 Study Toll

This study utilized the questionnaire in order to examine the dilemmas and solutions for the university student

athletes. The questionnaire was composed of the 5 questions on the background variables of student athletes (gender, exercise career, exercise item, career after graduation and important career decision determinants) and the 2 descriptive questions asking for the current dilemmas and relevant efforts to solve the dilemmas.

Table 1. Characteristics of study subjects

Variable	Sub-Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	205	62.9
	Female	121	37.1
Athletic career	8 years or less	89	27.3
	8 to 11 years	144	44.2
	11 years or more	93	28.5
Athletic game	Individual	157	48.2
	Interpersonal	105	32.2
	Team	64	19.6
Career path after graduation	Corporate team	182	55.8
	Learning	23	7.1
	Exercise cessation	33	10.1
	Enlisting in military	56	17.2
	Coach	20	6.1
	Other	12	3.7
Gender	Coach	94	28.8
	Parent	122	37.4
	Senior/junior	34	10.4
	Friend	9	2.8
	Oneself	67	20.6

3. Results

3.1 Type of Dilemmas and Resolution Strategies of University Student Athletes
3.1.1 Dilemmas of University Student Athletes

As shown in (Table 2), there are a total of 313 raw data for the dilemmas of university student athletes before graduation. These 313 raw data was classified into the 9 sub-domains through the primary analysis. Then, they were classified into the 3 broad domains in the secondary analysis.

3.1.2 Type of Dilemma Resolution Strategies of University Student Athletes

As shown in (Table 3), there are a total of 326 raw data for the dilemma resolution strategies of university student athletes. These 326 raw data was classified into the 6 sub-domains through the primary analysis. Then, they were classified into the 3 broad domains in the secondary analysis.

Table 2. Dilemmas of university student athletes

Large scale		Small scale		Raw data
Content	Frequency	Content	Frequency	Content(Frequency)
Athletic performance	95	Athlete's life	30	Athletic performance (18), Retirement period (4), Asian game participation (1), Weight adjustment (1), National member team selection tournament (1), Exercise underperformance (1), Tournament performance (1), Exercise continuance (2), Inadequate exercise facility (1)
		Corporate team	46	Corporate team exercise environment (6), Corporate team interpersonal relationship (4), Corporate team salary (12), Adaptation after joining corporate team (3), Selection of corporate team (14), Contract period of corporate team (2), Competitiveness in corporate team (4), Corporate team contract (1)
		Injury	19	Injury (17), Athletic performance after recovering from injury (1), Injury treatment cost (1)
Career	195	Learning	36	Learning(6), Graduate school advancement (15), University academic grade (6), Graduate school advancement (3), Graduate school advancement period (2), Learning method (1), Learning and exercise career dilemma (1), Learning English (2)
		Career	113	Career (46), Business (1), Stable job (6), Post-retirement career (8), Post-corporate team career (7), Employment (14), Future (6), Anxiety about future (1), Adaptation to new career (1), Success about new career (1), Stable social position (1), Future job (4), Lifelong job (5), Things that I want to do (2), Post-athletic career job (1), Acquisition of license (1), Career certainty (3), Post graduation career (1), Career after military duty (4)
		Military	46	Enlisting in military(44), Achieved goals before enlisting in military (1), Applying for an officer position (1)
Livelihood	23	Fund	8	Fixed income (6), Debt (1), Accumulating wealth (1)
		Household problem	3	Household problem (2), Dependency on parent (1)
		Other	12	Social life (1), Marriage (3), Date (2), No goal (2), Setting goal (3), Selecting priority (1)
Total	**313**		**313**	

Table 3. Type of strategies to solve the dilemmas of university student athletes

Large scale		Small scale		Raw data
Content	Frequency	Content	Frequency	Content (Frequency)
Self-supporting type	221	Self-exploration	41	Positive mind (6), Information search (21), Career planning (5), Self-exploration (1), Challenging for new field (3), Making plan (2), Setting clear goals (3)
		Self-management	132	Training (61), Injury prevention (11), Devoted to the current work (42), Thorough self-management (5), Remedial exercise (8), Body management (4), Devoted to a single work (1)
		Self-improvement	48	Learning (19), Applying for an officer position (3), Learning English (6), Developing a learning habit (1), Acquisition of license (7), Self-improvement (3), Job related career experience (3), Improving specialized knowledge (1), Teaching experience (2), Attending academic institute (3)
Dependency type	55	Advice	54	Senior/junior Advice (30), Coach advice (17), Parent's advice (7)
		Religion	1	Religious life (1)
Abandonment type	50	Abandonment	50	Rest (2), No effort (48)
Total	**326**		**326**	

