

Spring 2020

## Newcomer Student-Athlete Perceptions of Coaches' Socialization Strategies: Scale Development

Evelyn Su Jara-Pazmino

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>



Part of the [Sports Management Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Jara-Pazmino, E. S. (2020). *Newcomer Student-Athlete Perceptions of Coaches' Socialization Strategies: Scale Development*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/5845>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu).

NEWCOMER STUDENT-ATHLETE PERCEPTIONS OF COACHES' SOCIALIZATION  
STRATEGIES: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

by

Evelyn Su Jara-Pazmino

Bachelor of Science  
University of Michigan, 2002

Masters in Sport and Entertainment Management  
University of South Carolina, 2015

---

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy in

Sport and Entertainment Management

College of Hotel, Retail and Sport Management

University of South Carolina

2020

Accepted by:

Bob Heere, Major Professor

Khalid Ballouli, Major Professor

Tom Regan, Committee Member

David Cardenas, Committee Member

Sam Todd, Committee Member

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Evelyn Su Jara-Pazmino, 2020  
All Rights Reserved.

## DEDICATION

**“Only she who attempts the absurd can achieve the impossible” (Robin Morgan)**

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Ciro Pazmino, who took the risk to support me in this impossible idea, thank you for being a constant source of support and encouragement during the challenges of graduate school and life. Thank you for being a firm believer in women’s professionalism and excellence.

**“It always seems impossible until it’s done” (Nelson Mandela)**

I dedicate this thesis to my daughters Samantha and Vianka, who are a source of inspiration for me every day. Just knowing you exist, pushes me to be the best I can be every day. Believe in yourselves you can achieve everything you set your mind to.

**“A river cuts through rock not because of power but because of persistence” (James Walkins)**

To my parents, Germán and Rocío Jara and my brother Germán A., you have always believe in me. Thank you for your unconditional support! I am feel extremely blessed to be part of your lives. Your good example and vision have taught me to work hard for the things that I aspire to achieve. I am forever grateful!

**“Fist, think. Second, dream. Third, believe. And finally, dare” (Walt Disney)**

To my grandparents, Blanca who first dreamed of a new reality, and to Roberto who dared to support women in this trip to the unknown. Thank you for believing in the future.

**“The strength of a family, like the strength of an army, is in its loyalty to each other” (Puzo)**

To Blanquita, Ciro and all the Pazmino family, thank you for all your support in this journey. Without all of you, this achievement could not have been possible.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Bob Heere. You have been a role model to me, “an international scholar being the best of the best in the USA”. Thank you for providing me with guidance and constant encouragement through the completion of the Ph.D. program.

To Dr. Tom Regan, co-advisor and committee member, thank you for giving me the opportunity to be a part of this program. Your discipline and work ethic guided me through the path to a master and a PhD at the University of South Carolina.

To Dr. David Cardenas thank you for your guidance and for promoting the University of South Carolina in other countries and especially in Ecuador.

To Dr. Sam Todd, committee member, thank you for your support. I would like to thank all the faculty and staff of the Sport and Entertainment Program of the University of South Carolina for sharing the passion and knowledge of the many dimensions of the sport industry.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Gangotena, Dr. Montufar and Dr. Quiroga from the Universidad San Francisco de Quito, for your trust and support.

## ABSTRACT

In this era of multi-million dollar paydays, the need to fill arenas and the pressure to win has increased dramatically. In order to build a winning program, the coaching staff turns to national and international recruiting. According to David Ching, Senior Contributor of Forbes, “Nearly every Power Five college athletics program spends more than \$1 million per year on recruiting” (Ching, 2018). The fact that student-athletes have a limited time of four years of eligibility to perform for their institutions, results in a continuous influx of newcomers to the team. Student-athletes with a diverse cultural background have to adapt to a team culture in order to be able to perform at the highest level. Every sports team is situated within a unique environmental context (i.e., physical, task, social, personal) that is characterized by a distinct social reality (Martin, Bruner, Eys & Spink, 2014). Considering that, the integration of newcomer athletes is a process that happens on a large scale at the beginning of every season, delineating the tactics sports teams employ to facilitate this process warrants considerable attention (Benson, Evan, & Eys, 2016). Theory regarding organizational socialization offers a promising framework to examine how sports teams manage initial entry experiences because it presumes that teams are active agents in newcomer socialization – using tactics that ideally combine to maximize outcomes for the individual as well as the group (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

In collegiate athletics, the head coach has a major leadership role within the team. The high salaries that head coaches receive are just a reflection of how important the coach

is within the collegiate athletics model. Nevertheless, very little is known about the effectiveness of the socialization process of student-athletes with a different culture (SADC), established by the coach.

In this study, the author focused on the organizational socialization process of newcomer student-athletes that have a significant difference between their culture and the team culture (e.g. a student-athlete from California who attends an institution in South Carolina). The author took special attention to the student-athlete's perception of the ability of the coach to structure the socialization process. Based on the results from Jara-Pazmino, Heere, Regan, Blake, and Southall (2017) that state that each athlete has a different background and different factors that influence their reality, which might hinder the effectiveness of universal treatment.

Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) proposed the use of a socialization process with five constructs (custom coaching, mentorship, team structure, all-inclusive family and support services). For this study, the author has conceptualized the five concepts proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) based on an extensive literature review to coach's cultural competence, mentorship, introduction to norms and roles, prosocial behavior and introduction to support services. Coaches face a challenge when trying to find a balance between accommodating SADC and findings ways to create a homogeneous culture for their team. For this reason, the purpose of this study is to develop a valid and reliable instrument to measure the SADC's perceptions of the tactics used by their coach during the socialization process of newcomers into college athletics, based on the scale development procedure by Churchill (1979).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Abstract .....	v
List of Tables .....	ix
List of Abbreviations .....	xii
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Chapter 2: Review of Literature: .....	6
2.1 Organizational Socialization Process .....	6
2.2 Cultural Distance and Cultural Difference .....	11
2.3 Organizational Socialization in Sports .....	13
2.4 Leadership Theory Development in Sport Management .....	15
2.5 Coach's Cultural Competence .....	23
2.6 Mentorship .....	26
2.7 Introduction to Team Norms and Roles .....	35
2.8 Prosocial Behavior .....	39
2.9 Introduction to Support Services .....	42
2.10 Sense of Belonging and Satisfaction as outcomes .....	44
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	48
3.1 Research design .....	48
3.2 Research context .....	51



3.3 Scale Development Procedure .....	52
3.4 Delimitations and limitations .....	75
Chapter 4: Results .....	76
4.1 Stage 1: Specify domains of constructs .....	77
4.2 Stage 2: Generate a sample of items .....	78
4.3 Stage 3: Pilot Data Collection.....	98
4.4 Stage 4: Reliability and validity assessment .....	104
4.5 Stage 5: Item Purification .....	111
4.6 Stage: 6 Second Data Collection .....	113
4.7 Stage 7: Reliability and Validity Assessment of Second Data Collection ....	116
4.8 Stage 8: Develop norms .....	135
Chapter 5: Discussion and Implications .....	137
5.1 General discussion of the results .....	137
5.2 Reliability .....	142
5.3 Validity .....	143
5.4 Contributions to the research .....	145
5.5 Implications for future research .....	147
5.6 Conclusion .....	149
References.....	151
Appendix A: Pilot Study Questionnaire .....	162
Appendix B: Expert Panel .....	168
Appendix C: Socialization Student-Athletes SSA scale.....	170
Appendix D: IRB approval.....	173

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Initial items generated for first data collection .....	61
Table 4.1 The constructs of the Socialization Process of SADC .....	77
Table 4.2 Items for Coach's Cultural Competence Construct .....	79
Table 4.3 Items for Mentorship Construct .....	81
Table 4.4 Items for the Introduction to the Team Norms and Roles Construct .....	83
Table 4.5 Items for Prosocial Behavior Construct .....	84
Table 4.6 Items for Introduction to Support Services Construct .....	86
Table 4.7 Items for Pre-Questionnaire .....	88
Table 4.8 Items for Outcome 1 Sense of Belonging .....	89
Table 4.9 Items for Outcome 2 Satisfaction .....	90
Table 4.10 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Cultural Difference .....	91
Table 4.11 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Coach's Cultural Competence .....	91
Table 4.12 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Mentorship Construct .....	92
Table 4.13 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Introduction to Norms and Roles .....	93
Table 4.14 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Prosocial Behavior .....	94
Table 4.15 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Introduction to Support Services .....	94
Table 4.16 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Outcomes Sense of Belonging .....	95
Table 4.17 Experts' Ratings of each Item in Outcomes Satisfaction .....	95
Table 4.18 Socialization process from the student-athletes perspective scale.....	96
Table 4.19 Demographics of Pilot Study Data Collection .....	99

Table 4.20 Descriptive Statistics – Pre Questionnaire .....	100
Table 4.21 Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Sense of Belonging - Satisfaction .....	101
Table 4.22 Descriptive Statistics of Constructs Coach’s Cultural Competence .....	101
Table 4.23 Descriptive Statistics of Construct Mentorship .....	102
Table 4.24 Descriptive Statistics of Construct Introduction to Norms and Roles .....	103
Table 4.25 Descriptive Statistics of Construct Prosocial Behavior .....	103
Table 4.26 Descriptive Statistics of Construct Introduction to Support Services .....	104
Table 4.27 Reliability of each construct .....	105
Table 4.28 Item-to-total Statistic: Pre-Questionnaire and Outcomes .....	107
Table 4.29 Item-to-total Statistic: Constructs .....	108
Table 4.30 Inter-item correlation Pre-Questionnaire and Outcomes .....	110
Table 4.31 Inter-item correlation 5 Constructs .....	110
Table 4.32 Items deleted from the new scale .....	112
Table 4.33 Demographics 2 <sup>nd</sup> Data Collection .....	114
Table 4.34 Demographics Background 2 <sup>nd</sup> Data Collection .....	115
Table 4.35 Reliability Assessment Construct 1 Coach’s Cultural Competence .....	117
Table 4.36 Reliability Assessment Construct 2 Mentorship.....	117
Table 4.37 Reliability Assessment Construct 2 Mentorship without CM5 .....	118
Table 4.38 Reliability Assessment Construct 3 Introduction to Norms and Roles .....	118
Table 4.39 Reliability Assessment Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior.....	119
Table 4.40 Reliability Assessment Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services .....	119
Table 4.41 Fit indices for model 1 (26 items – sample 1) .....	122
Table 4.42 Factor Loadings of the 26 items in model 1 .....	125

Table 4.43 Standardized Regression Weights .....	126
Table 4.44 Reliability measures Model 1 Sample 1 .....	127
Table 4.45 CFA model 2 compared to model 1 .....	128
Table 4.46 Factor Loadings of the 21 items in model 2 .....	129
Table 4.47 Reliability measures Model 2 Sample 1 .....	130
Table 4.48 Correlation between the constructs .....	130
Table 4.49 Assessment of discriminant validity by AVE's .....	131
Table 4.50 CFA for Model 2 Sample 2 compared to Sample 1 .....	131
Table 4.51 Factor Loadings of the 21 items in model 2 for Sample 1 and 2 .....	132
Table 4.52 Reliability measures Model 2 Sample 1 and 2 .....	132
Table 4.53 Correlation between the constructs sample 2 .....	133
Table 4.54 Assessment of discriminant validity by AVE's sample 2 .....	133
Table 4.55 Correlation between the Constructs and the two Outcomes .....	134

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HBCU .....	Historically Black College and University
ISA .....	International Student-athlete
LSS.....	Leadership Scale for Sports
MML.....	Mediational Model of Leadership
PWI.....	Predominantly White Institution
SA .....	Student-athlete
SADC.....	Student-athlete with a different culture
SSA .....	Socialization from Student-athlete Perspective scale

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The United States collegiate athletic system exists in an environment filled with a superior level of athletic competition, high pressure to perform, and abundant expectations. Collegiate athletics, “big-time sports” are associated with high investments and are built upon a revenue-generating model. In 2016, the USA Today News published the average expenditure of the top 50 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) institutions in 2014-2015, which constituted to be \$110,716,064.00. In this era of multi-million dollar paydays, the need to fill arenas and the pressure to win has increased dramatically. In order to build a winning program, the coaching staff turns to national and international recruiting. According to David Ching, Senior Contributor of Forbes, “Nearly every Power Five college athletics program spends more than \$1 million per year on recruiting” (Ching, 2018).

Based on the regulations of NCAA Division I collegiate sports, student-athletes have a limited time of four years to perform for their institutions. Therefore, there is a continuous influx of newcomers to the team, in addition to a large number of athletes that leave their programs early or transfer to other institutions, who had to adapt to a team culture in order to be able to perform at the highest level. Due to this fact, the fast and effective adaptation of newcomer student-athletes is imperative.

This becomes particularly important in the context of newcomer student-athletes with a different cultural background (SADC), such as international student-athletes (ISAs), and student-athletes who originate from a different regional, socio-economic or ethnic culture.

One of the primary potential drivers of withdrawal or attrition among organizational newcomers is inadequate socialization (Feldman, 1997; Fisher, 1986). Organizational socialization is an important process that uses tactics to help newcomers adapt to early entry experiences; to reduce uncertainty and anxiety associated with the reality shock of joining a new organization; and to acquire desired or necessary attitudes, behaviors, and knowledge (Bauer, Morrison, & Callister, 1998; Cable & Parsons, 2001; Jones, 1986; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In general, successful socialization is the transformation from outsider to participating and effective insider (Feldman, 1976b).

It is important to mention that socialization is not the same as socializing (interacting with others, like family, friends, and coworkers). Since such a process of socialization involves the transmission of information and values, it is fundamentally a cultural matter (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

The experience of entering a sports team environment is fraught with potential ambiguities surrounding how athletes will fulfill their role as newcomers (Benson, Evans & Eys, 2016). Every sports team is situated within a unique environmental context (i.e., physical, task, social, personal) that is characterized by a distinct social reality (Martin, Bruner, Eys & Spink, 2014). Time demands are a frequent source of stress for student-athletes. Many student-athletes spend more than 30 hours per week on their sport. With

extensive in-season travel and early morning practices. Managing both sport and academic demands often result in elevated stress inadequate sleep, and an inability to participate in other extracurricular or leisure activities that help promote overall well-being (Kroshus, 2014).

Considering that the socialization of newcomer athletes is a process that happens on a large scale at the beginning of every season, delineating tactics that sports teams employ to facilitate this process warrants considerable attention (Benson et al., 2016). Theory regarding organizational socialization offers a promising framework to examine how sports teams manage initial entry experiences because it presumes that teams are active agents in newcomer socialization – using tactics that ideally combine to maximize outcomes for the individual as well as the group (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). In collegiate athletics, the head coach has a major leadership role within the team. Athletes, administrators, and fans, in general, look up to the coach and expect him/her to form a winning team. Each head coach controls and is responsible for the strategic planning, the socialization process of newcomers, the correct behavior of staff and student-athletes and many other important decisions. The high salaries that head coaches receive are just a reflection of how important the coach is within the collegiate athletics model. Nevertheless, very little is known about the effectiveness of the socialization process of SADC established by the coach.

Organizational socialization theories have provided insights on how to structure newcomer entry experience in a way that reduces uncertainty for the individual (e.g., reduced role ambiguity, increased perceptions of fit) and create greater continuity at the group level (e.g., reduced turnover, increased commitment) (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan,



Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007). The head coaches of the athletic teams face a challenge when trying to find a balance between accommodating student-athletes from different cultures and finding ways to create a homogeneous culture for their team (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). While observers assume that the head coach treats everyone in the same way to avoid any preference, Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) suggest that coaches are better off implementing organizational tactics based on specific cultural differences of the newcomers. In what follows, I focused on the perception of the student-athlete of the way coaches structure the socialization process of newcomer student-athletes.

There is abundant literature on the socialization of newcomers within the management field as well as an emphasis on socialization of foreign managers into their new international assignments. However, there are few studies that focus on the socialization of athletes within the collegiate athletics context (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). Among these studies, no scales have been developed to measure the student-athlete's perception of the socialization tactics structured by the head coach of the athletic team. This means that our knowledge of what coaches do to socialize student-athletes consists of anecdotal evidence.

