

Outmatched and Under Pressure: A New Approach to Student-Athlete Wellbeing

One Athlete, Invisible

A transfer athlete arrives in August. She attends every practice, hits her benchmarks, and passes her wellness screening. But she eats alone more often now. She stopped lingering after practice two weeks ago. She has not initiated a conversation with a teammate since she arrived. No questionnaire captures this. No coach, responsible for 44 athletes, notices. By October, she is in the transfer portal again. The system will ask what went wrong. The answer is that nothing in the system was designed to see it.

Her case is not unusual. It is the architecture working as designed. Screening questionnaires, wellness check-ins, open-door policies, the entire apparatus depends on a single channel: the athlete choosing to disclose. When that channel fails, the system treats it as a personal failure rather than what it is: a design failure. It assumes athletes possess the emotional awareness to monitor their own distress, the language to articulate it, and the trust to share it with figures who control their playing time, their scholarship, and their future.

A System That Cannot See

Seventy-four percent of Division I athletic departments have no embedded mental health providers (Jones et al., 2022). That is a staffing gap. The consequences are measurable: mental health concerns among NCAA athletes remain 1.5 to 2 times above pre-pandemic baselines (NCAA, 2023), and the proportion of NCAA athlete deaths attributable to suicide doubled from 7.6% to 15.3% over two decades (Whelan et al., 2024).

The detection failure is equally stark. Chang et al. (2020) and Wolanin et al. (2016) found a five-fold gap between instrument-detected depression (21% of athletes screened) and self-reported depression (4%), meaning the vast majority of athletes experiencing clinical symptoms do not disclose them. Erickson et al. (2023) found a 67.5% false-negative rate on the IOC's screening tool: two out of three at-risk athletes pass undetected. These are not measurement errors. They reflect a system in which vulnerability carries professional consequences, and the person who holds the most authority over an athlete's competitive life also controls the environment in which help would be sought.

Then three disruptions arrived within three years. Legal sports betting (*Murphy v. NCAA*, 2018) converts athletes into involuntary betting lines. The transfer portal compresses team-building into free agency without guardrails. Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL, 2019) introduces financial stratification that fractures locker rooms. The market responded with generic wellness apps and AI chatbots built on the same broken assumption: the athlete engages alone. The median 30-day retention rate for these tools is 3.3% (Baumel et al., 2019). The architecture fails because it assigns responsibility to the person with the least structural power (Rhoden, 2006).

A Framework That Sees What's Coming

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) identifies three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and proposes that their satisfaction or frustration produces distinct outcomes. Satisfied needs produce intrinsic motivation and engagement. Frustrated needs produce burnout, depression, and disengagement. Bartholomew et al. (2011) demonstrated that need frustration uniquely predicts depression beyond low need satisfaction alone. The dark pathway is not the absence of the bright one.

Most psychological measures tell you what is happening. SDT shows you what is coming. Lonsdale and Hodge (2011) established that declining self-determination preceded increases in burnout; SDT constructs behave as leading indicators, not lagging ones. The predictive power is substantial: Lonsdale et al. (2009) reported that SDT variables accounted for up to 74% of the variance in global burnout, a figure that dwarfs the explanatory power of standard mood screenings.

The three disruptions press on the full infrastructure SDT identifies. Sports betting undermines autonomy by converting athletes into financial instruments and competence by redefining success through point spreads. NIL fractures relatedness by creating financial castes within teams. The transfer portal severs the relational bonds on which need satisfaction depends.

An athlete targeted by bettors, underpaid relative to teammates, and considering the portal is not experiencing three separate frustrations. She is experiencing one compounding environment. If need satisfaction predicts sustained competitive performance, and it does, then SDT is not exclusively a wellness tool. It is a competitive advantage.

Distributing the Burden

Any honest proposal must confront the obvious objection: coaches are already overwhelmed. They manage NIL advising, transfer portal retention, betting-related athlete protection, compliance mandates, recruiting, and the actual job of coaching. The current system places the entire burden of detection on two parties who cannot carry it: the athlete, who must self-disclose, and the coach, who must notice. Both are set up to fail.

A system designed for reality distributes this burden across three levels. First, athletes need the capacity to understand their own psychological needs, not as a prerequisite for seeking help, but as a skill built over time. An athlete who recognizes that declining motivation is linked to a loss of autonomy, not laziness, gains self-leadership. She can name what is shifting before anyone else needs to. Second, coaches need a system that does the pattern recognition they cannot do at scale. A coach responsible for 44 athletes cannot track the relational dynamics of each one through observation alone. But a system that surfaces the three athletes whose belonging dropped sharply this week turns an impossible task into a focused one. Third, institutions need visibility into patterns no single person can see. When freshman belonging scores are 23% below

the team average across three sports, that is not a coaching problem. It is an onboarding design problem.