3.2 Difference in Dilemmas in Accordance with the Background Variables of University Student Athletes

3.2.1 Difference in Dilemmas in Accordance with Gender and Career Path after Graduation

According to (Table 4), there was no statistically significant difference in the dilemmas before graduation in

Accordance with the gender of university student athletes (χ^2 = 1.291, p = .731). More specifically, career (37.1%) accounted for the largest proportion among the male athletes, followed by athletic performance (18.1%), livelihood (5.2%) and no dilemma (2.5%). Career (22.7%) accounted for the largest proportion among the female athletes, followed by athletic performance (11.0%), livelihood (1.8%) and no dilemma (1.5%).

According to (Table 4), there was a statistically significant difference in dilemmas in accordance with the post-graduation career of university student athletes (χ^2 = 93.173, p = .001). More specifically, athletic performance (26.7%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having decided to pursue a career in a corporate team upon graduation, followed by career (25.8%), no dilemma (1.8%) and livelihood (1.5%). Career (6.1%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having decided to study further upon graduation, followed by livelihood (0.9%). Career (8.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having stopped their athletic career, followed by livelihood (0.6 %) and no dilemma (0.6%). Career (11.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having decided to enlist in military, followed by livelihood (2.5%), athletic performance (2.1%) and no dilemma (1.5%). Career (4.6%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having decided to pursue a coach career upon graduation, followed by livelihood (1.5%). Career (3.4%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes having decided to other career paths upon graduation, followed by athletic performance (0.3%).

3.2.2 Difference in Dilemmas in Accordance with Athletic Career

According to (Table 5), there was a statistically significant difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the athletic career of university student athletes (χ^2 = 12.576, p = .050). More specifically, career (19.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among 8 years or less, followed by athletic performance (6.1%) and livelihood (2.1%). Career (23.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among 8 to 11 years, followed by athletic performance (14.7%), livelihood (3.4%) and no dilemma (3.1%). Career (17.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among 11 years or more, followed by athletic performance (8.3%), livelihood (1.5%) and no dilemma (0.9%).

Table 5. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domain of dilemmas in accordance with athletic career

Content	Athletic career		
	8 years or less	8 to 11 years	11 years or more
No dilemma	0(0.0)	10(3.1)	3(0.9)
Athletic performance	20(6.1)	48(14.7)	27(8.3)
Career	62(19.0)	75(23.0)	58(17.8)
Livelihood	7(2.1)	11(3.4)	5(1.5)
χ^2=12.576(df=6, p=.050)			

3.2.3 Difference in Dilemmas in Accordance with Sport Field and Important Career Decision Determinants

According to (Table 6), there was no statistically significant difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the sport field and important career decision determinants of university student athletes (χ^2 = 5.094, p = .532). More specifically, career (27.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among individual sport field athletes, followed by athletic performance (15.0%), livelihood (3.4%) and no dilemma (1.8%). Career (18.4%) accounted

Table 4. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domains of dilemmas in accordance with the gender and post-graduation career

Gender			Post-graduation career path						
Content	Male	Female	Content	Corporate team	Learning	Exercise cessation	Enlisting in military	Coach	Other
Career	121(37.1)	74(23.9)	No dilemma	6(1.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	5(1.5)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
Athletic performance	59(18.1)	36(11.0)	Athletic performance	87(26.7)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	7(2.1)	0(0.0)	1(0.3)
Livelihood	17(5.2)	6(1.8)	Career	84(25.8)	20(6.1)	29(8.9)	36(11.0)	15(4.6)	11(3.4)
No dilemma	8(2.5)	5(1.5)	Livelihood	5(1.5)	3(0.9)	2(0.6)	8(2.5)	5(1.5)	0(0.0)
χ^2=1.291 (df=3, p=.731)			χ^2=93.173 (df=15, p=.001)						

Table 6. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domains of dilemmas in accordance with sport field and important career decision determinants

