

# Relationship between Facebook Usage and Self-Efficacy among Collegiate Athletes

JONGSUNG KIM

*St. Thomas University, Florida, USA*

*This research investigates the relationship between Facebook usage and self-efficacy in collegiate athletes. The sample for this study are St. Thomas University athletes in the United States. The variables used to represent Facebook usage, Facebook frequency of use, Facebook number of friends, and Facebook frequency status updates are measured using Facebook Intensity Scale (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). The dependent variable used in this study is self-efficacy which is measured using the General Self-efficacy (GSE) developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1995). Data analyses indicate a statistically significant relationship between the number of Facebook friends and self-efficacy. The data also indicates a significant inverse relationship between Facebook frequency status updates and self-efficacy. The results of the correlation analysis indicate inverse relationships between frequency status updates and frequency of use, and frequency status updates and Facebook number of friends. These findings suggest that once the coaches, administrators, and professors attend to the issue of Facebook usage for collegiate athletes, it may enhance self-efficacy and psychological benefits.*

**Keywords:** College athletes, facebook, self-efficacy, social network sites

The Internet has become an omnipresent component of Americans' daily lives. In more detail, science has grown into a representative of socialization over the improvement of numerous social networking sites (i.e. Twitter, Google Plus, Facebook, etc.). What built social media exclusive is not because online users allow individuals to encounter other users; somewhat, they enable customers to communicative and make their social communication visible (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). The creator of Facebook, Zuckerberg believes that social networking site was what provides Facebook so captivating: additional friends became member of Facebook, and users might interconnect with every one through Internet and extended networks inside Facebook (Levy, 2007). Online social networking sites or social media provide online users with the capability to interconnect, work corporately, performance, and share thoughts with other online users without geographical or demographic boundaries (Giles, 2010).

---

**Correspondence to:** Jongsung Kim, Adjunct Professor, School of Leadership Studies, St. Thomas University, Florida, USA. E-mail: [j0710012@gmail.com](mailto:j0710012@gmail.com). All rights reserved with *Media Watch*. For permission and reprint, please mail to: [mediawatchjournal@gmail.com](mailto:mediawatchjournal@gmail.com).

Recently Facebook has grown into one of the leading social networking websites, used by millions of adolescents and college students. Initially considered for University students, Facebook has followers reaching from adolescences to elders through 15 million inimitable U.S. monthly guests (Dwyer, Passerini, & Hiltz, 2007). Furthermore, regardless of whether visitors are using Facebook for scholarly purposes. For example, students communicate with professor or faculty for assignments and academic purposes (Heiberger & Harper, 2008). From a social perspective, undergraduates might reach higher levels of social recognition as a consequence of augmented Facebook connections by building networks on social networking sites that students could not have then made in individual, which might accelerate in-person interactions essential out of social networking sites (Boyd, 2008). Additionally, researchers of social network sites have the ability to directly observe how online relationship networks may facilitate this social learning process, such as self-efficacy (Martin & Dowson, 2009).

Self-efficacy is defined as a belief in one's own ability to perform an action or activity necessary to achieve a goal or task (Bandura, 1977). Bandura places self-efficacy at the fundamental of all human operational and identifies it by way of the omission in considerate human performance. This is based on the principle that the method human consider, trust, and sense have emotional impact human behavior and the selections they create. Furthermore, the increasing cognition of network, such as Internet use and social networking sites, changes the possibility to improve self-efficacy because of social capital theory. Specifically, social capital theory foresees that interface with informally and governmentally diverse individuals undoubtedly affects wide-ranging belief and governmental efficacy. Communication with other people, who are diverse, reasons further social struggle than with homogeneous (Putnam, 2000). From a technology perspective, a study was found that feelings of self-efficacy and computer technology increased significantly between the first and second year, and maintained a high level of efficacy during the third year (Milbraith & Kinzie, 2000).