The age range of most student-athletes is from 17 to 24 years old; they are finishing their developmental process during their teenage years and the beginning of adulthood. In this case, student-athletes are still developing their character and personalities. When the newcomer student-athletes arrive at their universities they usually move without their families and do not have close friends or family to rely on as a support system. In the same sense, the high intensity of collegiate athletics dictates the amount of time that student-athletes spend with their coaches and teammates during practices, competition, travel,

classes, study halls, eating meals and even sleeping. It is very difficult for student-athletes to separate their “at work” vs “personal time”. In a sense, it might seem like they are working 24 hours 7 days a week. Because of the high-pressure culture of collegiate athletics, we need to evaluate what tactics coaches implement to socialize their student-athletes into their teams. We need to know how effective these tactics are, but since we currently do not have an instrument to measure these tactics empirically, the purpose of this study is to develop and validate a scale to measure the student-athlete’s perceptions of the tactics used by the coach during the socialization process of newcomers.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **2.1 Organizational Socialization Process**

The term socialization has been studied in many fields such as sociology, psychology, human resources, management, and leadership, with the common purpose to help the newcomers of an organization to get familiar with the organization's culture, values, beliefs and the way things function in that organization. It is important to define that organizational culture is one of the key elements in the socialization process. Organizational culture is defined as the patterns of behaviors that a group has created, discovered or developed through time and have proven to be effective in the resolution of common problems. Such patterns of behaviors are adopted by the members of the organization as their own (Schein, 1984).

Organizational culture is composed of explicit and tacit assumptions that are specific to an organization (Schein, 1990). There are four elements, which are part of the organizational culture: symbols, heroes, rituals, and values (Schein, 1990). Symbols are shallow representations of a group or organization such as colors or/and images. For example, the colors garnet and black and the gamecock represent the University of South Carolina as the organization. Heroes are the individuals who embody those characteristics valued by the organization (i.e. a president, a Chief Executive Officer, etc.). Rituals are traditions and patterns of behavior that connect the new members to the past and the origins

of the organization. Finally, the values are the core of the organization and determine the characteristics of the organization. The values are not always easy to identify from the outside of the organization, thus, the members of the organization hold them and transmit them to the new members of the organization through the socialization process.

According to Ashford and Nurmohamed (2012), the most cited definition of organizational socialization is the process in which the older members pass on the culture of the organization to the newcomers (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979). The older members transmit the information that has proven to be helpful in solving the problems of external adaptation and internal integration. The newcomer has to adapt to the common organizational culture and this process aids the newcomer to become integrated into his smaller unit. This information helps the newcomer to acquire the necessary language, skills, and abilities to adjust to the assigned role within the organization. Many researchers have studied the organizational socialization process such as Van Maanen & Schein, 1979; Jones, 1986; Bauer et al., 2007; Chao, 2012, but thanks to Ashford and Nurmohamed (2012), the development of organizational socialization theory presents three distinct waves. The first wave focuses on the actions taken by the organization and the attainment of the organization's expected outcomes. The second wave focuses on the pre-existing characteristics of the newcomer, and how these characteristics and the proactive attitude of the newcomer help him/her to attain self-satisfaction and expected outcomes. The third wave focuses on both the organization's actions and the antecedents of the newcomer in order to attain a successful adjustment and the organization's and the newcomer's expected outcomes.

In the first wave of organizational socialization theory, Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined the process of socialization based on six bipolar dimensions: formal, collective, fixed, serial, specific, and investiture. The formal-informal dimension determines the way in which the socialization process takes place, for example, if the new member is called into an official introduction as opposed to the new member shadowing and older member and learning as problems arise. The collective and individual dimension determines if the new member is going to be socialized individually in a unique way or as part of a group. The fixed dimension determines if the socialization is previously structured and does not change during the process. The serial dimension refers to a continuous process of socialization. The specific dimension determines if the process of socialization is structured specifically for one newcomer as oppose to having general socialization for any newcomer. Finally, investiture refers to the willingness to accept and value cultural expressions different from the organization's culture.

Base on those dimensions the socialization tactics could take place in various contexts. For example, an organization can take the formal or the informal approach depending on the values and the context of an organization. When socializing a newcomer in a higher ranked leadership position, the organization might need to use informal and individual tactics. On the other hand, if the organization is socializing a group of newcomers in entry positions, they might use collective and fixed tactics. Later on, Jones (1986) studied organizational socialization and proposed grouping the six dimensions into three distinct groups: formal-collective, fixed-serial, and specific-investiture. He proposed that by using specific tactics the organization could allow more or less freedom to their newcomers to adopt the new culture or to rebel against it. For example, in the case where

the organization brings a newcomer with a unique background and expects this individual to have a strong impact during an organization's culture change. On the other hand, when an organization needs the newcomer to value and assume the organizational culture as their own.

The second wave of development takes into account the characteristics (personality, the search of information, proactive attitude) of the newcomer as antecedents of the socialization process (Bauer et al., 2007). The emphasis here is on the antecedents of the socialization process and led researchers to attribute the success of the socialization process to the newcomer's pre-existing characteristics. Therefore, a lot of attention was placed on the recruiting process and the selection of newcomers. In the management field, an organization often recruits international individuals with a high quality of performance and specific skills. However, the international newcomer has to face many challenges such as culture shock, a different language and the ins and outs of the organizational culture before being able to adapt and perform up to the expectations (Tung, 1988). The many challenges faced by the newcomer have an effect on their level of performance. Researchers focused on the newcomer antecedents such as his/her proactivity to acquire new information, the request for feedback and intention to seek social networks among others. However, in the case of collegiate athletics, the number of talented athletes that are eligible to play is limited. Therefore, the personal characteristics of the newcomer athlete might not be complementary to the team culture because of the high value that is placed on someone's athletic abilities, over their fit with the organization.

Finally, in the third wave of socialization literature, the attention is on both the organization's actions and the individual's personal characteristics during the socialization

process (Ashford & Nurmohamed, 2012). It was stated that an effective adaptation of expatriates with great qualities was affected by the type of role assigned to them within the organization. An engineer that performs his work on his own and has a role that does not depend on social interaction will have an easier time adapting and performing better than an expatriate in a manager role, which requires a lot of social interaction, will face greater challenges during the socialization process (Chao, 2012). The role assigned by the organization and the personal characteristics of the newcomer has a great impact on the success of the socialization process. In this wave, the researcher also pays attention to both, the expected outcomes of the organization and the newcomer.

For Saks, Uggerslev and Fassina (2007) it is important to reduce the turnover ratio, improve productivity and increase the commitment to the organization, as well as improve the self-satisfaction of the newcomer. In some cases, it is possible that a newcomer performs up to the expectations of the organization but at the same time, the newcomer does not feel satisfied with his/her role within the organization, which leads to an increased intention to leave from the newcomer. There are many opportunities and challenges within the process of organizational socialization.

Organizations strive to improve productivity, and in this quest, they might need to recruit the right individuals. With the implementation of an effective socialization process, a company would be able to hire newcomers with different backgrounds and qualities and benefit from their work skills as well as their personal characteristics. Nevertheless, the lack of a general model of organizational socialization applicable in various fields presents itself as a challenge.

## 2.2 Cultural Distance and Cultural Difference

There are individuals that, based on their cultural background, struggle more with adaptation. In those cases, organizations should consider a more specific socialization process for those individuals. The differences of individuals based on a different nationality, culture, gender, ethnicity, age, or socio-economic background can make the process of organizational socialization more difficult or challenging. For example, an African-American athlete with a low socio-economic background, who becomes a member of a predominantly white university, with a student body with a high socio-economic background, will have to face many challenges. In all of the cases, the newcomer has to learn and adapt to the new organizational culture. The newcomer will have to learn the language used within the organization and learn about the norms and values of the organization.

Researchers refer to the cultural differences between the newcomer and the organization as cultural distance. The difference between norms, values, and beliefs from one culture to the other is difficult to evaluate, however, Hofstede (1980) studied those differences and developed specific dimensions to evaluate the cultural distance. His study took information from a survey given to employees in IBM and analyzed the difference between 76 countries. Later, Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) expanded the initial research and defined five dimensions of cultural distance. Hofstede's research used information from employees within the IBM Company. The five dimensions are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs collectivism, masculinity vs femininity and long-term vs short-term. One country could be positioned relative to other countries through a score on each of the five dimensions (Hofstede, 2009).



McSweeney (2002) criticized Hofstede's approach in several respects: his main reproaches were that surveys are not the most suitable way and nations, not the best units to examine cultural differences. In addition, it would be methodically questionable to assign the results of single employees from one company to their entire nation's scores and that five dimensions are not enough to determine cultural aspects. For example, a newcomer manager that was born in China but moved to the United States when he/she was a kid and was raised with strong Chinese family traditions would not be considered an average Chinese citizen or American citizen either. In this case, the cultural distance of the newcomer would be very difficult to determine and therefore the structure of the socialization process might not be based on the correct antecedents. Finally, in the context of this study, the focus is on including domestic students who come from a different background, which makes the application of Hofstede's work even more complicated. Nevertheless, despite this criticism, we could argue that there is value in the work of Hofstede, and its broad application across academic fields showed some interesting results.

In the field of education, researchers found that students from Latin America and Asia struggle to adjust to the American university culture more than students from Europe because of a greater cultural distance. International students have to learn a new language, adapt to a new culture, face financial restrictions among other challenges, and as a result, international students are more susceptible to experience depression, social isolation, anxiety, and poor self-esteem (Mori, 2000; Chapdelain & Alexitch, 2004). However, it was found that ISAs usually adjust better to the higher-education institution than the general international students, because their sports team becomes a socialization agent that helps them to adjust better and faster. International students do not have the structure of a team

that helps them to build social network therefore international students have many social limitations and usually suffer from isolation. It was reported that the less social interaction a newcomer has, the more difficult the socialization process is (Feldman, 1997). Yet, while ISAs adjust more easily than their general international student counterpart, they might still need more time to adjust to their team settings than the student-athletes on the team that are familiar with the culture surrounding the team, and we still need to better understand what the role of the coaches are in this socialization process. What do coaches do to ease the adaptation of the culturally diverse newcomer?

When an international student with a large cultural distance arrives at the university, there is a lot of new information that he/she has to learn and process. If the international student does not go through a socialization process guided by the organization, then the international student will have to find the necessary information on his/her own. In this case, the adaptation will become more challenging, it will take more time and it might not result in a successful adjustment. Culture is a complex concept, and comparing and determining the distance between two cultures in each of the five dimensions, is even more difficult to do. For the purpose of this study, the author wants to focus on the students' perception of the distance between the SADC 'home' culture and the new team culture, as it is expected that it is this perception that might prevent successful socialization, rather than what the actual cultural distance might be.

### **2.3 Organizational Socialization in Sports**

In the field of sports, Ridinger and Pastore (2000a) proposed a framework to identify factors associated with ISA's adjustment to college. The antecedents of the

proposed model placed a lot of attention on the personal characteristics of the incoming international student-athletes such as personality, exposure to international travel, adventure-seeking and cultural distance. In addition, Popp, Love, Kim, and Hums (2010), developed the model and suggested incrementing more elements to the antecedents of the newcomer as a first element to the adaptation process. Nevertheless, the model overlooked the socialization process before evaluating the adaptation of international student-athletes. Both studies also mentioned the need to measure cultural distance as the antecedent, but neither study determined what tool to use or what process to follow in order to measure cultural distance. Both studies took into consideration other factors in addition to the characteristics of the newcomers such as family influence and organizational culture.

The members of a sports team are under tremendous pressure to perform, and their organizations are marked by turnover. The fact that there is a high level of rotation among the sports organization's members causes the organization to establish a continuous process of socialization for the newcomers. The unique characteristics of the sports team and the newcomers, present a big challenge when structuring the socialization process. Elite athletes with unique athletic skills might not be a perfect fit for a team. Nonetheless, by using a structured socialization process the coach will attempt to smooth any cultural differences with the newcomer. The socialization process should ease the adjustment of the newcomer.

Especially, Van Maanen and Schein's (1979) description of the socially constructed boundaries that employees navigate upon organizational entry can be applied to illuminate athletes' experiences. First, there are *functional boundaries* that determine which task responsibilities need to be differentiated among group members. A sports team often

differentiates responsibilities according to positional requirements (e.g., point guard), or skill proficiency (e.g., 3-point shooter). Second, *hierarchical boundaries* refer to status distinctions among group members. This includes distinctions of authority (e.g., coach, athlete) as well as more tacit mandates of social rank (e.g., first-year athlete vs second-year athlete). Finally, there are inclusionary boundaries to which athletes must adjust, as interpersonal dynamics are likely to change as an athlete moves from the periphery of the group to its inner social circles. Sport offers a valuable context to not only adapt and test insights generated in the field of organizational behavior but to refine theories through the identification of conditions that may be overlooked in organizational groups (Day, Gordon & Fink, 2012).

#### **2.4 Leadership Theory Development in Sport Management**

Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) stressed the importance of the coach within a team. The coach provides leadership to the staff and the student-athletes. Early studies of leadership focused on the personality of the coach or on the coach's decision-making style such as autocratic versus democratic (Sage, 1975). However, the interaction between the coach (leader) and the SADC is more complex; researchers such as Fielder (1967) contributed with development on contingency models and Fielder and Garcia (1987) development on cognitive resource theory. Scholars began to take into account situational factors and their interaction with leader characteristics (Bird, 1977). Subsequent research focused on analyzing coaching behaviors across different athletic situations (Chelladurai & Carron, 1978).

Chelladurai (1978) proposed the Multidimensional Model of Leadership, which argued that the efficacy of coaches' leadership behaviors was contingent on their congruence with the preferences of the members as well as the demands of situational characteristics. Consequently, three models of leadership in sport are most prominent in the sport management literature: The Normative Model of Decision Styles in Coaching (Chelladurai & Haggerty, 1978), the Mediation Model of Leadership in Sport (Smoll & Smith, 1989), and the Multidimensional Model of Leadership in Sport (Chelladurai, 1990).

These leadership models focus mainly on the coaches' decision process and situational factors. However, none of these models consider the SAs' perception of the new environment and the cultural differences between the SA and the new team. The perception of each student-athlete is going to be different and the cultural background is going to have a big influence on how each individual perceives and interprets each situation and leadership style. The Normative Model centers on the efficacy of decision-making styles in coaching. Various studies focus on the contribution of SAs in decision-making, and the extent to which the coach prefers or permits the SA's participation (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985). In general, there are three types of decision-making styles: autocratic, consultative, and participative. While there are seven situations defined as follows: time pressure, quality requirement, problem complexity, and coaches' information, the criticalness of group acceptance, coaches' power base, and group integration (Chelladurai et al., 1989). In the Normative model, the researchers do not take into account the influence of each student-athlete's culture and the characteristics of each individual on the relationship with the coach and with the rest of the team.

Smoll and Smith (1989) suggested in the Mediational Model of Leadership behaviors (MML) that the relationships among situational, cognitive, behavioral and individual differences and states that outcomes associated with coaching behaviors are mediated by the meaning that players attribute to them. This model specifies that a number of situational and individual difference variables, influence core components including coaching behaviors, player perception and recall, and players' evaluative reactions. Ultimately, the mediational models suggest the importance of both overt leader behaviors as well as athletes' perceptions of the respective coach's behaviors. In synthesis, "leader effectiveness resides in both the behaviors of the leader and the eyes of the beholder" (Smoll & Smith, 1989, p. 1544). Even though the MML model takes into consideration the player's perception, however, the model does not take into account the socialization process of the newcomer. The author of the present study states that the effectiveness of the socialization process was influence directly the synergy and success of the team as well as the satisfaction of each newcomer (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017).

#### ***2.4.1 Leadership in Sport Scale LSS***

The Multidimensional Model of Leadership in Sport proposes that group performance and member satisfaction are a function of the alignment between the required, actual and preferred leadership behavior (Chelladurai, 1978). With the purpose of dealing with certain problems related to leadership in the sport context and to test the Multidimensional Model, Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) developed the Leadership Scale for Sport LSS. The LLS is a questionnaire made up of 40 items that are divided into 5 subscales: training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback. The LSS has been used in a variety of context to measure

leadership in sport and relationship between leadership and athletes' preferences for specific leader behavior (Chelladurai, 1984; Chelladurai, Imamura, Yamaguchi Oinuma, & Miyauchi, 1988; Chelladurai & Carron 1981; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behavior (Chelladurai et al., 1984), and coaches' perception of their own behavior (Bennett & Maneval, 1998; Brooks, Ziatz, Johnson, & Hollander, 2000; Dwyer & Fischer, 1988; Horne & Carron, 1985; Salminen, Luikkonen, Hanin, & Hyvonen, 1995). Even though the LSS was very informative for the present study, the author decided not to use this instrument because the focus of the study is the socialization process of newcomers and the LSS instrument focuses on coaches' leadership behavior in general. Based on the information from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017), the socialization process should be directed towards the particular needs of the newcomers in order to achieve an effective adjustment to the new team. In the present study, the author was focus on the SADC's perception of the tactics selected by the coaches for the socialization process of newcomers.