The answer to the coaching constraint is not that coaches do more. It is that the system asks less of any single person.

What Could Go Wrong

The evidence linking environments to athlete wellbeing is strong. Deploying SDT as a practical leading indicator across diverse populations remains in its early stages, and the hardest objections deserve direct answers.

The first is surveillance. Any system that measures psychological states risks becoming a monitoring tool dressed as care, regardless of its designer's intentions. If an institution uses belonging data to justify cutting an athlete, the system has been weaponized. If relatedness scores become a proxy for "culture fit," the tool reproduces the very power dynamics it was built to counteract. The values must be non-negotiable: development, not surveillance, and every insight must function as a lens, not a label. Measurement must be indirect, captured through channels athletes already use. For example, text-based interventions retain 94% of young users at 30 days, compared to just 74% of app-based tools (Prior et al., 2024). The medium matters as much as the model.

The second is capacity. If the coaching staff lacks the ability to respond to what a system surfaces, the result is better-documented neglect. Detection without response is worse than no detection at all, because it removes the excuse of ignorance. The three-level distribution must include actionable guidance at each level, or it creates three burdens where there was one.

The third is equity. Can SDT-based measures distinguish clinical risk from normal fluctuation? Does indirect measurement work equally well across racial, cultural, and developmental contexts? If athletes are given a self-leadership vocabulary without psychological safety to use it, the tool becomes another performance expectation layered onto those least equipped to absorb it.

What Comes Next

The case for investing despite these limitations is straightforward: the alternative system, depending entirely on self-disclosure and coach intuition, does not work. The evidence says so. The athletes say so. The suicide data says so.

What is needed is a system grounded in SDT that tracks the three basic needs dynamically, distributes detection across athletes, coaches, and administrators, and treats every data point as a development tool owned by the athlete. It must be indirect enough to capture what self-report misses, specific enough to guide action, and honest enough to flag its own blind spots.

The measure of success is the moment a coach says, "I caught that early," and the moment an athlete says, "I knew something was off before anyone had to tell me."

Bibliography

- Bartholomew, K. J., et al. (2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(11), 1459–1473.
- Baumel, A., et al. (2019). Objective user engagement with mental health apps. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 21(9), e14567.
- Chang, C. J., et al. (2020). Mental health issues and psychological factors in athletes. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 48(9), 2303–2314.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Erickson, J. L., et al. (2023). Validity of the APSQ for mental health screening. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 57(21), 1389–1394.
- Jabir, A. I., Lin, X., Martinengo, L., Sharp, G., Theng, Y.-L., & Tudor Car, L. (2024). Attrition in conversational agent-delivered mental health interventions: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 26(1), e48168.
- Jones, M., Zakrajsek, R., & Eckenrod, M. R. (2022). Mental performance and mental health services in NCAA DI athletic departments. *Journal for Advancing Sport Psychology in Research*, 2(1), 4–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55743/000010>
- Lonsdale, C., & Hodge, K. (2011). Temporal ordering of motivational quality and athlete burnout. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 43(5), 913–921.
- Lonsdale, C., et al. (2009). Athlete burnout in elite sport: A self-determination perspective. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(8), 785–795.
- NCAA Student-Athlete Health and Wellness Study, 2022–23 December 2023: https://ncaaorg.s3.amazonaws.com/research/wellness/Dec2023RES_HW-MentalHealthRelease.pdf
- Prior, E., Dorstyn, D., Taylor, A., & Rose, A. (2024). Attrition in psychological mHealth interventions for young people: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science*, 9, 639–651. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41347-023-00362-x>
- Rhoden, W. C. (2006). *\$40 Million Slaves: The Rise, Fall, and Redemption of the Black Athlete*. Crown Publishers.
- Wolanin, A., et al. (2016). Prevalence of clinically elevated depressive symptoms in college athletes. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 50(3), 167–171.
- Whelan, B. M., Kliethermes, S. A., Schloredt, K. A., Rao, A., Harmon, K. G., & Petek, B. J. (2024). Suicide in National Collegiate Athletic Association athletes: A 20-year analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 58(10), 531–537. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2023-107509>