Bandura (1997) finds that scholars who feel further assured in definite areas will pursue to increase and master educated abilities in specific domains. Bandura frames this notion of field specific self-assurance as self-efficacy. These people have high ranks of self-efficacy is further assured that those who will be able to achieve goals in convinced domains than these through low self-efficacy. According to Watts and Moore (1993), collegiate athletes devote a most of time on increasing physical skills, more than educational pursuits. Additionally, athletes might not have term and occasion to improve higher ranks of self-efficacy than common students. Hendricks and Constance (2005) argue that self-efficacy is a major characteristic among student-athletes. More specifically, relevant stages of anticipation and self-efficacy are required for evolving build up health performances in collegiate athletes.

Increasing Internet use and social networking sites, especially Facebook is fairly probable to enhance self-efficacy that certainly effects psychosomatic modification and societal contribution in college students. Additionally, research finds that dimensions of Facebook usage for class establishing performances contain self-efficacy and recognized inspiration to interconnect with other users using the Facebook (Lampe, Wohn, Vitak, Ellison, & Wash, 2011). However, collegiate athletes might not have term and occasion to improve higher ranks of self-efficacy than common students (Watts & Moore, 1993). Moreover, current research has not examined the relationship between Facebook usage and self-efficacy for collegiate athletes.

### **Need for Research**

College student's participation in social media has enlarged significantly in the last 10 years (Bugeja, 2007). For the most of University students, online communication, with text messaging, blogging, and e-mailing have convert a day-to-day portion of their societal and financial lives (Charnigo & Barnett-Ellis, 2007; Ellison, Steinfield & Lampe, 2007; Tapscott & Williams, 2008).

The growth of the "status update" function allows friends to make available actual time accounts on users' lives while getting feedback on a quick time environment on Facebook (Ellison et al., 2007). This sort of micro-blogging interface inner social media is related with self-esteem (Harter, 1999). Moreover, many scholars emphasize that it has been thoroughly connected to self-efficacy (Brookover, Thomas, & Patterson, 1985; Coopersmith, 1967; Covington, 1989; Holly, 1987; Wylie, 1979), this is not astonishing that current study has similarly recommended that degree of Facebook use and product within profiles are connected to Facebook visitors' scores on levels of psychological factors (Kim, LaRose, & Peng, 2009).

By the time Facebook reaches self-efficacy, a previous study presented that Internet use had an optimistic outcome on self-efficacy (Furutani, Kobayashi, & Ura, 2009). Self-efficacy has its backgrounds in Bandura's (1977) social learning concept. A highly self-efficacious individual can obtain numerous emotional assistances (Bandura). Moreover, research finds that dimensions of Facebook usage for class establishing performances contain self-efficacy and recognized inspiration to interconnect with other users using the Facebook (Lampe et al., 2011).

Consequently, from the use of Facebook, this is pretty possible that self-efficacy positively effects emotional modification and social contribution. Reflecting on collegiate athletes, they are people who might experience growth and growth complications with both perceptive and psychosocial responsibilities (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001; Parham, 1993). Sepulveda (2008) also emphasizes that self-efficacy is one of significant factor on collegiate athletes. Thus, by investigative the impact of Facebook usage on self-efficacy, this study can provide an innovative perception to the study on Facebook usage and emotional benefits or psychological adaptations. It would be appealing to examine how Facebook usage affects individuals and self-efficacy in collegiate athletes.

### **Purpose of the Study**

Previous research indicates that online interactions has been related with emotional happiness and persons using the Internet and other online social networking sites and applications might expand their social sustenance structures and expand users' interactive relationships offline, thus intensifying their emotional well-being (Bargh & McKenna, 2004). Furthermore, academic research suggests that students see social networking sites as predominantly social or entertainment systems (Joinson, 2008). Moreover, research finds that dimensions of Facebook usage for class establishing performances contain self-efficacy and recognized inspiration to interconnect with other users using the Facebook (Lampe et al., 2011). Reflecting on collegiate athletes, previous studies emphasize that self-efficacy is one significant factor on collegiate athlete (Sepulveda, 2008). Given the additional specific demands faced in today's scientific environment, the current study seeks to extend previous

studies for a possible relationship between Facebook usage and self-efficacy in collegiate athletes.