#### ***2.4.2 Path-Goal Leadership Theory***

The author analyzed the Path-Goal leadership theory. This theory was inspired by Evans (1970) and it can be thought of as a process by which leaders select specific behavior that is best suited to their employee's needs and their working environment, so that leaders may best guide their employees through their path and the obtainment of their daily work activities (Northouse, 2013). The theory argues that leaders are flexible and that they can change their style, as situations require. Research demonstrates that employee performance and satisfaction have a positive influence when the leader compensates for the shortcomings in either the employee or the work setting.

Path-goal theory borrows from the motivation perspective of the expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964). According to Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2012), the leader's role is to increase the followers' belief that their effort will lead to accomplishing a goal, which in turn will lead to attaining the rewards. Moreover, leaders help follower motivation by making the path-goal clear, removing obstacles/roadblocks which followers might encounter in the process of goal attainment, coaching/providing direction to keep the followers on track, and increasing work satisfaction (Northouse, 2016). The theory proposes two contingency variables, such as environment and employee characteristics that moderate the leader behavior-outcome relationship (House, 1996). The leader's behaviors can be directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented (House & Mitchell, 1978). Leaders might use any/all of these behaviors depending on the followers and the situations (Northouse, 2016). Therefore, the newcomer characteristics researched are newcomer's needs for affiliation, preferences for structure, desires for control, and self-perceived level of task ability (Northouse, 2016). If the newcomer has a strong need for affiliation, they would prefer leaders who are friendly and supportive. However, if the newcomer is dogmatic and does not like uncertain situations, they would prefer a directive leader that provides structure and task clarity (Northouse, 2016). When the newcomer has an internal locus of control, which means that one believes to have control of events that occur in their life, they prefer participative leadership. On the contrary, those who have an external locus of control, which means that one believes that external circumstances determine one's life events, they prefer directive leadership. Finally, the self-perceived level of task ability where a follower becomes empowered to attain a task, then the need for a controlling leader is diminished (Northouse, 2016).



The Path-Goal theory was informative for the collegiate athletic context, where the idea of coaches removing obstacles for their SA's in order for them to perform effectively seems to be helpful. Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) stressed the importance of the coach within the socialization process of the SADC and found that based on the coaches' perspectives, the socialization tactics used within a sport team's environment can be gathered under the following five constructs: a) custom coaching, b) mentorship, c) team structure, d) all-inclusive family and, e) support services. Custom coaching refers to the coaches' use of previous knowledge about their incoming ISAs' background (individual needs, personal values, motivation to become an ISA, and the knowledge of the NCAA rules for their sport) in order to establish a socialization tactic that will be favorable for the adaptation of the newcomer. For example, a coach stating that when he recruited Brazilian players, he was aware of the collectivistic nature of their culture and always committed two or three athletes at the same time, for them to have a group experience. On the other hand, if the athlete was from England, he understood that the culture is more individual-centered so he focused more on one individual and making sure he understood the athletic and academic expectations he had for him. In this way, the coach changes his/her approach based on the cultural background of the athlete seeking to ensure an effective adjustment to the new team and consequently a better athletic and academic performance from the athlete.

Mentorship refers to a system to help newcomers (proteges) become acclimated into the team by pairing them up with more experienced teammates (peer-mentor) or coaching staff (mentor). The coaches trusted that the mentorship relationship allowed the newcomers to obtain information, have a good example to follow, and provide them with advice. Mentors introduce new ISAs into their new roles, increase the interaction and

communication with the ISAs. The constant interaction also increases the trust of the athlete in their mentor and facilitates clear and direct communication, where the athlete feels secure about seeking help and asking questions. Some cultures assume that asking for help or sharing a problem is a sign of weakness or it is not appropriate, for those individuals it would be very difficult to talk to the coach and seek help when needed. Nevertheless, the mentor who become his/her support network, and advocates for their well-being would be in a better position to recognize a troubled athlete.

Team structure refers to the use of team rules as unifiers for all its members without distinction of origin, or status within the team. However, it might be necessary to communicate the rules to the ISAs in a different way than the general student-athlete. The rules of a team are written down in paper, however, the interpretation of those rules might be different from culture to culture. For example, when a coach asks the team to be on-time for a meeting, “on-time” can mean ten minutes early, five minutes early, right at the time they called or fashionably late depending on the culture of the individual. Therefore, when announcing the rules to the athletes it is imperative to also communicate the expected behavior rather than assume that all the individuals understand the behavior-standards they have to follow.

All-inclusive family is dependent upon the members of the team and their style of human interaction, connectedness, and favorability to diversity. The older members ratify those personal characteristics the newcomer brings into the organization. The important element of this concept is all-inclusive, meaning “at all times”, maintaining a welcoming and supportive environment among the members of the team during practices, competitions, traveling times, classes, even during relaxing times. The coach incentivizes

the interaction of the members of the teams and the expectations that each member of the team will take care of each other and support each other during good and bad times.

Support services include study hall, tutors, psychologists, nutritionists, sport trainers, and various introductory meetings among others. Even though coaches do not directly control support services, they receive continuous reports and information from these services. The main goal of the support services is to ease the student-athletes process and help them with common issues. The academic services, tutors, are the most used services that help student-athletes to maintain academically eligible. However, for the other services, there is a stigma attached to the use of the services which have to be eliminated. The way that the coach introduces the services to the newcomers and how encouraging he/she is of the use of those services will be key elements in changing the current stigma associated with them.

The head coach of a team, structures a group of socialization tactics that will ease the adaptation process and facilitate the achievement of the expected outcomes for the newcomer and the receiving team. In the case of SADCs, the adaptation process brings additional challenges (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). In the present study, the author conceptualized the five socialization tactics identify in the work of Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017). Since Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) conducted an exploratory study, they did not lean upon the existing socialization literature from the management and sport management fields. Instead, the authors conducted in-depth interviews with coaches and identified the five areas with terms expressed in the lexicon of the coaches during the in-depth interviews.

In the present study, the author used each of the five concepts as a starting point for an extensive literature review into each of the five socialization tactics. Based on that literature review, the author then proposed five measurable constructs that have a stronger grounding in the literature than the five constructs that Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) proposed.

Therefore, the author operationalized the five concepts to the following measurable constructs based on theory. The original term “custom coaching” was operationalized as “coach’s cultural competence”, the original term “mentorship” was maintained, the original term “team structure” was operationalized as “introduction of norms and roles”, the original term “all-inclusive family” was operationalized as “prosocial behavior”, and the original term “support services” was operationalized as “introduction of support services”. In what follows the researcher details each of the five working areas for the SADC socialization process.

## **2.5 Coach’s Cultural Competence**

The first of the five areas of newcomer socialization identified in the qualitative exploratory study by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017), was custom coaching. This concept refers to the ability of the coach to identify individual differences and treat each of his/her players in a particular way. The concept of custom coaching was operationalized to coach’s cultural competence in order to be able to assess the construct. Cultural competence closely aligns with another concept, “cultural diversity”. Nowadays, cultural diversity is something to celebrate and embrace, however, this notion is permeated with fear of people who are different from oneself (Zander, 2006). In the 1970s psychologists began developing models and techniques that would reduce the risk of cultural bias in their investigations (Marsella,

Dubanoski, Hanada, & Morse, 2000). Since then, cultural sensitivity and cultural competence have become a moral obligation among behavioral and social scientists (Zander, 2006).

Sue and Sue (1995) introduced the construct “cultural competence” originated from a three-fold-approach for professional counselors and therapists who work with culturally diverse populations: cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, and cultural skills. The opposite of cultural competence is cultural incompetence or ethnocentrism, which is a view of the dominant culture as being superior to all other cultures (Leininger, 1995). Kavanaugh and Kennedy (1992) identified ten myths associated with cultural incompetence and the need to avoid them in order to become culturally competent: 1) Cultural blindness: one is unable to recognize one’s own unique worldview and cannot recognize another’s 2) Cultural elitism: believe that one cannot take time for cultural issues because they are beneath the person’s dignity or position, 3) Cultural imposition: tendency to force beliefs, values, and practices on another culture, 4) Cultural superficiality: denies a deep understanding of the other culture, 5) Cultural avoidance: is the resistance to knowing anything about other cultures. 6) Cultural inequity: it is perpetuated by only educating individuals who are members of a minority. 7) Cultural stereotyping: racist, classist and sexist assumptions. 8) Cultural carelessness: expecting the minority client to adapt when in fact it is the helping professional who needs to adapt. 9) Cultural ignorance: a consideration that there should be no difference or special consideration in how service is provided. 10) Cultural denial: minimizes the importance of clarifying one’s own values, beliefs, and practices in order to accept those of others. However, cultural competence is not about knowing everything about another culture; is about having general knowledge

about cultural patterns, so one can ask questions and obtain the needed information. When a coach is able to identify individual differences and treat each of his/her players in a particular way, then that coach is culturally competent.

The literature discussing cultural competency describes five main elements. First, cultural awareness, described as the deliberate cognitive process by which one becomes enthusiastic and receptive to an individual's cultural differences (Campinha-Bacote et al., 1996). In other terms, cultural awareness is respecting differences among people, appreciating the inherent worth of diversity and eliminating ethnocentricity (Grossman, 1994). Second, cultural knowledge, the knowledge must be obtained from the individuals and not from texts that only present the main culture and not the subcultures with all of their subtle nuances (Campinha-Bacote et al., 1996). Third, cultural skills, the professional must master performing a cultural assessment to obtain the knowledge needed to provide culturally congruent care for each and every client (Andrews & Boyle, 2015). It is the skill to effectively communicate with individuals from a different culture (Bennett, 1999). It also includes interpreting nonverbal cues that might be different from what the professional is accustomed to in the dominant culture. Forth, cultural encounters, it is the ability to form and sustain relationships with diverse individuals. It is about sincerity, effort, and openness in response to all cultures encountered (O'Hagan, 2001). Fifth, cultural desire is the motivation to want to interact with individuals from different cultures and ethnicities (Campinha-Bacote et al., 1996).

As opposed to using a universal treatment for all the members of the team, the coach can treat a player based on that specific player's needs. In the case of SADC, the adaptation process brings additional challenges (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). However, the challenges

or obstacles that SAs face are going to be different depending on their background. In the case of SADC, the coach can eliminate many factors that negatively influence the adaptation of the newcomer but the coach first has to be culturally competent which means to be aware, knowledgeable and skilled at interacting with individuals from other cultures. It is important for the coach to have the desire to understand the SADC values and beliefs. Additionally, the experience of the coach in relating to many SADC will also increase his/her cultural competence. By assessing the SADC's perception of the coach's cultural competence, the author analyzed if the coach has the ability to identify individual differences and consider those differences when interacting with each of his/her players. This is an example of custom coaching previously proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) and in this study, the author conceptualized it to Coach's cultural competence in order to assess this construct.

## **2.6 Mentorship**

As the demographics of the American population change (Johnston & Packer, 1987), businesses feel competitive pressures to attract and retain qualified heterogeneous people (Cox & Blake, 1991). Heimann and Pittenger (1996) suggest that a well-designed formal mentorship program could be instrumental in retaining qualified minority group members by socializing the newcomers to the culture of the organization and by enhancing their commitment to the organization through such a program.

Mentoring is very complex; it varies from one situation to another. Different people interpret it in different ways (McKimm, Jollie & Hatter, 2007). Mentoring relations can be traced back to the Greek mythology; however, organizational mentoring research began

with the seminal works from Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) and Kram (1980). Mentoring is difficult to define, but Megginson and Clutterbuck, (1995) state that mentoring is “off-line help by one person to another in making significant transitions in knowledge, work or thinking”. Other authors define mentoring as a relationship between an older, more experienced mentor and a younger less experienced protégé for the purpose of helping and developing the protégé’s career (Kram, 1980; Ragins, 1999; Wanberg et al., 2003).

Mentoring distinguishes from other types of personal relationships because mentoring is a developmental relationship that is embedded within the career context (Ragins & Kram, 2007). The purpose and intentions of mentoring also vary depending on the particular context in which they are used. First, mentoring contributes to creating a sense of oneness by promoting the acceptance of the organization’s core values throughout the organization. Second, the socialization aspect of mentoring also promotes a sense of membership.

Kram and Ragins (2007) discussed the importance of expanding the outcomes explored beyond career-related outcomes. While it has been beneficial to understand the impact of mentoring on traditional outcomes such as performance, compensation, promotions, advancement, job attitudes, and career satisfaction, so many more outcomes are attributed to mentoring. Kram and Ragins (2007) further expanded the discussion of potential outcomes by sharing how the work-family interface may be interrelated with mentoring, including family interference with work and work enrichment of family. People are more than their careers.



Kram (1980) identified two general functions of the mentoring process: career and psychosocial. Five career functions that enhanced career development were: sponsorship, exposure-and-visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. Four psychosocial functions were: role modeling, acceptance-and-confirmation, counseling, and friendship. The psychosocial functions clarified the participants' identities and enhanced their feelings of competence (Kram, 1980).

Mentoring impacts organizational processes (e.g., recruitment, retention, leadership development), individual processes (e.g. involvement, commitment, satisfaction), and interpersonal processes (e.g., attachment, identification, and socialization). Most recently, mentoring has been linked to transformational processes such as globalization, inclusion, and innovation (Blake-Beard, Kram, & Murrell, 2017). The mentorship's potential benefits seem to be ideal especially for SAs who maintain a constant interpersonal relationship with their teammates and coaches, while they seek to improve their performance for their self-satisfaction and the success of the team.

One of the main differences between the college athletic context and the business context is that the newcomers are young individuals who are completing their personal developmental process. Also, the nature of collegiate athletics requires SA to spend a great percentage of their time with their teammates, whether they are in practices and competition or during training tables, traveling or in some cases SAs live in the same dorm rooms or apartments. Therefore, SAs do not have a clear work/home environment as in the business context where employees have a clear division between work and home environments. Therefore, the need for a mentor that would guide and support the newcomer SA seems to be imperative.

### ***2.6.1 Mentorship during the Socialization Process***

Ostroff and Kozlowski (1993) suggest that mentoring can have its most dramatic impact soon after new members join the organization. However, it may also be the time when mentoring relationships are least likely to occur naturally due to their limelight status but the precarious position as newcomers, their lack of self-confidence in establishing new relationships or time constraints (Ragins & Cotton, 1993). Also, because they are new, potential mentees will lack the knowledge of and exposure to experienced organizational members who might serve as mentors (Heimann & Pittenger, 1996). Factors such as these strongly support the idea that formal mentorship programs are necessary for an organization, particularly for newcomers (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993).

The head coach should have in mind not only the best interest of the team or the organization but also the athletes as individuals and their interpersonal relationships with his/her teammates. Mentoring used as a socialization tactic has the power to impact in those three areas during the adjustment process of the CDSAs. Management literature suggests that the variables of socialization and commitment are correlated (Heimann & Pittenger, 1996). Furthermore, it is logical to assume that individuals whose socialization and commitment are influenced by a program would find such a program of value or vice versa. As the demographics of the American population change (Johnston & Packer, 1987), businesses feel competitive pressure to attract and retain qualified heterogeneous people (Cox & Blake, 1991). Heimann and Pittenger (1996) suggest that a well-designed formal mentorship program could be instrumental in retaining qualified minority group members by socializing the newcomers to the culture of the organization and by enhancing their commitment to the organization through such a program.

Williams and Schwiebert (2000) discuss cross-cultural mentoring in the context of a multicultural inclusive mentoring perspective. This perspective includes the kind of equity that encourages discourse, critical dialogue and an understanding of the role of power. Due to the limited number of the same race and same-gender pairs of mentor-protégé, which produce positive outcomes (Thomas, 1990; Blake-Beard, 2002), the authors emphasize the need for dialog between the mentor and protégé regarding the experience, personalities, interest, and backgrounds.