	Game type				Important career decision determinants				
Content	*Individual*	*Interpersonal*	*Team*	*Content*	*Coach*	*Parent*	*Senior/junior*	*Friend*	*Oneself*
No dilemma	6(1.8)	5(1.5)	2(0.6)	**No dilemma**	5(1.5)	6(1.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(0.6)
Athletic performance	49(15.0)	34(10.4)	12(3.7)	**Athletic performance**	38(11.7)	25(7.7)	14(4.3)	3(0.9)	15(4.6)
Career	91(27.9)	60(18.4)	44(13.5)	**Career**	45(13.8)	83(25.5)	18(5.5)	5(1.5)	44(13.5)
Livelihood	11(3.4)	6(1.8)	6(1.8)	**Livelihood**	6(1.8)	8(2.5)	2(0.6)	1(0.3)	6(1.8)
	χ^2=5.094(df=6, p=.532)				χ^2=17.619(df=12, p=.128)				

for the largest proportion among interpersonal sport field athletes, followed by athletic performance (10.4 %), livelihood (1.8%) and no dilemma (1.5%). Career (13.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among Team sport field athletes, followed by athletic performance (3.7%), livelihood (1.8%) and no dilemma (0.6%).

According to (Table 6), there was no statistically significant difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the important career decision determinants of university student athletes (χ^2 = 17.619, p = .128). More specifically, career (13.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose coach, followed by athletic performance (11.7%), livelihood (1.8%) and no dilemma (1.5%). Career (25.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose parent, followed by athletic performance (7.7%), livelihood (2.5%) and no dilemma (1.8%). Career (5.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose seniors and juniors, followed by athletic performance (4.3%) and livelihood (0.6%). Career (1.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose friend, followed by athletic performance (0.9%) and livelihood (0.3%). Career (13.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose themselves, followed by athletic performance (4.6%), livelihood (1.8%) and no dilemma (0.6%).

3.3 Difference in the Types of Dilemma Resolution Strategies in Accordance with the Background Variables of Univerisy Student Athletes

3.3.1 Difference in the Types of Dilemma Resolution Strategies in Accordance with the Gender and Post-Graduation Career Path

According to (Table 7), there was a statistically significant difference in the types of dilemma resolution strategies in accordance with the gender of university student athletes (χ^2 = 10.120, p = .006). More specifically, self-supporting type (43.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among the male athletes, followed by abandonment type (11.3%) and dependence type (7.7%). Self-supporting type (23.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among the female athletes, followed by dependence type (9.2%) and abandonment type (4.0%).

According to (Table 7), there was no statistically significant difference in the types of dilemma resolution strategies in accordance with the post-graduation career of university student athletes (χ^2 = 14.848, p = .138). More specifically, Self-supporting type (38.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose corporate team, followed by dependence type (10.1%) and abandonment type (7.7%). Self-supporting type

Table 7. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domains of dilemmas in accordance with the gender and post-graduation career

	Gender			Career path after graduation					
Content	*Male*	*Female*	*Content*	*Corporate team*	*Learning*	*Exercise cessation*	*Enlisting in military*	*Coach*	*Other*
Self-supporting type	143(43.9)	78(23.9)	Self-supporting type	124(38.0)	14(4.3)	19(5.8)	40(12.3)	17(5.2)	7(2.1)
Dependency type	25(7.7)	30(9.2)	Dependency type	33(10.1)	5(1.5)	4(1.2)	6(1.8)	3(0.9)	4(1.2)
Abandonment type	37(11.3)	13(4.0)	Abandonment type	25(7.7)	4(1.2)	10(3.1)	10(3.1)	0(0.0)	1(0.3)
	χ^2=10.120(df=2, p=.006)			χ^2=14.848(df=10, p=.138)					

(4.3%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose learning, followed by dependence type (1.5%) and abandonment type (1.2%). Self-supporting type (5.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose to stop athletic career, followed by abandonment type (3.1%) and dependence type (1.2 %). Self-supporting type (12.3%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose to enlist in military, followed by abandonment type (3.1%) and dependence type (1.8 %). Self-supporting type (5.2%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose coach, followed by dependence type (0.9 %). Self-supporting type (2.1%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose others, followed by dependence type (1.2%) and abandonment type (0.3%).

3.3.2 Difference in the Dilemmas Resolution Strategies in Accordance with the Athletic Career

According to (Table 8), there was a statistically significant difference in the dilemmas resolution strategies in accordance with the athletic career of university student athletes (χ^2 = 22.782, p = .001). More specifically, self-supporting type (20.90%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes whose athletic career was 8 years or less, followed by dependence type (5.5%) and abandonment type (0.9%). Self-supporting type (28.5%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes whose athletic career was 8 to 11 years, followed by abandonment type (10.7%) and dependence type (4.9%). Self-supporting type (18.4%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes whose athletic career was 11 years or more, followed by dependence type (6.4%) and abandonment type (3.7%).