### **Research Question**

This study focused on the following research question: What, if any relationship exists between Facebook usage and self-efficacy in collegiate athletes? This question addresses the purpose of the study and the need for research by directly investigating the correlation between these two variables.

### **Facebook and College Students**

College students' engrossment in online social media has enlarged significantly in the last 10 years (Bugeja, 2007). For the most of University students, online communication, with text messaging, blogging, and e-mailing have convert a day-to-day portion of their societal and financial lives (Capriccioso, 2006; Charnigo & Barnett-Ellis, 2007; Ellison, Steinfield & Lampe, 2007; Tapscott, 2008). Dahlstrom, Eden, Boor, Grunwald and Vockley (2011), on behalf of the Educause Center for Applied Research, conducted one of the first national studies of undergraduate social network site use. Survey responses of 3,000 college students from 1,179 colleges and universities indicate that the 90 percent of students use Facebook, including 58 percent who report using it 13 times a day. Students at associate institutions use Facebook less frequently than other students, but 49 percent still use it multiple times a day. Fifty-eight percent of the students say they are comfortable using Facebook as a way to communicate and connect with other students about coursework.

### **Self-Efficacy and Collegiate Athletes**

Collegiate athletes are people what one might involvement development and increase difficulties with both perceptive and psychosocial responsibilities (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001; Parham, 1993). In detail, research shows that collegiate athletes require help in overcoming tasks in the growth of physical, educational, and individual abilities (Ferrante & Etzel, 1996).

Reflecting on the athletes, Bandura (1997) emphasizes that physical ability is principally constructed over demonstrating. Rookie or not as much of trained athletes detect more experienced athletes and evoke what athletes did in order to learn abilities that will advantage them in the upcoming event. Athletes also absorb expertise over and done with "physical demonstration, pictorial portrayal, or verbal instruction" (p. 371).

According to Watts and Moore (1993), collegiate athletes devote a most of time on increasing physical skills, more than educational pursuits. Additionally, athletes might not have term and occasion to improve higher ranks of self-efficacy than common students. Hendricks and Constance (2005) argue that self-efficacy is a major characteristic among collegiate athletes. More specifically, relevant stages of anticipation and self-efficacy are required for evolving build up health performances in collegiate athletes.

Scholars discussed that collegiate athletes might not grow as common non-athletes students do, due to the environment and values of big group sports (Sowa & Gressard, 1983). Reflecting on collegiate athletes, previous study emphasized that self-efficacy is one

significant factor on collegiate athlete (Sepulveda 2008). Moreover, collegiate athletes have a higher hope and self-efficacy than non-student athletes (Hendricks & Constance, 2005). Those who possess strong self-efficacy beliefs seek to participate in challenging activities (sports) and respond with heightened effort and persistence in demanding situations (Bandura, 1982; Bandura & Cevone, 1983).

## **Methodology**

This research methodology is a quantitative method utilizing a correlational research design. Through the utilization of the General self-efficacy scale (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995) in tandem with the Facebook intensity scale (Ellison et al., 2007), a correlational study will be assembled in order to increase the understanding of the underlying forces of the relationship (Johnson & Christensen, 2004) that exists between Facebook usage and self-efficacy among collegiate athletes.

Scholz, et al (2002) notes that the general self-efficacy scale typically yielded internal consistencies between alpha = .75 and .91. Its stability has been examined in several longitudinal studies. On the Facebook intensity scale, Ellison et al. (2007) find that their measure sustained high internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha of .83.

The conceptual frameworks used in this study investigate a single dependent variable and one independent variable with three dimensions. The dependent variable used in this study is self-efficacy (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995). The independent variable, Facebook usage will measure the frequency and duration, incorporating emotional connectedness to the site and its integration into individuals' daily activities is the interest in this study and this instrument contained 3 items (Ellison, et al, 2007). There are dimensions of Facebook usage: (1) Facebook frequency of use; (2) Facebook number of friends; (3) Facebook frequency status updates. In this study the independent variable will be manipulated indirectly through measured selection.