For instance, in higher education, the black female still faces limited opportunities and daily challenges, as such she is considered an at-risk population (Packard, 2003; Simon, Bowles, King & Roff, 2004). The student-athletes of color and females are the most visible and historically underrepresented groups in higher education (Person, Benson-Quaziana & Rogers, 2001). The underrepresented groups' treatment is often characterized by stereotypes, alienation, and isolation (Harrison, Comeaux, & Plecha, 2006; Hawkins, 2001; Lawrence, 2005). Considering the factors previously described, the concept of mentoring could prove a worthy option for academic, social and athletic achievement. Mentoring in the realm of higher education is a necessary element in developing young people. However, it must be noted in higher education mentoring has focused on faculty development, racial minorities, gender minorities, undergraduate, and graduate students and not the student-athlete.

Research suggests that the foundation of a functional mentor-protégé relationship is grounded in four essential areas: (1) establishing a sense of basic trust (Simon et al., 2004); (2) the realization of the dream or vision (Levinson et al., 1978); (3) professional skills and confidence (Johnson, 2002); and (4) networking (Ragins & Scandura, 1997). The

use of a mentoring program should utilize the mentor that reflects the race, gender and athletic culture of a specific newcomer student-athlete. Additionally, the mentor-protégé program might require a design that acknowledges individual needs, institutional barriers (race, gender) and athletic structural constraints, (e.g., practice competition, NCAA regulations) (Comeaux & Harrison, 2007). In sport, it would be most likely that the mentoring dyads will be the same sex. However, it is advisable to have a compliance protocol in order to maintain a healthy mentoring relationship.

### ***2.6.2 Mentoring outcomes in collegiate sports***

One of the fundamental differences between mentoring within a college sports team and mentoring in a business organization would be the ultimate goals. In the case of college sports, three stakeholders expect to benefit from the mentorship, the student-athlete (protégé), the coach (mentor) and the institution. Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) developed a mentoring model for sport management. Even though it does not refer to the specific coach (mentor) student-athlete (protégé) dyad, their findings greatly inform the mentorship of SADC in a college sport's team environment. Within this environment, mentorship serves a socialization function as well as a career-advancement function. On the other hand, in the case of a business organization, the primary goal is the advancement of the protégé's career.

Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) propose the expected outcomes for the student-athlete (protégé) to be: advancement and growth outcomes. The advancement outcomes are evident in career success, the power within the organization, and the experience of happiness and satisfaction (Dreher & Ash, 1990). The growth outcomes consist of

competence, identity, and effectiveness (Kram, 1980). Levinson (1978) found that mentoring is an important element of psychosocial development specifically related to identity. According to Levinson (1978), the function of a mentor is to support and facilitate the realization of the dream... He/she fosters the young athlete by believing in him/her, helping to define the newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young man/woman can work on a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the dream. (pp. 98-99) The mentor ensures the athlete's performance by contributing to his/her feeling of being competent, self-assured and effective.

In a successful mentoring relationship, the coach (mentor) becomes known for good character judgment (Kram, 1980) and is identified as a "star-maker." Such reputations often lead other talented young individuals (future college athletes) to seek the mentor's help and guidance (Newby & Heide, 1992). In the same way, the institution benefits from mentoring in maintaining a healthy organizational culture, increasing job satisfaction and reducing the likelihood of a protégé premature departure (Hunt & Michael, 1983).

After defining the outcomes of the mentorship, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) presented two distinct functions that the mentor should focus on while working with the protégé. First, the career functions that include sponsorship, exposure and visibility, coaching, protection, and challenging assignments. These functions have a direct relationship with the athletic performance of the student-athlete. Second, the psychosocial functions include role modeling, acceptance and confirmation, counseling, and friendship. These functions increase the confidence and trust of the protégé on the mentor. Then the mentor would help the protégé to solve personal internal conflicts, for example, anxiety and fears, which might limit the student-athlete's effective performance.

### ***2.6.3 Mentoring phases***

Successful mentoring is a transitional process (Hardy, 1994) and requires time to move along its different phases (Kram, 1980). In their study, Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) state that the “initiation” is a process that lasts 6 to 12 months, where the mentor might select the protégé based on his/her individual characteristics, and the protégé begins to seek support and guidance. Differently than a sports administrator protégé, the student-athlete has a shorter cycle when participating in collegiate athletics; therefore, the initiation process should take less than 6 to 12 months. In the latter situation, the coach (mentor) and the student-athlete (protégé) spend a great number of hours together during practice, competition and travel, which might help them to go through the initiation phases faster.

The following phase is “cultivation” in which the mentoring functions are enacted with intensity (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). In the case of college athletics, this phase might last during the athlete’s college career. The next step is “separation” after the protégé has gained the knowledge and support needed to further a career. In college athletics, this phase will occur when the student-athlete graduates. At this moment, the student-athlete will seek independence and autonomy. That is, mentoring is only successful when the protégé becomes independent (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999). The final phase of the mentorship is the “redefinition” where a lasting friendship becomes the result of the mentoring relationship (Kram, 1980).

### ***2.6.4 Compatibility protégé-mentor across cultures***

The success of a mentoring relationship depends upon the compatibility between mentor and protégé (Hardy, 1994). It is important to have two elements in the mentor-

protégé dyad, first share the same interest and goals (Burke & McKeen 1989) and second, the similarity in attributes, attitudes and interest, physical characteristics, personality factors, ability, socio-economic status, and behavioral similarity (Dreher & Cox, 1996). Mezias and Scandura (2005) pointed out the need for mentoring research to use data from contrasting cultures where mentoring dynamics are studied within the backdrop of a cultural context. Ramaswami, Huang, and Dreher (2014) examined the influence of power distance on mentoring. Unfortunately, mentoring theory and practice have not evolved towards taking into account the needs of different cultures for mentors, protégé and their interactions (Blancero & Cotton-Nessler, 2017). Cultural values affect how individuals behave, and these behaviors have implications for relationships at work, including mentoring relationships. Blancero and Cotton-Nessler (2017) stated that formal mentoring is more effective for cross-cultural relationships. Those formal mentoring programs may need to be adjusted in order to meet the needs of diverse groups. The fundamental goals of a formal mentoring program focus on career outcomes and retention of protégés. However, cultural values affect how career success is understood (Murrell & Blake-Beard, 2017).

One limitation to strictly matching based on cultural similarity is that in most cases. There are not enough culturally diverse individuals in the higher ranks of the organization to provide an adequate supply of mentors. Ghosh and Reio (2013) suggested that mentors received five types of subjective career outcomes from mentoring: job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intent, job performance, and career success. Their findings also suggested that mentors were more satisfied with their jobs and had a greater organizational commitment.

Within the context of college athletics, unique factors influence the way formal mentorship can be applied. The fact that the protégé will experience high levels of physical demands, the need to perform athletically and academically and only 4 years of eligibility, requires a quick and effective adaptation to the team and new environment. Newcomer SADC are young individuals who are going through their last stages of personal development, in a new environment. The SADC usually do not have friends or family, a close support network, at their new location. They tend to spend a great percentage of their time with their teammates, whether they are in practices and competition or during training tables, traveling or in some cases, SADCs live in a dorm room assigned to athletes. Therefore, SADC do not have a clear division between inside and outside the team. In this case, mentorship as a socialization tactic can guide the newcomer SADC through the adaptation process in order to give them the necessary tools to succeed during their college experience. The mentor becomes a source of emotional support for the SADC since the newcomer does not have an established close support network in the new team. The mentor will also act as an advocate for the newcomer, by making sure that good opportunities to grow, athletically and academically are offered to the mentee.

## **2.7 Introduction to Team Norms and Roles**

This area of newcomer socialization was identified in the qualitative exploratory study by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017), as team structure which from the definition presented by the authors referred to the way in which the newcomer was informed about the group of team rules, norms, and roles. Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined organizational socialization in simple terms as the process by which one is taught and learns “the ropes” of a particular organizational role. In more general terms, organizational socialization is



the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role. In these statements, there are three important elements, which are part of the organizational culture: rules, norms, and roles. The difference between these elements is substantial. First, the rules of an organization are usually visible, clearly stated, oftentimes written in paper and distributed to the entire organization. The author did not analyze the socialization process of the team rules because it is assumed that the coaching staff presented the rules to all newcomers in general. It is assumed that the rules are visible and clear to every member of the team.

Second, the norms of an organization are expectations of a behavioral regularity among a population (Dannals & Miller, 2017). Norms are the implicit standards and values that evolve in working groups (Kilmann & Saxton, 1983). The implicit, unwritten rules for getting along in the organization, “the ropes” that a newcomer must learn to become an accepted member “the way we do things around here” (Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976). Norms are basic assumptions that have become taken for granted and there is little variation within a social unit. The basic assumptions are strongly held in a group; that members will find behavior based on any other premise inconceivable (Schein, 2010). After an individual has developed an integrated set of assumptions “mental map”, he/she will be maximally comfortable with others who share the same set of assumptions. The same individual will feel very uncomfortable and vulnerable in situations where different assumptions operate because either he/she will not understand what is going on, or worse, he/she will misperceive and misinterpret the actions of others (Douglas, 1986; Bushe, 2009). Group norms will provide its members with a sense of identity and define the values that provide self-esteem (Hatch & Schultz, 2004).

Some organizations have more strict norms and others are more flexible. Norms can also be categorized by their strength within a group. Norm strength is defined as the importance or prevalence of the norm relative to other norms within the group (Chatman, 2010). The most critical norms, or those evaluated as having the greatest importance in this hierarchy, they are categorized as stronger norms. In order for a social norm to be maintained, newcomers must adopt the norm and tenured members of the group must maintain their allegiance to it. According to Dannals and Miller (2017), most theories suggest that conformity to social norms in the short term is due to some combination of an individual's desire to avoid the expected social punishment attendant on breaking a norm and an individual's desire to garner the positive social evaluation or status that accompanies some act of conformity. The norms of the team are an important element because the socialization process is directly related to making sure the newcomers learn the norms of the team before they encounter resistance from other members for nonconformity to the norms.

Third, the term role is employed in organizations, sports teams, and many other areas. Biddle and Thomas (1966) communicated the knowledge base pertaining to the concept of roles. In addition to the contribution by Robert Kahn and his colleagues published two role perceptions, role conflict, and ambiguity. Role-oriented research in sport has been developing since the 1990s. Roles are important structural components of all groups and represent the expectations for behaviors of individuals within a particular social situation. There are many ways in which to describe the type of roles. A way to categorize roles based on the primary objective of the role is task versus social orientations. The second categorization classifies roles based on the degree of formalization of

responsibilities as formal, or informal. Additionally, the roles present a number of cognitive (e.g., role clarity,) affective (e.g., role satisfaction) and behavioral (e.g., role performance) elements to role involvement. In this study, the author was focus on the role clarity component, which is defined as the degree of understanding one has about his or her role responsibilities. Beauchamp, Eys, Carron, and Bray (2002) proposed a conceptual model of role ambiguity, and the assessment tool the Role Ambiguity Scale. The scale evaluates the athlete's understanding of a) the general scope of their responsibilities, b) the specific behaviors necessary to fulfill their responsibilities, c) how will they be evaluated with respect to the role performance, and d) the consequences of not fulfilling their responsibilities.

According to Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017), the newcomer's culture is an element that will affect the socialization process. There is an important difference between the rules and the norms and the roles within a team. The norms can be defined as an informal guideline about what is considered normal social behavior in a particular group or social unit. The norms form the basis of collective expectations that members of a community have from each other and play a key part in social control and social order by exerting a pressure on the individual to conform.

Finally, the roles within a team are acts of actions and responsibilities assigned to each member of the team. Roles specify the general behavior expected of people who occupy different positions within the group (Forsyth, 2014). Roles such as the leader, follower, the information seeker, the information giver and compromiser among other roles that may emerge in any group (Benne & Sheats, 1948). The norms also shape the action and interaction of the group members, they are consensual standards that describe what

behaviors should and should not be performed in a given context. When a newcomer joins a group, they initially spend much of their time trying to come to terms with the requirements of their role. In the case that they cannot meet with the role requirements then they might not remain part of the group for long. In addition, the norms and roles of a group are renegotiated over time based on the new challenges the team has to face.

## **2.8 Prosocial Behavior**

This area of newcomer socialization was identified in the qualitative exploratory study by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017), as “all-inclusive family” which was previously defined as the way in which the newcomer experiences the team culture, dependent upon the other members of the team and their style of human interaction, connectedness, and favorability to diversity. The concept of “all-inclusive family” was operationalized to the construct “prosocial behavior” which is a behavior that the actor expects was benefit the person to whom it is directed (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996). A working definition to guide research is suggested by Brief and Motowidlo (1996) as prosocial organizational behavior is behavior which is performed by a member of an organization, directed toward an individual, group or organization with whom he/she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed. The term prosocial behavior is often associated with acts such as helping, sharing, donating, cooperating and volunteering. They are positive social acts carried out of produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996), hence the author chose to rename this construct from an all-inclusive-family to prosocial behavior.

Prosocial behavior has important implications for effective organizational functioning (Katz, 1964) along with behaviors such as joining and staying in the organization. Prosocial behavior represents ways in which an individual can act spontaneously and voluntarily to promote the organization's interest or practical reasons or selfish motives (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996). In the context of collegiate athletics, the existence of prosocial behavior in a sports team is highly valued by head coaches (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). Coaches stated that one benefit of being part of a sports team is the "all-inclusive-family" feeling where other members of the team are on the lookout for the well-being of the newcomers (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). The "all-inclusive-family" term is equivalent to prosocial behavior, where a member of the team is willing to help the newcomer. This type of behavior by the members of the team can be encouraged or motivated but not mandated by the coach.

This construct is meant to assess the newcomer's perception of the quality of interaction of old-new members of the team at all times (during and after any athletically related activities). Personal norms are more salient when individuals recognize another one's needs, identify actions they can perform to alleviate the need and feel responsible to perform such actions. Weinstein and Ryan (2010) suggested that when recipients perceive that they are being helped autonomously, they could feel more truly valued or cared about, as opposed to being helped because the helper feels he or she should help or has no choice in doing so. The recipient may also be less likely to feel shamed or impinged upon.

An important contribution from Weinstein and Ryan (2010) is the emphasis they placed on the differential effects of autonomous versus controlled motivation for helping on both helpers and the recipients of help. The importance of volition in yielding well-

being benefits to helpers and recipients alike. If individuals volitionally help, they experience greater autonomy, relatedness, and competence; they need satisfactions that in turn appear to enhance the helper's sense of well-being. Benefits also appear to radiate to the recipients of help, who experience greater benefit from autonomous helpers, plausibly through enhanced feelings of closeness and the receipt of better quality help (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). The prosocial orientation encompassing both the behavior displays and facilitator group conditions for the behavior displays ultimately would define a group culture (George & Bettenhausen, 1990).

In organizations, workgroups are powerful suppliers of norms to their members, and exchange relationships that form within groups may determine, the level of prosocial behavior characteristic of a group (George & Bettenhausen, 1990). Another influence that groups have is the result of the enforcement of group norms, which also serve to control group member's behavior to achieve predictability and uniformity of behavior (Feldman, 1984). It is assumed that all groups would emphasize the importance of prosocial behavior; however, the extent to which the prosocial behavior is emphasized during the socialization process will vary (George & Bettenhausen, 1990).

Based on the definition of prosocial behavior which emphasizes the volition of the helper, the head coach of a sports team does not impose this behavior. George and Bettenhausen argue that an emphasis placed on prosocial behavior during initial socialization would be positively related to the performance of prosocial behavior by the group were supported. Therefore, the motivation of prosocial behavior within the team would become part of the team culture in general.

## 2.9 Introduction to Support Services

This construct was operationalized from the concept “support services” from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which mentioned various services such as tutors, psychologists, nutritionists, among other services that are available to all SA. The construct “introduction to support services” implies the fact that the coach can only introduce the SA to the support services and promote a positive attitude towards the use of the services. In this case, the scale measures the tactics used by the coach in order to introduce how to use the services, what benefits to expect from the services as well as the promotion of a positive feeling towards those individuals that use the services.

Nowadays, every athletic department at the NCAA Division I, II and III level provides support services for their athletes. The main goal of these services is to facilitate SAs’ success on the field, in the classroom and in life. According to the NCAA, member schools support their SA’s academic success by providing state-of-the-art technology, tutoring, and access to academic advisors. High levels of pressure and expectations may lead to SAs’ issues of maladjustment, emotional illness, and psychological distress (Watson, 2005).