Table 8. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domains of resolution strategies in accordance with the athletic career

Content	Athletic career		
	8 years or less	8 to 11 years	11 years or more
Self-supporting type	68(20.9)	93(28.5)	60(18.4)
Dependency type	18(5.5)	16(4.9)	21(6.4)
Abandonment type	3(0.9)	35(10.7)	12(3.7)
χ^2=22.782(df=4, p=.001)			

3.3.3 Difference in the Dilemmas Resolution Strategies in Accordance with the Sport Field and Important Career Decision Determinant

According to (Table 9), there was no statistically significant difference in the dilemmas resolution strategies in accordance with the sport field of university student athletes (χ^2 = 6.791, p = .147). More specifically, self-supporting type (34.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among those individual sport athletes, followed by dependence type (8.6%) and abandonment type (5.5%). Self-supporting type (19.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among those interpersonal sport athletes, followed by abandonment type (7.4%) and dependence type (4.9%). Self-supporting type (13.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among those team sport athletes, followed by dependence type (3.4%) and abandonment type (2.5%).

According to (Table 9), there was a statistically significant difference in the dilemmas resolution strategies in accordance with the important career decision determinants of university student athletes (χ^2 = 25.202, p = .001). More specifically, self-supporting type (19.9%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose coach, followed by abandonment type

Table 9. Result of analysis on the difference in the broad domains of resolution strategies in accordance with the sport field and important career decision determinants

Content	Game type			Content	Important career decision determinants				
	Individual	Interpersonal	Team		Coach	Parent	Senior/ junior	Friend	Oneself
Self-supporting type	111(34.0)	65(19.9)	45(13.8)	Self-supporting type	65(19.9)	88(27.0)	19(5.8)	6(1.8)	43(13.2)
Dependency type	28(8.6)	16(4.9)	11(3.4)	Dependency type	11(3.4)	15(4.6)	14(4.3)	0(0.0)	15(4.6)
Abandonment type	18(5.5)	24(7.4)	8(2.5)	Abandonment type	18(5.5)	19(5.8)	1(0.3)	3(0.9)	9(2.8)
χ^2=6.791(df=4, p=.147)				χ^2=25.202(df=12, p=.001)					

(5.5%) and dependence type (3.4%). Self-supporting type (27.0%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose parent, followed by abandonment type (5.8%) and dependence type (4.6%). Self-supporting type (5.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose seniors and juniors, followed by dependence type (4.3%) and abandonment type (0.3%). Self-supporting type(1.8%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose friend, followed by abandonment type (0.9%). Self-supporting type (13.2%) accounted for the largest proportion among those athletes who chose themselves, followed by dependence type (4.6%) and abandonment type (2.8%).

4. Discussion

The discussions based on the study results are as follows. This study found that the dilemmas of university student athletes before graduation included athletic performance factor, career factor and living factor. These student athletes had such stress factors as training and game burden and learning and uncertain future[6,7,18]. The reason thereof is that their dilemmas were worsened due to the unilateral nature of career decision through only athletic performance unlike other conventional students as a result of the long period of athletic life[18]. This unique feature makes a large number of student athletes limit their career development areas[21]. Thus, student athletes need to get opportunities to experience various socio-cultural events because they need a process of social adaptation in order to have a normal social life after retirement of athletic career.

This study found that the types of dilemmas resolution strategies of university student athletes were self-supporting type, dependence type and abandonment type. As for the sub-domain themes, self-management accounted for the largest proportion, followed by advice, abandonment, self-development and self-discovery. Reference[15] analyzed and reported that the types of career discovery of those non-popular sport field high school student athletes were self-abandonment type, others-depending type, indecisive type and busying oneself type. Thus, their result was similar to the finding of this study. Self-supporting resolution strategy type is very similar to "busying oneself type" found in the study of[15], which mainly appears among academically or athletically outstanding students. Thus, it is having a positive impact on inducing active discovery action for career in various fields in addition to athletic career upon graduation due to the positive expectations of parents and self-confidence[15]. In[13] reported that student athletes would decide their own career. Thus, he also supported the finding of this study that the student athletes with self-supporting resolution strategy type accounted for the largest proportion.