The following three hypotheses will be tested:

H1N: There is no significant relationship between Facebook frequency of use and self-efficacy

H1A: There is a significant relationship between Facebook frequency of use and self-efficacy

H2N: There is no significant relationship between Facebook number of friends and self-efficacy

H2A: There is a significant relationship between Facebook number of friends and self-efficacy

H3N: There is no significant relationship between Facebook frequency status updates and self-efficacy

H3A: There is a significant relationship between Facebook frequency status updates and self-efficacy.

## **Sample**

Seventy-two St. Thomas University student athletes were surveyed. Only athletes who are Facebook members took part in this study. Two were discarded for being incomplete or

incorrectly filled out. Consequently, the valid sample consisted of 70 participants. The athletic director conducted a review of all instruments prior to granting approval of the study. Of the 70 applicants that did reply to demographic queries, 44.3% were male and 55.7% were female. Regarding ethnicity, 32.9% were White, 25.7% were Black or African-American, 27.1% were Hispanic, and 14.3% were other ethnicities. Finally, the applicants' ages ranged from 18 – 25 with a mean age of 21. More specifically: 24.3% of participants were 18 - 19 years of age, 45.7% were 20 – 21 years of age, 21.4% were 22 – 23 years of age, and 8.6% were 24 – 25 years of age.

## Findings

### Facebook Usage Analysis

To determine their Facebook Usage, respondents rated 3 statements based on the Facebook intensity scale (FIS) (Ellison et al., 2007). This measure focuses on three components of Facebook: frequency of use, number of friends, and the frequency status updates. Additionally, FIS measures the frequency and duration of Facebook usage as well as incorporation of emotional connectedness to the site and its integration into individuals' daily activities is the interest in this study.

To measure solid features of Facebook usage, applicants were questioned to whole queries that were in multiple choice formats. Table 1 presents the summary statistics of respondents' aggregate Facebook intensity for each subscale of Facebook intensity.

Table 1: Summary Statistics of Respondents Aggregate Facebook Intensity

	N	Min.	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Frequency of use	70	0	5	2.21 (31-60min)	1.48
Number of friends	70	2	8	5.70 (201-250)	2.07
Status updates	70	0	5	1.445 (1-5 times)	1.45

### Self-efficacy Analysis

To determine their self-efficacy, respondents rate 10 statements based on the general self-efficacy scale (GSE) (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1995). The GSE is a 10 item scale. It measures 10 items on an ordinal scale, with 4 possible responses to each item (range 1-4): 1= not at all true; 2 =barely true; 3 = moderately true; and 4 = exactly true. The summated scores range from 10-40, with higher scores indicating greater confidence in generalized self-efficacy (Schwarzer, & Scholz, 2000). Table 2 presents the summary statistics of respondents' aggregate self-efficacy.

Table 2: Summary Statistics of Respondents Aggregate Self-Efficacy

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.	Coefficient Alpha
Self-efficacy	70	24	40	33.25	4.39	.90

**Data Presentation and Analysis**

The data was analyzed using SPSS 20 analytic computer software. Correlation analysis was used at the .05 significance level. The result or output for this type of study is numbered between -1 and + 1 referred to as correlation coefficient and a result of 0 indicates no correlation (Anderson et al., 1993). Correlation assessment was performed using Pearson’s standard r correlation coefficient. Table 3 is a correlation matrix showing the results of the hypothesis testing.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

	Self-efficacy	Frequency of use	Number of friends	Status updates
Self-efficacy	1.000	-.202	.305*	-.361**
Frequency of use	-.202	1.000	-.140	.513**
Number of friends	.305*	-.140	1.000	-.400**
Status updates	-.361**	.513**	-.400**	1.000

\*\*Correlation is significant at the.01 level (2-tailed)

\* Correlation is significant at the.05 level (2-tailed)

**Results of Hypothesis Testing**

For the first hypothesis, Table 3 shows a correlation coefficient of -.202 for the Facebook frequency of use and self-efficacy. This indicates the relationship between these two variables is not statistically significant. Thus the null hypothesis 1 should not be rejected.