Previous researchers have conservatively suggested that 10% to 15% of SAs suffer from distress that warrants clinical attention (Hinkle, 1994). However, assumptions to the underutilization of services suggest that SAs are hesitant to seek help (Watson, 2005). SAs are apprehensive of being stigmatized by coaches, teammates, student peers, and fans (Brewer, Van Raalte, Petipas, Bachman, & Weinhold, 1998; Linder, Brewer, Van Raalte,

& DeLange, 1991). Help-seeking behavior is seen as an adaptive mode of coping with personal concerns or problems (Gulas, 1974).

Nevertheless, SAs have been conditioned to axioms such as, “no pain, no gain” which may lead to views of help-seeking as a sign of weakness (Watson, 2005). For many athletes admitting personal needs lead to an image of poor self-efficacy in their ability to perform, damaging the level of trust established with their teammates, reducing playing time, or weakening their coach’s confidence in their ability to perform (Etzel, Pinkney, & Hinkle, 1994).

“Many colleges and universities continue to focus only on maintaining academic eligibility and graduation rates rather than on enhancing the academic, personal, and athletic development of the SA” (Broughton & Neyer, 2001, p. 48). Many institutions offer support services for their SA however, there is a big gap in the introduction to these services and the way how SADC and SA, in general, can benefit from them. As previously mentioned, in the athletic community there is a conceived notion that seeking help is perceived as weak, which is a big obstacle to effective use of the services. SADC might have other cultural obstacles as well. Research suggests the adoption of a team approach toward developing effective service delivery heuristics (Watson, 2005). An effective introduction to the support services would consider cultural differences, which may lead to a change in the conception of help-seeking for SADC and SA in general. Therefore, an evaluation of the SADC perception of the introduction to the support services can yield important information towards an effective way to seek support services, which automatically was lead to a better adaptation of SADC.



## 2.10 Sense of Belonging and Satisfaction as outcomes

In collegiate athletics, the head coach of a team structures a process of socialization for their student-athletes in order to facilitate the adaptation process. In the case of SADC, the newcomer entering a team with a different culture from their own was face additional challenges while learning the rules and behavioral norms of the team. In the management literature, many researchers have studied the outcomes of the socialization process finding two different sets of outcomes: proximal outcomes and distal outcomes (Bauer and Erdogan, 2010). Proximal outcomes indicate how well a newcomer is adjusting to his or her new organization and they are role clarity, self-efficacy and social acceptance (Feldman, 1981). Those outcomes tend to be measured early on in the process, potentially every 3 months until the newcomer has been with the organization for a year (Bauer et al. 1998). Distal outcomes indicate the ultimate results of organizational socialization and they are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job performance, intentions to remain and reduction of turnover (Erdogan, Bodner & Truxillo, 2005). Distal outcomes are the final result of an effective socialization process. In the management literature, organizations perceive that effective socialization has improved their retention rates, time to productivity and customer satisfaction overall (Bauer, 2010).

Since this study focuses on developing a valid and reliable instrument to measure the SADC's perceptions of the tactics used by their coach during the socialization process of newcomers into college athletics the author decided to assess one proximal outcome (social acceptance) and one distal outcome (satisfaction) in order to assess the external validity of the new scale. The author included an assessment of sense of belonging, which is a reflection of social acceptance from the newcomer perspective. A feeling of acceptance

and belonging is an important part of a high-performance culture. Individuals who feel like they belong, gain security, which leads to self-esteem. Social acceptance and a sense of belonging are important throughout life (Maslow, 1962). Their absence often leads to lowered interest and engagement in ordinary life activities (Weiss, 1973). “Belongingness” (Finn, 1989) or “school membership” has been identified as the potentially critical factor in the school retention and participation of at-risk students (Wehlage, 1989). Unfortunately, even in generally supportive schools, some individual students may feel socially marginal or excluded, for any number of reasons such as poor social skills or stigmatized status as special education or ethnic minority student (Goodenow, 1993).

“School membership means that students have established a social bond between themselves, the adults in the school and the norms governing the institution” (Wehlage, 1989, p.10). In the case of not meeting the belonging requirement, people have problems in communicating with their environment and difficulties in accepting themselves with feelings of inferiority and inadequacy (Adler, 2015). The people’s feeling that they belong to a place and have social status is a more powerful factor of motivation than the satisfaction of physiological needs (Keenan, 1996). Anderman (2003) did extensive research on the effect of the school on the psychological status of adolescents and indicated that belonging is also an important factor among various factors affecting the configuration of personality.

Research shows that the feeling of belonging is significantly related to distal outcomes of socialization as well. For example, it is positively related to organizational commitment (Bauer & Green, 1998; Kammeyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003; Saks et al., 2007) and job satisfaction (Ashford & Black, 1996; Saks et al., 2007). In addition,

acceptance has also been shown to be positively related to performance (Bauer, Erdogan, Liden, & Wayne, 2006) and negatively related to actual turnover (Bauer et al, 2006; Kammerlyer-Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). The sense of belonging will not only indicate an effective adjustment to the team but it is related to the distal outcomes such as performance and satisfaction of SADC. For this reason, the author decided to include the Psychological Sense of School Membership (PSSM) scale by Goodenow (2003) to the newly developed scaled in order to assess the sense of belonging of the freshmen student-athletes subjects of the present study. The PSSM scale is an 18-item valid and reliable scale tested with both urban and suburban students. The scales have good internal consistency reliability across samples, with working-class urban as well as middle-class suburban students from 5<sup>th</sup> grade to high school.

According to Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, and Truxillo (2007), all the facets of socialization are significantly correlated with satisfaction and intention to remain. The author considers the satisfaction scale by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001) which is a 3-item scale that was developed in the context of customer satisfaction. Satisfaction is defined as an overall cognitive and affective state of happiness and contentment (Oliver, 1997). The 3-item scale showed .75 reliability. This scale supported findings by Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) which stated that customers' overall satisfaction was composed of both product satisfaction and informational satisfaction, or satisfaction with the information provided to customers as they were making their decisions. In the present study, the researcher modified the vocabulary of the items in order to fit the context of intercollegiate athletics.

Subsequently, research on organizational socialization has evolved over the years. It has moved from understanding the adjustment into a given occupation, towards a more individual-focused interactionist process. Researchers have the challenge to study and understand the socialization process from the newcomer's perspective as well as the perspective of the organization (Bauer & Erdogan, 2010). For this reason, in this study, the author focuses on the perception of the SADC in relation to the five areas during the organizational socialization process in college sports proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017). The purpose of this study is to develop a valid and reliable instrument to measure the SADC's perceptions of the tactics used by their coach during the socialization process of newcomers into college athletics, based on the scale development procedure by Churchill (1979).

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

An eight-step framework was implemented in order to develop a scale based on Churchill (1979). In the first step, specify the domain of construct, the author performed an extensive literature review in order to define the domain of the constructs. The second step, generation of items follows an inductive approach, known also as “classification from below” (Hunt, 1991). The author used information from the previous qualitative study Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) in addition to conceptual definitions grounded in theory in order to develop items. The third step is the collection of data for the pilot study. After analyzing the data, the author performs the fourth step to purify the measure, by using coefficient alpha and factor analysis. The fifth step is to collect data with the new and purified instrument. The sixth step involves the assessment of reliability. The seventh step focuses on the assessment of validity. Finally, for the eight-step, the author developed norms for the new scale.

After reviewing, the literature on organizational socialization tactics and after analyzing various scales to measure the newcomer’s perception tactics used during the socialization process, it was evident that those scales had some limitations based on the context of Collegiate Athletics. The theories reviewed in the previous section were informative and contribute to the foundation for creating a scale that focuses on the

newcomer's perceptions of the socialization tactics selected by the team head coach. Organizational socialization in collegiate athletics is perceived to be a multi-dimensional construct, and the development of an instrument to measure these socialization tactics is a fundamental step towards the examination of the relationship between socialization and adjustment.

As stated by Daniel (1979), sample surveys allow for a collection of a wide variety of data, including opinions, beliefs, knowledge, feelings and present and past behavior. One of the most effective ways to collect data from a large group of subjects is the survey method. Alreck and Settle (1985) related to surveys as a comprehensive, customized, versatile, flexible, and efficient instrument to gather data. Moreover, in this study, the author focused on newcomer SADC's perceptions; therefore, the survey was the best way to gather information from them.

There are several challenges to using surveys as a data collection instrument when focusing on attitude research that needs to be acknowledged. Attitude research has shown weak attitudes are susceptible to change (Petty & Wegener, 1992). A consequence of this is that a person might give a response the first time, but if the research is repeated, the respondent is likely to give another response the next time. In addition, attitudes are complex constructs that vary in intensity and the way people perceive them. Therefore, while two respondents have the same attitude towards a socialization tactic, they both might give a different response to the question based on their own perception. Because surveys often rely on scales (such as the Likert scale), this limits the detail of information obtained in the response.

Research has shown that in scales, people tend to stay “in the middle” with a slight preference to the positive side (Gillham, 2000). However, the author has evaluated the newcomer’s perception of the socialization tactic and how useful that tactic has been for themselves.

Surveys face the challenge of reliability, which refers to the fact that it is possible to repeat a study and obtain the same responses for study one and two. Often, responses are dependent on contextual variables, and when using a survey, it is extremely hard to find situations where respondents are faced with exactly the same contextual variables. As previously, stated, society changes from moment to moment and this dynamic nature changes the context in which variables are measured from moment to moment (Heere, 2005). When a survey is distributed to a group of respondents by email, each person fills in the survey at a different time and each respondent might be faced with different contextual factors. So, even when the data is collected at one point in time, the respondents are faced with different contextual variables. These factors have a significant impact on the possibility of repeating a survey in the same matter of conduct.

The validity of the study is important and it is concerned with the degree to which a measurement seems to measure what it is supposed to measure. If a researcher asks different people about a certain construct, validity makes sure all people interpret the question in the same way (Cronbach, 1971). However, in social research, it is extremely difficult to reach validity because they are focused on social constructs subjective in nature, hard to measure and might be interpreted by each respondent in their own way. For example, while one newcomer might perceive the personalized attention of the coach as a successful way to interact with the authority, for other newcomers the personalized

interactions with the coach might cause an uncomfortable situation. It is important to consider the previously mentioned challenges throughout the scale development process. The researcher needs to be strict in following all the steps in the development process in order to obtain the necessary information to evaluate perceptions of the socialization tactics used with the newcomers.

### **3.2 Research Context**

The population of the study is freshman and sophomore student-athletes of NCAA Collegiate Athletics Division I, II with a different cultural background than their new team's culture. The SADC are individuals from another country or another region, for example, a student-athlete from New York coming to the University of South Carolina, or black student-athletes becoming part of a mostly white team.

The NCAA in its most recent Race and Ethnicity Report 2016-2017 stated that 18,464 student-athletes were internationals among its three divisions. This represents 4.00% of the total number of student-athletes. In addition to focusing on international student-athletes, the author decided to expand the focus of the study to all newcomer student-athletes that have large cultural differences between themselves and their team culture. The author made this decision after identifying the great number of student-athletes with a different cultural background which could relate to the outcomes of this study. According to the NCAA most recent Race and Ethnicity Report from 2016-2017, the percentage of black student-athletes attending predominantly white institutions (PWI) is 17.6% for men and 9.3% for women.



In 1980 the NCAA initiated a study conducted by the American Institutes for Research using data from a national survey of 4,083 student-athletes from 42 Division I institutions (39 PWIs and 3 HBCUs) revealing Black student-athletes at HBCUs were less likely to express feelings of being different from others, less likely to report experiences with racial isolation, and more likely to report having control over their lives. These findings can primarily be attributed to the fact that HBCUs enroll a large number of Black students in the general student body and reinforce Black cultural significance (Cooper & Dougherty, 2015).

The author assumes that the team culture might be different from the institutional culture and the geographical culture. The analysis of culture is very complex and there are many different shades and not necessarily one clear division. Since culture is based on social perception, the author decided to ask the newcomer if they perceive themselves to have a different cultural background from their team's culture. The author focuses on SADC because the cultural difference is a factor that influences the effectiveness of the socialization process within an organization (Schwesinger, Muller & Lundan, 2015). It is not essential for this study to evaluate how different is the newcomer's culture and the team's culture. It is only necessary to know if the newcomers perceive themselves to be from a different cultural background than the team.

### **3.3 Scale Development Procedure**

#### ***3.3.1 Stage 1: Specify the domains of construct***

The first step of Churchill's process is to specify the domains of the constructs examined in a study. Sport organizational socialization is conceptualized as the introduction process in which the newcomer athlete learns about the team and its culture,

values, and beliefs. The head coach of a team structure a group of tactics that ease the adaptation process and facilitate the achievement of the expected outcomes for the newcomer and the receiving team. In the present study, the author conceptualized the five socialization tactics identify in the work of Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) based on the literature review previously presented.

Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) based their findings on in-depth interviews, which yield five areas of newcomer-organizational socialization: custom coaching, mentorship, team structure, all-inclusive family, support services. The qualitative exploratory study by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) reported the five areas of newcomer socialization identified from the in-depth interviews; words frequently mentioned by the coaches of the sports teams. Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) did not lean upon the existing literature from the management and sport management fields, on the contrary, the authors analyzed the in-depth interviews and identified the five areas with terms expressed in the lexicon of the coaches during the in-depth interviews.

In the present study, the author operationalized each of the five concepts into measurable constructs based on a rigorous literature review in the management and the sport management fields. Therefore, the original term “custom coaching” was operationalized to “coach’s cultural competence”, mentorship was maintained, the original term “team structure” was operationalized to “introduction of norms and roles”, the original term “all-inclusive family” was operationalized to “prosocial behavior”, and the original term “support services” was operationalized to “introduction of support services”.

**3.3.1.1 Coach's Cultural Competence.** This construct was operationalized from the concept of custom coaching which refers to the ability of the coach to identify individual differences and treat each of his/her players in a particular way. As opposed to using a universal treatment for all the members of the team, the coach would treat a player based on that specific player's needs. This does not mean to make exceptions to rules or to have favoritism for an individual; however, it means to maintain a fair treatment for everyone even if the treatment is different in style for each member. In the same way that a chess player considers a pawn a bishop or a queen in different ways during a match. The interactions of the coach with the African-American student-athlete or the Brazilian international student-athlete should also be differentiated. Based on the extensive literature review the author analyzed an effective way to operationalize the original term "custom coaching" stated on Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which refers to how the coach of a team leads each SADC based on the SADC's specific needs.

The author analyzed various leadership theories and two were most relevant to the reality of SADC within the collegiate context: Multidimensional Model of Leadership MML (Chelladurai, 1978) and Path-Goal Leadership theory P-G (Evans, 1970). Chelladurai argued in his MML theory that the efficacy of coaches' leadership behaviors was contingent on their congruence with the preferences of the members as well as the demands of situational characteristics. In the same line, Evans (1970) argued that leaders are flexible and they can change their style, as situations require. Leaders help follower's motivation by making the path-goal clear removing obstacles/roadblocks which followers might encounter in the process of goal attainment, coaching/providing direction to keep the followers on track, and increasing work satisfaction (Northouse, 2016).

In the case of SADC in the collegiate context, the coach can eliminate many factors that negatively influence the adaptation of the newcomer but the coach first has to be knowledgeable and sensitive to the cultural differences in the newcomer SADC. Coaches need to be culturally competent. Cultural competence means to be respectful and responsive to behaviors, languages, communications, actions, values, religious beliefs, social groups and ethical perceptions of diverse individuals. The coach's cultural competence refers to the ability to successfully negotiate cross-cultural differences in order to accomplish practical goals (Vaughn, 2007). By assessing the SADC's perception of the coach's cultural competence, the author analyzed if the coach has the ability to identify individual differences and treat each of his/her players in a particular way. This is the definition of custom coaching previously proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which has been conceptualized to Coach's cultural competence in order to assess this construct.

**3.3.1.2 Mentorship.** Mentoring is a process for the informal transmission of knowledge, social capital, and the psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional development. Mentoring entails informal communication, usually face-to-face and during a sustained period, between a person who is perceived to have greater relevant knowledge, wisdom, or experience (the mentor) and a person who is perceived to have less (the protégé) (Bozeman and Feeney, 2007). The mentor becomes a source of emotional support for the student-athlete since the newcomer does not have an established close support network in the new team. The mentor will also act as an advocate for the newcomer, by making sure that good opportunities to grow are offered to the mentee.