Those of dependence resolution strategy type tend to solve dilemmas through consultation with coach, parents, seniors and juniors. That is to say, they tend to depend on their coach or acquaintances. Those people of this type are very similar to "related people-dependent type"[22,23] who decides to pursue their athletic career in a team decided by their coach or parents and "others-dependent type" who unconditionally agree with the decision of their coach or parents in relation to the matters of university advancement or employment[15]. This also found that the student athletes would get their first job through their coach or acquaintances after retirement of athletic career[12]. It is believed that the aforementioned phenomenon was inevitable for student athletes to compete against competitors who have long prepared with various social experiences at the time of retirement[24]. On that account, it would be imperative to provide those many opportunities of career training to student athletes so that they could explore their career paths more flexibly.

Abandonment resolution strategy type is very similar to "self-abandonment type" who tends to give up on diverse possibilities for their present time and future[15]. In general, student athletes have less experiences of pondering over their educational advancement, employment and post-retirement career due to their frequent absence in class. Also, they experience abandonment due to their academic and athletic under-achievement[15]. These student athletes with abandonment type have suffered from the abnormally operated school sport system. They are aware of the need to prepare for a different life after retirement. However, they are unable to conduct their study because they have a feeling of physical and psychological helplessness due to excessive training time[14].

As for the difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the background variables of university student athletes, there was a difference in accordance with the athletic career and post-graduation career, whereas there was no difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the gender, sport field and important career decision

determinants. All of the respondents in this study had more than 8 years of athletic career. Thus, 55.8% of the respondents were scheduled to pursue a career in a corporate team upon graduation. As a result, this study found that there were many dilemmas associated with career and athletic performance among these student athletes who chose to pursue a career at a corporate team. Those student athletes who chose to enlist in military accounted for 17.1%. This result is believed to be attributing to the fact that student athletes should postpone their military duty until graduation. In addition, this study found that those student athletes who had chosen to enlist in military or pursue a career as a coach had a lot of dilemmas associated with their living. In[25] emphasized the need of improving the work conditions of athletic club coaches by pointing out the urgency of establishing stable work and wage conditions for athletic club coaches.

As for the difference in the types of dilemma resolution strategies in accordance with the background variables of university student athletes, there was a difference in accordance with the gender, athletic career and important career decision determinants. However, there was no difference in accordance with the sport field and post-graduation career. As for the resolution strategy types for each gender, self-supporting type accounted for the largest proportion among the men, followed by abandonment type and dependence type, whereas self-supporting type accounted for the largest proportion among the women, followed by dependence type and abandonment type. Thus, there was a statistically significant difference. In[13] supported the finding of this study by reporting that more male students (66.1%) had not made any effort for their career as compared with the female students (48.0%) in his study for the high school student athletes. It is believed that the reason thereof is that female students tend to depend more on their coaches or parents as compared with male students. As for the difference in the dilemma resolution strategy type in accordance with the important career decision determinants, there was a statistically significant difference. Among the student athletes who were influenced by their coaches or parents on career decision, self-supporting type accounted for the largest proportion, followed by abandonment type and dependence type. Among those student athletes who were influenced by senior and juniors on their career decision or who would make their own career decision,

self-supporting type accounted for the largest proportion, followed by dependence type and abandonment type. This result may indicate that student athletes simply give up without making any effort because they depend on their coaches or parents for their career decision. In contrast, those student athletes who make their own career decision with consultation from seniors and juniors depend on their coaches or acquaintances in order to find a resolution while making their own decision given the result that they get their first post-retirement job through their coaches or acquaintances[12].

5. Conclusion and Suggestions

The purpose of this study is to analyze the types of dilemmas and resolution strategies of university student athletes. This study first collected the data from the 326 university student athletes and then analyzed the data based on the types of dilemmas and resolution strategies of university student athletes. Lastly, this study verified the dilemmas in accordance with the background variables of university student athletes and the differences in the types of resolution strategies. The conclusions obtained in this study are as follows.

First, university student athletes have many dilemmas associated with athletic performance factor, career factor and living factor. The types of dilemma resolution strategies include self-supporting type, dependence type and abandonment type. Second, there is a partial difference in the dilemmas in accordance with the background variables of university student athletes. Third, there as a partial difference in the resolution strategies in accordance with the background variables of university student athletes.