For the second hypothesis, Table 3 shows a correlation coefficient of .305 for the Facebook number of friends and self-efficacy. This indicates a weak, statistically significant relationship at the .05 level of significance between two variables. Consequently, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 2 should be rejected.

For the third hypothesis, Table 3 shows a correlation coefficient of -.361 for the Facebook frequency status updates and self-efficacy. This indicates statistically significant inverse relationship at the .01 level of significance between two variables. Consequently, the null hypothesis for hypothesis 3 should be rejected. It suggests that as Facebook frequency status updates increases self-efficacy decreases because the correlation coefficient for this pair of variables is negative.

Additionally, the Table 3 shows relationships among the variables representing Facebook intensity. With a correlation coefficient of .513, frequency status updates and

frequency of use appear to be moderately correlated. The data also indicate there is statistically significant inverse relationship between frequency status updates and number of friends, as the results of the analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of  $-.400$ .

### Conclusions and Discussion

Researchers of social network sites have the ability to directly observe how online relationship networks may facilitate this social learning process such as self-efficacy (Martin & Dowson, 2009). Hendricks and Constance (2005) state that self-efficacy is as a major characteristic among collegiate athletes. A highly self-efficacious person can receive various psychological benefits (Bandura, 1997).

In these results, one can conclude that if coaches, administrators, and professors might want to observe the arrangement of maintenance, inspiration, and psychological benefits for collegiate athletes, specifically self-efficacy, Facebook usage will affect their self-efficacy. In other words, Facebook number of friends will affect collegiate athletes' self-efficacy. On the other hand, Facebook frequency status updates had a statistically significant inverse relationship with self-efficacy.

More specifically, findings suggested that Facebook frequency of use did not affect self-efficacy, but Facebook number of friends affected self-efficacy and frequency of status update affected self-efficacy negatively. Particularly, the cognition that an athlete could connect with friends or groups with diverse social circumstances by the Facebook usage positively affected athletes' self-efficacy. On the other hand, the cognition that an athlete could frequency of status update that chooses the information they want to share on their timeline negatively affected self-efficacy. Coaches, administrators, and professors would examine the tactic of in what way to treat this destructive influence. Additionally, this result suggests that they explore the procedure by which Facebook usage affects communal performance through self-efficacy. In addition to helping collegiate athletes, this use of technology could support a variety of populations, including professional researchers, or others who benefit from psychological well-being.

### References

- Anderson, D.R., Sweeny, D.J., & Williams, T.A. (1993). *Statistics for Business and Economics*. St. Poul: West Publishing Company.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1982). *Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency*. *American Psychologists*, 37, 122-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Co.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1017-1028.
- Bargh, J., & McKenna, K. (2004). The Internet and social life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55(1), 573–590.



- Boyd, D. (2008). Facebook's privacy train wreck. Exposure, invasion, and social convergence. *Convergence. The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies Online*, 14, 13-20.
- Boyd, D., & Ellison, N.B. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13, article 11. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol13/issue1/boyd.ellison.html>
- Bugeja, M. (2007). Distractions in the Wireless Classroom. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(21), C1-C4.
- Brookover, W.B., Thomas, S.R., & Patterson, T.W. (1985). *Self-concept of ability and school achievement*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Office of Research and Public Information.
- Capriccioso, R. (2006). Facebook faceoff. Message July 30, 2008, posted to Inside Higher Ed: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2006/02/14/facebook/>
- Carodine, K., Almond, K.F., & Gratto, K. K. (2001). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 19-34.
- Charnigo, L., & Barnett-Ellis, P. (2007). Checking out Facebook.com: The impact of digital trend on academic libraries. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 26(1), 23-34.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.
- Covington, M. (1989). *Self-esteem and failure in school: The social importance of self-esteem*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Dahlstrom, E., Boor, T., Grunwald, P., & Vockley, M. (2011). *The ECAR National Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology*. Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research.
- Dwyer, C., Passerini, K., & Hiltz, S.R. (2007). Trust and privacy: A comparison of Facebook and Myspace. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Keystone, Colorado August 2007.
- Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook "Friends": Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143-1168. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x
- Ferrante, A.P., Eztel, E.F., & Lantz, C. (1996). Counseling college student athletes: The problem, the need. In E. F. Eztel, A. P. Ferrante & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), *Counseling college student athletes: Issues and interventions* (pp. 3-26). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Furutani, K., Kobayashi, T., & Ura, M. (2009). Effects of internet use on self-efficacy: Perceived network-changing possibility as a mediator. *AI & Society*, 23(2), 251-263. doi:10.1007/s00146-007-0132-3
- Giles, M. (2010). A world of connections. *The Economist*. Retrieved from [http://www.economist.com/specialreports/displaystory.cfm?story\\_id=15351002](http://www.economist.com/specialreports/displaystory.cfm?story_id=15351002)
- Harter, Susan. (1999). *The construction of the self: A developmental perspective*. New York: Guilford Press