**3.3.1.3 Introduction to team norms and roles.** This construct was operationalized from the concept “team structure” from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which from the definition presented by the authors referred to the way in which the newcomer was informed about the group of team rules, norms, and roles. Therefore, the author decided to use “Introduction to...” in order to allude to the way in which the coach informs the newcomers about the rules, roles, and norms.

After a thorough analysis of the literature of team rules, roles and norms, the author identified the fact that the rules of a group are written statements that might be given to newcomers at their arrival and serve as unifiers for all the members of the team. There should not be exceptions or changes to the rules in a well-functioning group. For this reason, it seemed meaningless to assess the introduction to rules since those are going to remain written and unchanged.

However, the norms are the deepest level of the team culture, very difficult to identify for any newcomer or person outside of the team. The norms are a group of assumptions as to how to behave when facing external challenges and how to behave among all the members of the team. For example, the arrangement of lines of authority, communications, rights and duties of an organization are examples of norms. The introduction to these assumptions will help the newcomer lessen anxiety and stress from not knowing how to behave within and outside of the group.

In addition, each individual on the team has a particular role within that team, however, the clarity and acceptance of the role assigned to each newcomer might sometimes be in conflict. The introduction to the role of the SADC can be done in various

ways. Base on the cultural background of each student-athlete the way in which he/she is introduced to his/her role might be more or less effective. The goal during the socialization process is to have clarity and acceptance of the role assigned to the newcomer. Base on this analysis the author decided to use the construct “Introduction to team norms and roles”.

**3.3.1.4 Prosocial behavior.** This construct was operationalized from the concept “all-inclusive family” from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which was previously defined as the way in which the newcomer experiences the team culture, dependent upon the other members of the team and their style of human interaction, connectedness, and favorability to diversity. The interaction of the older members of the team and the newcomers inside and outside of the sport context was qualified as very important.

Based on the definition the author identified the construct “prosocial behavior” which is defined as behavior intended to benefit other people or society as a whole, such as helping, sharing, donating, co-operating and volunteering. These actions may be motivated by empathy and by concern about the welfare and rights of others (Sanstock, 2007) as well as for practical concerns, such as one’s social status or reputation, hope for direct or indirect reciprocity. This type of behavior by the members of the team can be encouraged or motivated but not mandated by the coach. This construct intends to assess the newcomer’s perception of the quality of interaction of old-new members of the team at all times (during and after any athletic-related activities). In the context of collegiate athletics, this is particularly important because of the large number of hours that the members of the team experience with each other during practices, competitions, training tables, study halls, travels, etc... Unlike an employee in a company where there is a clear

distinction between work and outside of work environments, the student-athletes members of a team tend to interact with each other continuously.

**3.3.1.5 Introduction to support services.** This construct was operationalized from the concept “support services” from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which mentioned various services such as tutors, psychologists, nutritionists, among other services that are available to SA. In the definition of this concept, it was also stated that the athletic department organizes and controls these services. Although, the coach does not directly support services he/she can promote and encourage the use of these services. For this reason, the author used “Introduction to ...” to refer to the way in which the coach informs the newcomers about the use of these services.

After a detailed literature review, the author identifies a current problem in the use of the support services and the consequences for those SA that use the services. In the publication by the National Collegiate Athletic Association NCAA, Carr and Davidson (2014) stated, “Student-athletes, coaches and staff tend to minimize mental disorders or psychological distress because of the expectations of strength, stability and mental toughness inherent in the sports culture”. In addition, SA’s perception of being rejected by teammates or coaches due to the use of psychological services increases the stigma of being weak or not capable of performing as an SA.

Therefore, it is more important for the coach to introduce the services in a way that would clear off any stigma and even encourage the SA to use them. The services provided to SA seek to guide a successful college experience and ensure the physical and psychological well-being of the SA. The introduction to the support services is very

important during the socialization process and the goal is to familiarize the SADC with how to use those services.

**3.3.1.6. Different culture – control variable.** Culture is complex and nowadays with the effects of globalization, the multiplicity of different cultures is even greater. Assessing the cultural difference between one person and an institution is extremely difficult. There have been many studies that attempt to evaluate culture especially national culture. Dr. Geert Hofstede was one of the pioneers in cultural distance assessments, as well as Terence Blake with the World Prism Profiler. However, for the purpose of this study, the author focused on SADC which includes any newcomer to the team who perceives themselves to have a different culture from the team that they are entering. It is not important to evaluate how different are cultures but only if they are different. Therefore, the author added four questions for the respondents to self-report on his/her perception.

**3.3.1.7 Outcomes feeling of belonging and satisfaction.** The expected outcome of an effective socialization process is the newcomer's adaptation to the new team. Pittman and Richmond (2008) analyzed the relationship between the feeling of belonging to the university, the quality of friendships and the psychological adjustment of freshman college students in the process of transition to college. The research findings showed that the feeling of belonging to the university and the quality of peer relations are the most important factors in the adaptation process to university. Positive behavior, high motivation, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and competence are seen in students who have their belonging requirements fulfilled (Battistich, Solomon, Watson & Schaps, 1997).



For this study, the author decided to evaluate the feeling of belonging and satisfaction as the main elements of an effective adaptation of the newcomer to the team. The author decided to include the Psychological Sense of School Membership (PSSM) scale by Goodenow (2003) and the satisfaction scale by Keaveney, S., and Madhavan P. (2001) to the newly developed scaled in order to assess the sense of belonging and satisfaction of the freshmen and sophomore student-athletes subjects of the present study. The PSSM scale is an 18-item valid and reliable scale tested with both urban and suburban students. The scales have good internal consistency reliability across samples, with working-class urban as well as middle-class suburban students from 5<sup>th</sup> grade to high school.

The satisfaction scale by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001) is a 3-item scale that was developed in the context of customer satisfaction. Satisfaction was defined as an overall cognitive and affective state of happiness and contentment (Oliver, 1997). The 3-item scale showed 0.75 reliability. This scale supported findings by Spreng, MacKenzie, and Olshavsky (1996) which stated that customers' overall satisfaction was composed of both product satisfaction and informational satisfaction, or satisfaction with the information provided to customers as they were making their decisions. In the present study, the researcher modified the vocabulary of the items in order to fit the context of intercollegiate athletics.

### ***3.3.2 Stage 2: Generate a sample of items***

The second stage involved generating items to capture the social constructs defined in Stage 1. It is important to note that newcomer socialization is a multi-dimensional

construct proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017). Many variables of interest to social and behavioral scientists are not directly observable; beliefs, motivational states, expectancies, needs, emotions, and social role perceptions are some examples. However, developing a measure that is optimally suited to the research question requires understanding the subtleties of the theory (DeVellis, 2017).

Table 3.1 *Initial items generated for first data collection*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
<u>Prequestionnaire: Cultural Difference</u>			
CD1	Dev. by author	The culture in this team [place] is so different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD2	Dev. by author	People around here think and act so different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD3	Dev. by author	I feel very different from the people around me.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD4	Dev. by author	In conversations with people around here, I do not always know what the appropriate response is.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD5	Dev. by author	I do not always know how to act around people in my team.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
<u>Construct 1: Coach's Cultural Competence</u>			
CC1	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC2	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths associated with cultural incompetence
CC3	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural

CC4	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person.	competence and its elements Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC5	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths associated with cultural incompetence
CC6	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths associated with cultural incompetence

### Construct 2: Mentorship

CM1	Dev. by author	I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM2	Based on Berk et al. 2005	I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time	Original item: My mentor was supportive and encouraging
CM3	Dev. by author	My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM4	Dev. by author	Having a coach-mentor helps me in getting adjusted to the new environment	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM5	Dev. by author	I wish I did not have a coach-mentor (reversed)	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM6	Dev. by author	The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM7	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff knows how to motivate me.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM8	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff cares about my well-being.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring and its impact

### Construct 3: Introduction to team Norms and Roles

CN1	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN2	Dev. by author	I feel familiar with how I should behave as a member of this team.	Based on Schein 2010 characteristics of norms

CN3	Dev. by author	I feel comfortable with how to do things around here.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN4	Dev. by author	I agree with how thing work around here.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN5	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team behave.	Based on Hatch and Schultz 2002, importance of knowing group norms
CN6	Dev. by author	The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are within the team.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN7	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN8	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN9	Dev. by author	I like my role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group

#### Construct 4: Prosocial Behavior

CP1	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff promotes other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP2	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP3	Dev. by author	I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP4	Dev. by author	I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP5	Dev. by author	I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP6	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff does not like that other members of the team have to help me (reversed)	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996

definition of prosocial behavior

Construct 5: Introduction to Support Services

CS1	Dev. by author	The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS2	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these services.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS3	Dev. by author	I feel comfortable using any services that I might need.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS4	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of used of services
CS5	Dev. by author	I feel like the coaching staff was think less of me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of used of services
CS6	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages me to use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS7	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages everyone to use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS8	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff likes it when I use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used

Outcomes: Sense of Belonging

OB1	Goodenow 1993 PSSM 8-18	I feel like a real part of my team	I feel like a real part of (name of school).
OB2	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	It is hard for people like me to be accepted here. (reversed)	Same as original
OB3	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong here. (reversed)	Same as original
OB4	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes	I am treated with as much respect as other students.

OB5	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I can really be myself at this team.	I can really be myself at this school.
OB6	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I wish I were at a different team. (Reversed).	I wish I were at a different school. (Reversed).
OB7	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I feel proud of belonging to this team	I feel proud of belonging to (name of school).
OB8	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Other students-athletes here like me the way I am	Other students here like me the way I am

Outcome 2: Satisfaction (service)

OS1	Keaveney, and Madhavan (2001)	Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.	On the whole, I am satisfied with my experience with this/that service.
OS2	Keaveney, and Madhavan (2001)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete. (reverse)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh/outweighed my positive experiences with this/that service. (r)
OS3	Keaveney, and Madhavan (2001)	In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.	In general, I am/was happy with the service experience.

Demographics

D1	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Age	Older student-athletes might deal with adaptation differently
D2	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Gender	Males vs Females might deal with adaptation differently
D3	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Ethnicity	Each ethnicity might deal with adaptation differently
D4	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Sport	Group sports vs individual sports might deal differently with adaptation
D5	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Where are you from?	Where do they consider themselves from and is that region different from where the school is located?
D6	NCAA GOALS (2019)	City (In what city is your school located)?	Where do they consider themselves from and is that region different from where the school is located?

### 3.3.3 Stage 3: Data collection

The researcher used a pilot study of 150 responses, targeting newcomer freshman and sophomore student-athletes of NCAA Collegiate Athletics Division I and II. These subjects were chosen for the level of athletic competition, one of the highest in the nation. The process of organizational socialization would facilitate SADCs to adjust to their new teams and be able to handle the pressures of collegiate athletics. Due to the competitiveness of the conference, the head coach of each team recruits at the national and international levels in order to get highly talented athletes. This fact ensures the presence of a significant number of SADC on each team and facilitates the collection of data. The responses had a Likert scale format. When a Likert scale is used, the item is presented as a declarative sentence, followed by response options that indicate varying degrees of agreement with or endorsement of the statement (Hinkin, 1995). This instrument is widely used to measure opinions, beliefs, and attitudes. It is often useful for these statements to be strong when used in a Likert format, the items should be in clear terms (Hinkin, 1995).

The instrument was distributed through Qualtrics. The researcher used convenience sampling through personal and professional contacts with coaches. The researcher had to motivate the student-athletes for their participation in the study. Due to NCAA rules, it was not possible to offer compensation for the completion of the survey. Therefore, the need to contact the head coach of the team directly and request his/her support in the collection of data is important.

The data collection process started in November 2018, assuming that the subjects already had experienced the socialization process during the previous months. The study

is exploratory since the researcher's purpose is to develop a new scale, and the items in the scale are pertinent to the respondents, all of them are student-athletes and have already experienced the socialization process. The sample size fulfills the condition that it has at least an item-to-response ratio range of 1:4 (Rummel, 1970), which would require a sample size of at least 144 respondents based on 36 items. The author expects to have 36 items based on an average of six questions per each of the five constructs in addition to one control variable.

#### **3.3.4 Stage 4: Purify Measure**

By assessing the reliability and validity of the data obtained in the pilot study, the author identified the items that might need to be removed or modified. A reliability test would be performed based on several techniques. One of the most important techniques to measure reliability is Cronbach's Alpha. The alpha is an indication of the proportion of variance in the scale score that is attributable to the true score and is desired to be higher than 0.7 (Cronbach, 1951; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In addition, the item-to-total statistic would be reviewed and if it is lower than 0.5 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998) then the researcher would reword an item. Then, the inter-item correlations would be analyzed, and if any of the scores are lower than 0.3 (Hair et al., 1998), then both items would be reviewed and the wording of one of the items would be changed. If the inter-item correlation is higher than 0.8 then, both items would be reviewed and one of the two items would be deleted without hurting the reliability of the construct (Hair et al., 1998).

Data analysis through factor analysis is important and there are exploratory factor analysis EFA and confirmatory factor analysis CFA available for the scale development



process. The EFA is typically used to reduce the items into a smaller and more parsimonious set of variables. The CFA is used to evaluate the factor structure by statistically testing the significance of the model and the relationships among items and scales (Hinkin et al., 1997). Both can be used in the process of scaled development, however, the CFA is more widely used for a deductive method (Kline, 2011). The present study used an inductive approach, therefore EFA was helpful for identifying the structure and reliability of the scale and CFA was helpful for the validity of the scale. Validity testing in the exploratory stage would be done based upon content validity. Five experts in the field of collegiate sport socialization research were approached and asked to rate the items and to provide insights regarding the wording of items.

### **3.3.5 Stage 5: Collect Data**

The corrected questionnaires for the second data administration were distributed among 400 student-athletes from various Division I and II NCAA member institutions and various teams such as basketball (men and women), soccer (men and women), golf (men and women), tennis (men and women) and swimming (men and women). The author recognized that the greater number of newcomers with a different culture is part of teams such as the men's soccer, women's and men's golf and tennis, women's and men's track and field and swimming and the women's and men's basketball team, however, other sport teams are not excluded. The researcher sought to have diversity in the sample that increased the validity and robustness of the data.

The instrument was distributed past the end of the fall semester in order to ensure that all the student-athletes had experienced the socialization process to their new teams.

By directly contacting the head coach of the team and requesting, his/her support in the collection of data, the researcher hoped to gather all the necessary questionnaires. The instrument was distributed through Qualtrics. The researcher used convenience sampling through personal and professional contacts with coaches.

The sample size was divided into two, which allowed for both an exploratory EFA as well as a confirmatory factor analysis CFA. The sample size fulfills the condition that it has at least an item-to-response ratio range of 1:4 (Rummel, 1970), which would require a sample size of at least 146 respondents based on 36 items. The author expected to have 36 items based on an average of six questions per construct (5 total) in addition to one control variable. However, since both EFA and CFA would be performed on the second sample size, then the total sample size of the second data distribution should be at least 300. With this number of respondents, the minimum requirement of 150 for factor analysis was also covered (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988).

### **3.3.6 Stage 6: Assess the reliability**

The reliability of the instrument is observed through the internal consistency and objectivity of the measurement item. Internal consistency implies that the items comprising the scale are homogeneous and a respondent would respond to the items the same way because of the high correlation between the items (DeVellis, 1991). The consistency of the items could also be tested by a test-retest approach, in which the respondents respond to the item on two different occasions. Reliability is reached when the respondent provides the same answer on both occasions.

The most common way to measure reliability is Cronbach's Alpha, which measures the internal consistency of the items. Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) suggested the minimum acceptable level of the Cronbach's Alpha is 0.70, which indicates a modest agreement between the variables just below 50%.

Since Cronbach's Alpha does not measure the amount of variance explained by the construct relative to the amount of variance that may be attributed by measurement error, the reliability could further be examined with the average variance extracted (AVE) (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE of the construct should be greater than the unique variance of the construct and the values of AVE should be higher than 0.50.

In addition, Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1998) used both inter-item correlation and the item-to-total statistic to examine reliability. For inter-item correlation, a correlation of 0.3 or higher is deemed appropriate, while the item to the total statistic should be 0.5 or higher. It should be noted a researcher should be aware of any inter-item correlation higher than 0.8 because this might indicate the researcher is using redundancy of items. There are many ways that the reliability of the survey can be harmed and measurement error is unavoidable. It is the responsibility of the researcher to diminish these errors as much as possible.