The considerations for future-oriented career education measures for student athletes and the suggestions for the direction of follow-up studies are as follows. First, it would be imperative to conduct a study on the policies related to the athlete student system that is based on tournament performance. Second, it would be required to prepare systematic measures that could levy penalty to those whose academic performance grade does not meet the minimum standard. Coaches and student athletes in school sport sites will get all the damages resulting from the implementation of inadequately planned policies.

6. References

1. Kwak EC, Kim YK, Joo BH. A study on student-athletes learning environments in secondary schools and systematic alternatives. Korean Journal of Sport Pedagogy. 2011; 18(1):1–16.
2. Kim MJ, Chung HJ. Their own learning: Ethnography for the learning of athlete-students. The Korean Journal of Physical Education. 2012; 51(2):51–62.
3. Lee HJ. Support on right to learn for student-athlete: ground and alternative. The Korean Journal of Physical Education. 2009; 48(5):35–44.
4. Cho WS, Lee YK. The Practical problems of the minimum academic achievement implementation. Korean Journal of Sports Science. 2013; 22(6)1013–29.
5. Lee YK, Cho OS. The effectiveness of minimum academic achievement policy for student-athletes. The Korean Journal of Physical Education. 2013; 52(5):677–90.
6. Kim BJ, Kim JS. Sources of Stress in competitive youth sport In Korea. Korean Society of Sport Psychology. 1998; 9(1):33.
7. Seong CH, Hong SC, Seong HG. Motives of drop - out in competitive youth sport in Korea. Korean Journal of Sport Pedagogy. 2001; 8(2):145–62.
8. Lim YS, Ryu TH, Lee GI. The Process of loss for drop-out student athletes. Anthropology of Education. 2010; 13(3):37–69.
9. Han TR, Chung YL, Seo HJ. The actual condition analysis for the career path of athletic students. Korean Journal of Society for the sociology of Sport. 2010; 23(2):135–48.
10. Kim JS, Hwang YJ. Determinants of job decision of general high school students. Journal of Employment and Skills Development. 2007; 10(3):1–23.
11. Lim SA. Effects of the aptitude for choosing a career choice, the career support from parents, the will to overcome career barriers on academic achievement motivation. Journal of Future Oriented Youth Society. 2012; 9(4):221–38.
12. Korean Olympic Committee. A study on the career and vocational consciousness of school players. Seoul: Korean Olympic Committee. 2010.
13. Lee CS. A study on the awareness of careers in high school soccer players. Korean Journal of Sports Science. 2008; 17(4):203–14.
14. Choi YL, Lee YK. The student athletes' recognized for academic differences. Journal of Coaching Development. 2014; 16(1):61–71.
15. Kwon MJ, You JA. Inquiry on career searching types of high school student-athletes in unpopular sports. Journal of Korean Physical Education Association for Girls and Women. 2014; 28(1):101–16.
16. Kim K. A study on career cases of elite synchronized swimming players. Korean Journal of Sports Science. 2014; 23(4):407–20.
17. Cha EJ. An analysis on the status of occupation of drop-out student athletics. Korean Journal of Sports Science. 2012; 21(5):513–26.
18. Kim MY, Cho MH. A study on the dilemmas of low achievement athletes at a urban high school. Korean Journal of Sport Pedagogy. 2004; 11(2):177–91.
19. Kim SA. National team status and future direction of support systems for enhancing career after retirement. National Assembly Research Service. Issues Report. 2009 Jan 7; 19(1).
20. Lee YS. A study on retirement preparation and career support for national athlete in Korea. Korean Journal of Sport Science. 2008; 19(4):136–45.
21. Lee KH. A Study on the intercollegiate athletes' perceptions toward future career development. The Journal of Korea Society for Wellness. 2013; 18(1):71–80.
22. Koo CM. The study on the life style of collegiate athletes in unpopular sports. Korean Journal of Society for the Sociology of Sport. 2010; 23(3):1–18.
23. Park CB. Employment paths of female collegiate athletes. The Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction. 2013; 13(5):481–500.
24. Mc Knight K, Bernes K, Gunn T, Chorney D, Orr D, Bardick A. Life after sport: Athletic career transition and transferable skills. Journal of Excellence. 2009; 13:63–77.
25. Kim DK. A study on better treatment for instructors of school sport teams. Journal of Korean Society of Sport Policy. 2007; 9: 1–25.