- Hendricks, D.L., & Constance, S.H. (2005). The relationship of hope and self-efficacy to health promoting behaviors among student-athletes attending historically black colleges and universities. *Journal of Multicultural Nursing & Health, 11*(3), 23-34.
- Heiberger G., & Harper, R. (2008). Have you Facebooked Astin lately? Using technology to increase student involvement. *New Directions for Student Services, 124*, 19-35.
- Holly, W. (1987). *Self-esteem: Does it contribute to students' academic success?* Eugene: University of Oregon, Oregon School Study Council.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative qualitative and mixed approaches*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Joinson, A.N. (2008). Looking at, looking up or keeping up with people?: Motives and use of Facebook. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1027–1036). New York: ACM
- Lampe, C., Wohn, D., Vitak, J., Ellison, N. B., & Wash, R. (2011). Student use of Facebook for organizing collaborative classroom activities. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 6*(3), 329-347.
- Levy, S. (2007). Facebook grows up. *Newsweek*, August 27, 40-46.
- Martin, A. J., & Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and educational practice. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 327-365.
- Milbraith, Y. and Kinzie, M. (2000). Computer technology training for prospective teachers: Computer attitudes and perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 8*(4), 373-396.
- Parham, W.D. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990s profile. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*, 411-429.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster
- Scholz, U., Gutiérrez D. B., Sud, S., Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is General Self-Efficacy a Universal Construct?. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 18* (3): 242.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35–37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Schwarzer, R., & Scholz, U. (2000). Cross-cultural assessment of coping resources: The general perceived self-efficacy scale. Paper presented at the First Asian Congress of Health Psychology: Health Psychology and Culture, Tokyo, Japan. Retrieved from [http://www.fu-berlin.de/gesund/publicat/world\\_data.htm](http://www.fu-berlin.de/gesund/publicat/world_data.htm)
- Sepulveda, M. L. (2008). *The effects of stress management training on collegiate football athletes anxiety, self-esteem, self-efficacy, motivation, academic performance and coping skills*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. F. (1983). Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 236-239.

- Tapscott, D., & Williams, A. D. (2008). *Wikinomics: How mass collaboration changes everything (expanded ed.)*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Watt, S.K. & Moore, J. L. (1993). Who are student athletes? New directions for student services. In M.F. Howard-Hamilton and S. K. Watts (Eds.), *Student services for athletes*, (pp. 7-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wylie, R. C. (1979). *The self-concept*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

---

**Dr. Jongsung Kim** received Bachelor degree in Business Administration and Sport Management from Kyonggi University in South Korea in 2005. Shortly after his graduation, he served as ROTC Officer, First Lieutenant & Human Resources Officer in the 1<sup>st</sup> Division Artillery of Republic of Korea Army at 2005 through 2007. In 2010, he received Master of Business Administration degree in St. Thomas University, Florida, USA. In 2013, he received Doctorate of Education degree from St. Thomas University, Florida, USA. Dr Kim has presented papers at a number of national and international conferences including New Mexico, Seoul, and Suwon. He has several publications in national journals to his credit. His research interests include the uses of online social network, educational leadership, human resource management, and sport administration. E-mail: [jkim@stu.edu](mailto:jkim@stu.edu)