### **3.3.7 Stage 7: Assess the validity**

Cronbach Alpha, item to total and inter-item correlation would be used to assess the reliability of the scales. In addition, an exploratory factor analysis would be performed to test the multidimensionality of each factor. Confirmatory factor analysis would also be performed, in order to further test the reliability of the model and see if the model represents

a good fit for the data. Validity testing would be done based upon content, discriminant, convergent and construct validity.

Finally, the discriminant validity of the scales would be assessed by examining the squared correlations among dimensions of the scale. A squared correlation that is higher than the AVE score for a construct would indicate the dimensions possess discriminant validity.

**3.3.7.1 Validity.** The researcher should also be aware of the validity issues of the survey. Validity indicates that the measurement instrument actually assesses what it is supposed to measure (Baumgartner & Jackson, 1982). Unlike reliability, validity is often a more subjective assessment of the researcher and its surroundings. There are different forms of validity: 1) Content validity, 2) External and Concurrent validity, 3) Convergent and Discriminant validity, and 4) Construct validity. Content validity is a conceptual approach, while the other three forms are empirical and theoretically based.

**3.3.7.2 Content validity.** Content validity is a qualitative approach in which the items are presented to expert analysts to judge whether the measures fully represent a certain domain (Heeler & Ray, 1972). The examination of test items and the item selection is obtained by logical deduction and expert opinion and therefore, content validity often is dependable on the subjective assessment of the researcher and the experts involved. The use of experts to validate the items is an approach often used to obtain content validity (Lasser, Mittal, & Sharma, 1995). The lack of content validity is often the result of an incomplete understanding of the underlying theory.

**3.3.7.3 Concurrent validity.** Concurrent validity compares the two different instruments at the same point in time (e.g., to what degree the scores on the CLEP College Algebra exam are related to performance in a college algebra class). Predictive validity is present when the instrument is able to predict some appropriate criterion (e.g., a comparison of scores on the SAT with first-semester grade point average GPA in college) (Kline, 2011). Test scores should be correlated with some future behavior or other criteria.

There are several shortcomings to this validity approach. The results are not only influenced by the measurement error in the new instrument, but also by the measurement error of the benchmark instrument. In addition, the assessment of another instrument as a benchmark is subjective in nature. Finally, for most exploratory research benchmarks are not available, since no instrument has been developed yet.

**3.3.7.4 Convergent validity.** Despite the value of both validity measurements, based on the limitations of content and criterion validity, more stringent measurements of validity should be performed in order to validate an instrument. Convergent validity is related to predictive or concurrent validity because it uses comparisons between different instruments to test the same construct. There is no current agreement on how convergent validity can be measured, and several different approaches are used to obtain it. Several researchers have used reliability statistics (Cronbach's Alpha, AVE, composite reliability) to demonstrate convergent validity (McDonald, 2002). Convergent validity could also be measured by examining the loading of the specific items. If an indicator's loading is twice its standard error, convergent validity may be evident (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Another way to measure convergent validity is by an examination of the residual matrix.

If an individual, the residual value does not exceed the threshold value of  $\pm 1.15$  and the number of cases that do exceed this value is less than 5 percent.

**3.3.7.5 Discriminant validity.** Discriminant validity is the extent to which the measurement is new and differs from other measurements. It is concerned with the correlation between the new instrument and old instruments, to which it should differ (Heeler & Ray, 1972). It is indicated by a low correlation between the new instrument and the existing instruments.

According to Anderson and Gerbing (1988), the correlation between any two constructs should not be within two standard errors of unity. Another way to establish discriminant validity is to use the AVE. Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggested the AVE for each construct should be greater than the squared correlation between that construct and the comparative construct used.

**3.3.7.6 Construct validity.** While both convergent as discriminant validity could be regarded as construct related validity measurements, the use of these two measurements can only suggest validation. Construct validity, in general, is the broader concept of the instrument because of the theory of the researcher (Cronbach & Meehi, 1955). The true base of construct validity can be found in the literature review of the researcher and shows the validation of the instrument. This falls back to the model as designed by Churchill (1979), in which the process of construct validity is apparent in stages 1 through 5.

**3.3.7.7 External validity.** This refers to the extent to which the scale measures what it was set out to measure. For external validity purposes, the author used the Psychological Sense of School Membership PSSM scale by Carol Goodenow (2003) and

the Satisfaction scale by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001). A high correlation between these scales and the scores for the different socialization constructs would indicate a certain degree of external validity.

**3.3.7.8 Factor analysis.** The two forms of factor analysis are exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is used to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller set, and describe the pattern of inter-relationships among the observed variables. It is exploratory in nature and could justify the scales the researcher would develop (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

In itself, the EFA is not enough evidence for the unidimensionality of the scales and the researcher had to perform confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for conclusive evidence. For CFA, the researcher examines the factors as proposed in the theoretical framework, to see if the CFA supports the theory. In contrast to the EFA, the CFA allows a more precise specification of the measurement model. Due to the small sample size of the pilot study, the second data distribution would be split into two samples. With the first sample, both an EFA as well as a CFA would be performed. After purification through an iterative process, a CFA would be performed with the second sample. The second set of data would also be used to test for external validity.

### **3.3.8 Stage 8: Develop norms**

Since the proposed instrument would be a first attempt to create a scale that is generalizable and it would be the first step towards construct validity, norms cannot be established. However, the current study would offer suggestions for further scaled development and future norms.

### 3.4 Delimitations and limitations

This study only focused on newcomer SADC, this means the subjects were freshman, sophomore or transferring student-athletes entering a collegiate athletic team. The author decided to have this delimitation due to the nature of the socialization process, which is assumed to be carried out during the first months of the arrival of the newcomer. Another delimitation to the study is the fact that the scale was only measure based on the perception of the SADC.

Future studies can also analyze the perspective of the coach. In regards to the outcomes with which the researcher tested external validity, only the sense of belonging and satisfaction were used to evaluate the adaptation of the newcomers. In future studies, more outcomes can be assessed such as performance statistics, role clarity, and intention to remain, team commitment, among others. A limitation is a fact that culture is a multi-dimensional phenomenon and it is extremely complex to measure the levels of cultural difference from the newcomer to the team culture. For this reason, the author decided to evaluate the newcomer's perception of their similarity or difference from the team culture.

Another limitation is the assumption that the SADC had already experienced the socialization process within their teams, however, it is not guaranteed that the coach would have structure a socialization process for the newcomers. In some teams, the newcomers might be expected to adapt to the new environment on their own. This study only focused on the development of an instrument to measure the SADC perceptions of the tactics used by the team/coach during the socialization process of newcomers, using the scale development procedure of Churchill (1979).



## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to create an instrument that will measure the student-athlete's perceptions of the tactics used by the coach during the socialization process of newcomers. This was a first effort to assess the socialization process of first, second-year and transfer student-athletes from their perspective. This chapter is an overview of the results of the instrument development based on Churchill (1979) eight stages of scale development. Through Stage 1, the researcher defined five constructs based on an extensive literature review and the results of Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which indicated five domains during the socialization process of student-athletes into their new teams. In Stage 2, the researcher developed new items following an inductive approach. At this stage, the researcher also requested feedback from five experts in the field in order to improve content validity. After analyzing and modifying the items based on the experts' feedback the researcher proceeded to the next stage. Through Stage 3, the collection of data for the pilot study took place. In Stage 4, the reliability and validity results of the first data collection were examined based on basic reliability statistics (Cronbach's alpha, inter-item correlation, and item-to-total statistic). Through Stage 5, the item purification procedure was explained. In Stage 6, the second data collection procedure took place using various distribution methods, such as paper surveys in-person distribution and online distribution. In Stage 7, the reliability and validity of the instrument were demonstrated after dividing the second data collected into two groups in order to perform EFA and CFA. Finally in

Stage 8, the researcher suggested norms that should be used in order to apply the instrument in specific settings.

#### 4.1 Stage 1: Specify domains of constructs

The constructs are defined in Table 4.1 after analyzing the theories and the results from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) which were informative and contributed to the foundation for creating a scale that focuses on the newcomer's perceptions of the socialization tactics selected by the team head coach. Organizational socialization in collegiate athletics is perceived to be a multi-dimensional construct, and the development of an instrument to measure these socialization tactics is a fundamental step towards the examination of the relationship between socialization and adjustment.

Table 4.1. *The constructs of the Socialization Process of SADC*

Constructs	Definitions
Coach's Cultural Competence	The ability of the coach to identify individual differences and successfully negotiate those cross-cultural differences in order to accomplish practical goals (Northhouse, 2016; Vaughn, 2007; Evans, 1970)
Mentorship	Mentoring is a process for the informal transmission of knowledge, and the psychosocial support perceived by the recipient as relevant to work, career, or professional and personal development (Bozeman and Feeney, 2007)
Introduction to team norms and roles	The way in which the coach informs the newcomer about the norms of the team, and how to behave when facing external challenges and how to behave among all the members of the team. As well as how the coach informs the newcomer about their role on the team

Prosocial behavior	Behavior intended to benefit the newcomer or the team as a whole, such as helping, sharing, donating, co-operating and volunteering. These actions may be motivated by empathy and by concern about the welfare and rights of others
Introduction to support services	The way in which the coach informs the newcomer about the support services and how to use them, with the purpose of clearing off any stigma and even encouraging the SA to use those services.
<u>Control Variable</u>	
Cultural distance*	Newcomer self-report on his/her perception of the differences from his/her culture and the team's culture.
<u>Outcomes</u>	
Sense of belonging*	Belonging is a sense of fitting in or feeling like you are an important member of a group.
Satisfaction*	Fulfillment of one's wishes, expectations, or needs, or the pleasure derived from this

*\*These are not proposed constructs for the new scale; instead, they are separate constructs to test external validity*

## **4.2. Stage 2: Generate a sample of items**

The following paragraphs provide explanations of how items were developed and also review earlier attempts to measure the constructs.

### **4.2.1. Coach's Cultural Competence**

Measuring the coach's cultural competence is a difficult process because of the measurement errors that arise when trying to measure perception. In the present study, the researcher's focus is the perception of the student-athlete of the socialization tactics used by his/her coach. In this specific construct, the student-athlete should perceive the coach's knowledge and/or interest for getting to know the student-athletes individual

characteristics, needs and wants strengths and weaknesses as an athlete and as a person, and their cultural differences. The researcher developed the following six items based on the cultural competence's five elements described by Campinha-Bacote et al. (1996) (cultural awareness, cultural knowledge, cultural skill, cultural encounter, and cultural desire). 1) I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths, 2) I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me, 3) I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses, 4) I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person, 5) I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs, 6) I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs. According to Campinha-Bacote et al. (1996), the elements of cultural competence can be developed with experience if a coach has more opportunities to deal with SADC they will develop their cultural competence.

Table 4.2 *Items for Coach's Cultural Competence Construct*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
CC1	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC2	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent
CC3	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC4	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC5	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent
CC6	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent

#### **4.2.2. Mentorship**

According to Heimann and Pittenger (1996), a well-designed formal mentorship program could be instrumental in retaining qualified minority group members by socializing the newcomers to the culture of the organization and by enhancing their commitment to the organization through such a program. However, mentoring is very complex and its outcomes can vary from one situation to another. In some situations, the coaches use mentoring without a formal program, therefore, it is more difficult to identify if this socialization tactic is beneficial for the SADC.

The researcher, based on Kram and Ragins (2007) and Heimann and Pittenger (1996) developed the following items. 1) I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor, 2) I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time, 3) My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team, 4) Having a coach-mentor helps me in getting adjusted to the new environment, 5) I wish I did not have a coach-mentor (reversed), 6) The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor, 7) I feel the coaching staff knows how to motivate me, 8) I feel the coaching staff cares about my well-being.

The purpose of the first question is to identify if the student-athletes perceives to have a formal mentoring program directed by the coach of the team. The second item seeks to identify if the SA perceives to have support from the mentor in other areas than athletics, such as emotional support. The third and fourth items attempt to help the newcomer adapt to the environment within the team.

The fifth question asks the SA about the acceptance of a mentor within the team. The researcher realizes that in some cases the SA can think that the mentoring program is not necessary when going through the socialization process of newcomers.

Table 4.3 *Items for Mentorship Construct*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
CM1	Developed by author	I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996m need for formal mentoring
CM2	Based on Berk et al. 2005	I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time	Original item: My mentor was supportive and encouraging
CM3	Developed by author	My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM4	Developed by author	Having a coach-mentor helps me in getting adjusted to the new environment	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM5	Developed by author	I wish I did not have a coach-mentor (reversed)	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM6	Developed by author	The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff knows how to motivate me.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff cares about my well-being.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring and its impact

#### 4.2.3. *Introduction to team norms and roles*

This construct focuses on the way in which the newcomers are informed about the group team norms and roles. According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979) defined organizational socialization as the process by which one is taught and learns “the ropes” of a particular organizational role. Norms are basic assumptions that have become taken for granted and there is little variation within a social unit. The basic assumptions are strongly

held in a group; that members will find behavior based on any other premise inconceivable (Schein, 2010). Group norms will provide its members with a sense of identity and define the values that provide self-esteem (Hatch & Schultz, 2004).

Based on the definition of norms stated by Van Maanen and Schein (1979) The researcher developed the following questions: 1) I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”, 2) I feel familiar with how I should behave as a member of this team, 3) I feel comfortable with how to do things around here, 4) I agree with how thing work around here, 5) I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team behave. In addition, the author also developed the following questions in relation to the introduction of the new role to the SA, 6) The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are within the team, 7) I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me, 8) I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me, 9) I like my role within the team.

Those questions were based on the Biddle and Thomas (1966) communication of the knowledge base pertaining to the concept of roles. Additionally, the roles present a number of cognitive (e.g., role clarity,) affective (e.g., role satisfaction) and behavioral (e.g., role performance) elements to role involvement. In this study, the author will focus on the role clarity component, which is defined as the degree of understanding one has about his or her role responsibilities.

Table 4.4 *Items for the Introduction to the Team Norms and Roles Construct*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
CN1	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”.	Based on Van Maanen and Schein 1979 definition of norms
CN 2	Developed by author	I feel familiar with how I should behave as a member of this team.	Based on Schein 2010 characteristics of norms
CN 3	Developed by author	I feel comfortable with how to do things around here.	Based on Van Maanen and Schein 1979 definition of norms
CN 4	Developed by author	I agree with how things work around here.	Based on Van Maanen and Schein 1979 definition of norms
CN 5	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team behave.	Based on Hatch and Schultz 2002, the importance of knowing group norms
CN 6	Developed by author	The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are within the team.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN 7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN 8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN 9	Developed by author	I like my role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group

#### 4.2.4. *Prosocial Behavior*

A working definition prosocial organizational behavior is behavior which is performed by a member of an organization, directed toward an individual, group or organization with whom he/she interacts while carrying out his or her organizational role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual, group or organization toward which it is directed (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996).



The term prosocial behavior is often associated with acts such as helping, sharing, donating, cooperating and volunteering. They are positive social acts carried out of produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996). Prosocial behavior represents ways in which an individual can act spontaneously and voluntarily to promote the organization's interest or practical reasons or selfish motives (Brief & Motowidlo, 1996).

The six following questions were developed in order to measure the SA's perception of the prosocial behavior within their new team. 1) I feel the coaching staff promotes other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility, 2) I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me, 3) I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help, 4) I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team, 5) I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me, 6) I feel the coaching staff does not like that other members of the team have to help me (reversed).

Table 4.5 *Items for Prosocial Behavior Construct*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
PB1	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff promotes other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
PB2	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
PB3	Developed by author	I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior

PB4	Developed by author	I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
PB5	Developed by author	I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
PB6	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff does not like that other members of the team have to help me (reversed)	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior

#### ***4.2.5. Introduction to support services***

It is important to mention that the construct “introduction to supporting services” implies the fact that the coach can only introduce the SA to the supporting services and promote a positive attitude towards the use of the services. In this case, the scale measures the tactics used by the coach in order to introduce how to use the services, what benefits to expect from the services as well as the promotion of a positive feeling towards those individuals that use the services.

The researcher based the following questions on Watson (2005) which states that there are assumptions about SA underutilization of services. Generally, SAs are hesitant to seek help, due to being conditioned to axioms such as, “no pain, no gain” which may lead to views of help-seeking as a sign of weakness.

The researcher developed the following three of eight items based on Watson (2005): 1) The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the supporting services offered to student-athletes, 2) I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these services, 3) I feel comfortable using any services that I might need. Those items focus on

the way the coach introduces the support services to the SA and questions the SA perception as to how comfortable they are using those services.

The other five items of this construct were based on Etzel, Pinkney, and Hinkle (1994) which state that for many athletes, admitting personal need, leads to an image of poor self-efficacy in their ability to perform. This damages the level of trust established with their teammates, reducing playing time, or weakening their coach's confidence in their ability to perform (Etzel, Pinkney, & Hinkle, 1994).

These are the questions: 4) I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the supporting services. (reversed), 5) I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the supporting services. (reversed), 6) I feel the coaching staff encourages me to use the supporting services, 7) I feel the coaching staff encourages everyone to use the supporting services, 8) I feel the coaching staff likes when I use the supporting services.

Table 4.6 *Items for Introduction to Support Services Construct*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
CS1	Developed by author	The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS2	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these services.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS3	Developed by author	I feel comfortable using any services that I might need.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS4	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of use of services

CS5	Developed by author	I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of use of services
CS6	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages me to use support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages everyone to use support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff likes it when I use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used

#### ***4.2.6. Different culture – control variable***

These items are not part of the new scale. The researcher used this variable different culture to determine how the SA perceived him/herself within the new team. Since culture and cultural differences are very complex to measure. It is not important to evaluate how different are cultures but only if they are different.

1) The culture in this team [place] is different from where I am from, 2) The culture in this team [place] is different from where I am from, 3) I feel very different from the people around me, 4) In conversations with people around here, I do not always know what the appropriate response is, 5) I do not always know how to act around people in my team.

Table 4.7 *Items for Pre-Questionnaire*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
CD1	Developed by author	The culture in this team [place] is different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD2	Developed by author	People around here think and act so different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD3	Developed by author	I feel very different from the people around me.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD4	Developed by author	In conversations with people around here, I do not always know what the appropriate response is.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD5	Developed by author	I do not always know how to act around people in my team.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception

#### **4.2.7. Outcome 1: Feeling of Belonging**

The expected outcome of an effective socialization process is the newcomer's adaptation to the new team. The researcher decided to evaluate the feeling of belonging as an important element of an effective adaptation of the newcomer to the team. The author decided to include a modification of the Psychological Sense of School Membership (PSSM) scale by Goodenow (2003). The PSSM scale is an 18-item valid and reliable scale tested with both urban and suburban students. The scales have good internal consistency reliability across samples, with working-class urban as well as middle-class suburban students from 5th grade to high school.

The modified items are: 1) I feel like a real part of my team, 2) It is hard for people like me to be accepted here (reversed), 3) Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong here (reversed), 4) I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes, 5) I can

really be myself at this team, 6) I wish I were at a different team (Reversed), 7) I feel proud of belonging to this team, 8) Other students-athletes here like me the way I am. The following table details the modifications of the original scale and the 8 questions selected from the 18-items PSSM scale.

Table 4.8 *Items for Outcome 1 Sense of Belonging*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
OB1	Goodenow 1993 PSSM 8-18	I feel like a real part of my team	I feel like a real part of (name of school).
OB2	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	It is hard for people like me to be accepted here. (reversed)	Same as original
OB3	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong here. (reversed)	Same as original
SB4	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes	I am treated with as much respect as other students.
SB5	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I can really be myself at this team.	I can really be myself at this school.
SB6	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I wish I were at a different team. (Reversed).	I wish I were at a different school. (Reversed).
SB7	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I feel proud of belonging to this team	I feel proud of belonging to (name of school).
SB8	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Other students-athletes here like me the way I am	Other students here like me the way I am

#### 4.2.8. Outcome 2: Satisfaction

Satisfaction is another outcome of a successful socialization process. The researcher picked the satisfaction scale developed by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001). There are three items on this scale and its reliability was 0.75. The author used the three items of the scale and modified the language to fit the context of the study. This is not a construct for the new scale, however, the information obtained from these items will inform about the success or lack of success of the socialization process. These are the items: 1)

Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience, 2) Overall, my negative experiences outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete (reverse), 3) In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.

Table 4.9 *Items for Outcome 2 Satisfaction*

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
OS1	Keaveney and Madhavan (2001)	Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.	On the whole, I am satisfied with my experience with this/that service.
OS2	Keaveney and Madhavan (2001)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete. (reverse)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh/outweighed my positive experiences with this/that service. (r)
OS3	Keaveney and Madhavan (2001)	In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.	In general, I am/was happy with the service experience.

#### **4.2.9 Review of the Scale and Experts Feedback**

At this stage in the scale development process, the researcher requested feedback from five experts in the field. The experts have a background in the socialization process, international student-athletes, athlete's adaptation, network theory, adaptation to new environments and student-athlete experience. The researcher has mentioned and used information from each one of the experts' previous studies.

The researcher asked the experts to review the proposed instrument and rate the quality of the items relative to the definition of a respective factor. The ratings were made using a scale from one to five (1= Item is not relevant to factor at all, 5= item is very relevant to factor). Based on the experts' feedback the researcher made changes to improve

the content validity of the new scale. The following tables report the ratings given by the experts and the average score.

Table 4.10 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Cultural Difference*

Pre-Questionnaire Cultural Difference						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CD1	5	0	3	3	2	2.6
CD2	5	0	4	5	1	3
CD3	2	0	5	5	5	3.4
CD4	4	0	4	5	0	2.6
CD5	5	0	5	5	0	3

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

According to the experts' feedback, the five questions about Cultural Difference received a low ranking average. The researcher did not explain clearly that the Cultural Difference questions were not part of the new scale, and that instead, they served as a pre-screening question when actual testing occurs to better understand the impact of cultural differences on coaching strategies. Besides making grammar and spelling corrections, the researcher used more specific vocabulary changing words such as "place" for "team" and people for "teammates, coaches and members of this team" in order to be more specific.

Table 4.11 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Coach's Cultural Competence*

Construct 1 Coach's Cultural Competence						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CC1	5	2	4	5	5	4.2
CC2	5	4	4	5	3	4.2
CC3	5	2	4	5	3	3.8
CC4	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CC5	5	3	5	5	5	4.6
CC6	3	3	5	5	1	3.4

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*



The average expert feedback for the first construct Coach's Cultural Competence was mostly above 4. The two items with a lower rating were CC3 and CC6 and the comments just emphasize that the wording was very general, which was the intent, in order to be able to compare to the responses of the domestic student-athletes and the SADC. The author maintained all the items for this construct and additionally added "as a person" in order to clarify if the coach knows the strengths and weaknesses of the SA as a person which will involve knowing the cultural difference of those individuals. The item CC6 the researcher used the word "respect" instead of values (my cultural beliefs) because the intention is not to impose any cultural value but it is to respect and tolerate the cultural differences.

Table 4.12 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Mentorship Construct*

<u>Construct 2 Mentorship</u>						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CM1	1	5	0	5	3	2.8
CM2	4	5	4	5	5	4.6
CM3	4	5	0	5	5	3.8
CM4	0	5	4	4	4	3.4
CM5	1	3	4	5	4	3.4
CM6	3	2	4	4	3	3.2
CM7	4	1	4	5	1	3
CM8	4	1	4	5	1	3

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

The lower average ratings were for items CM1, CM7 and CM8. The feedback suggested rewording the items and keep them in order to explore the various aspects of the mentorship of SADC. The main purpose of item CM1 is to know if the SA has a distinct mentor.

Table 4.13 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Introduction to Norms and Roles*

<u>Construct 3 Introduction to Team Norms and Roles</u>						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CN1	4	3	5	5	3	4
CN2	5	5	3	4	4	4.2
CN3	5	3	4	4	4	4
CN4	1	3	4	4	4	3.2
CN5	4	5	4	5	0	3.6
CN6	5	5	5	5	5	5
CN7	3	1	3	5	5	3.4
CN8	4	4	3	5	5	4.2
CN9	2	3	3	5	3	3.2

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

The ratings for the items in this construct introduction to team norms and roles were high. The researcher proceeded to change the term around here for the term “on this team” in order to be more specific. Additionally, the words “when I arrived” were added in order to emphasize the evaluation of the socialization process, which occurs as soon as the newcomer arrives in the new team.

Following the experts' feedback, the researcher eliminated two items from this construct. CN4 and CN 9 both with an average of 3.2. The item CN 4 evaluates the agreement of the new team's culture, however, during the socialization process the SADC newcomer is just being introduced to the new team culture, therefore, an agreement or in item CN 9 (like my role) might be too soon to evaluate at this point.

Table 4.14 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Prosocial Behavior*

<u>Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior</u>						
Items	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CP1	5	5	3	5	3	4.2
CP 2	5	5	2	5	3	4
CP 3	5	5	3	5	3	4.2
CP 4	4	5	3	5	1	3.6
CP 5	3	5	2	5	3	3.6
CP 6	2	4	3	5	0	2.8

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

The items in the Prosocial Behavior construct were maintained in its original form. The observation made for item CP5 stated the change of wording from other members of the team have helped me to “are available to help me”. The researcher, however, decided not to change this wording because the purpose of the question is to evaluate if the newcomer SADC has had help from other members of the team.

Table 4.15 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Introduction to Support Services*

<u>Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services</u>						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CS1	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
CS2	5	3	4	5	3	4
CS3	4	2	4	5	3	3.6
CS4	3	4	2	5	1	3
CS5	4	4	4	5	5	4.4
CS6	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CS7	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CS8	2	4	2	5	4	3.4

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

The first correction made to the construct was in the jargon from Supporting to “support services”. All the items received a high rating. The item CS4 had the lower score

and the comments from the experts offered a warning on this item because it is worded as a reversed question. However the researcher decided to keep the item reversed, based on the literature review, there was an emphasis made in the possibility that SA might be criticized negatively for using the support services. For this reason, this item seeks to evaluate if the SA has the perception of being negatively judged for using the support services.

Table 4.16 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Outcomes Sense of Belonging*

<u>Outcome 1 Sense of Belonging</u>						
Items	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
OB1	4	4	5	5	5	4.6
OB2	4	3	2	5	5	3.8
OB 3	4	3	2	5	2	3.2
OB 4	5	3	5	5	5	4.6
OB 5	4	4	2	5	2	3.4
OB 6	4	4	2	5	1	3.2
OB 7	4	5	2	5	1	3.4
OB 8	5	4	5	5	2	4.2

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

Table 4.17 *Experts' Ratings of each Item in Outcomes Satisfaction*

<u>Outcome 2 Satisfaction</u>						
Items	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
OS1	5	4	5	5	4	4.6
OS2	4	4	2	5	4	3.8
OS3	5	4	2	3	5	3.8

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

The ratings of both outcomes, sense of belonging and satisfaction were high. The researcher followed some suggestions from the experts in changing some wording and grammar, but all the items were kept in their main form. In addition, the experts suggested

using the demographic questions used by the NCAA in their instrument GOALS Questionnaire, which the researcher accepted and added to the instrument. The following table provides an overview of the items after the modifications made based on the experts' ratings and suggestions.

Table 4.18 *Socialization process from the student-athletes perspective scale*

Code	Item
<u>Pre-questionnaire</u>	
PQ1	1. The culture on this team is so different from where I am from.
PQ2	2. Teammates, coaches, and members of this team here think and act differently from where I am from.
PQ3	3. I feel very different from teammates, coaches, and members of this team
PQ4	4. In conversations with teammates, coaches, and members of this team, I do not always know what the appropriate response is.
PQ5	5. I do not always know how to act around teammates, coaches, and members of this team.
<u>Construct 1 Cultural Competence</u>	
CC1	6. I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths as a person.
CC2	7. I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me.
CC3	8. I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses as a person.
CC4	9. I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person.
CC5	10. I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.
CC6	11. I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.
<u>Construct 2 Mentorship</u>	
CM1	12. I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor
CM2	13. I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time
CM3	14. My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team
CM4	15. Having a coach-mentor has helped me in getting adjusted to the new environment on the team.
CM5	16. I wish I received more mentorship from my coaching staff
CM6	17. The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor
CM7	18. I feel like the coaching staff on my team knows how to motivate me.

CM8 19. I feel like the coaching staff on my team cares about my well-being.

Construct 3 Introduction to Norms and Roles

- CN1 20. I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”.
- CN2 21. The coaching staff makes certain that I know how I should behave as a member of this team.
- CN3 22. The coaching staff gave me options when I was not comfortable with how things are done around here.
- CN4 23. I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team interact with each other
- CN5 24. The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are on this team.
- CN6 25. I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when they assigned those responsibilities to me.
- CN7 26. I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role on the team that I am happy with

Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior

- CP1 27. I feel the coaching staff encourages other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.
- CP2 28. I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me.
- CP3 29. I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.
- CP4 30. I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.
- CP5 31. I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.
- CP6 32. I feel the coaching staff appreciate it that other members of the team have to help me.

Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services

- CS1 33. The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.
- CS2 34. I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these support services.
- CS3 35. I feel comfortable using any support services that I might need.
- CS4 36. I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services. (reverse)
- CS5 37. I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the support services. (reverse)
- CS6 38. My coaching staff encourages me to use support services.
- CS7 39. My coaching staff encourages everyone to use support services.
- CS8 40. I feel the coaching staff likes it when I use the support services.

### Outcomes

- OSB1 41. I feel like a real part of my team  
OSB2 42. It is hard for people like me to be accepted on this team. (reverse)  
OSB3 43. Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong on this team . (reverse)  
OSB4 44. I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes  
OSB5 45. I can really be myself on this team.  
OSB6 46. I wish I were on a different team. (reverse)  
OSB7 47. I feel proud of belonging to this team  
OSB8 48. Other students-athletes here like me the way I am  
OS1 49. Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.  
OS2 50. Overall, my negative experiences far outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete. (reverse)  
OS3 51. In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.

### Demographics

- D1 Are you playing on men's or women's teams? Men's Women's  
D2 NCAA sport(s) you are playing: select all that apply  
D3 How do you describe yourself? (select all that apply American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian, White, Other  
D4 Birth year: 1994 or earlier to 2002 or later  
D5 Birth month: Jan to December  
D6 Where did you live during your senior year in high school?  
D7 Where did you grow up? City Country
- 

### **4.3 Stage 3: Pilot Data Collection**

The first data collection was performed as a pilot study to examine the reliability of the items and to ascertain which items should be removed before the instrument was tested with a larger sample. The researcher contacted the senior women administrator SWA of 10 Division I and II institutions in the Southeast of the United States in order to request their help to distribute the new scale to freshman student-athletes. Unfortunately, only 2 of 10 SWA accepted to offer help in order to distribute the instrument electronically through Qualtrics. The rest of the SWA excused themselves from not being able to help, due to many requests from individuals and organizations, to have student-athletes filling out

surveys. Some SWA were very reluctant to give access to the student-athletes in an effort to protect their time and information.

The researcher required approximately 50 responses in order to perform the validity and reliability test for the pilot study. Very few student-athletes completed the survey on Qualtrics, therefore the researcher took a more direct approach in order to collect the necessary responses. The researcher started contacting each student-athlete with a close connection and requested their help to complete the survey and also to pass it along with other teammates and student-athletes that they knew. With this snowball approach, the researcher was able to collect 43 responses in paper and electronic versions within a period of 6 weeks. The following table shows the demographics of the respondents for the pilot study.

Table 4.19 *Demographics of Pilot Study Data Collection*

Factor	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
n	43	100.0%
Male	23	53.5%
Female	18	41.8%
No response	2	4.7%
<b>Race</b>		
n	43	100%
American Indian or Black or African	2	4.7%
Hispanic or Latino	4	9.3%
White	29	67.3%
Other	2	4.7%
No response	2	4.7%
<b>Sport</b>		
n	43	100%
Baseball	2	4.7%
Basketball	10	23.3%
Soccer	2	4.6%
Softball	2	4.6%
Swimming/Diving	10	23.3%
No response	17	39.5%



<u>Born on</u>		
n	43	100%
1998	4	9.3%
1999	9	20.9%
2000	18	41.9%
2001	9.3	9.3%
No response	8	18.6%
<u>Background</u>		
n	43	100%
US - Georgia	5	11.4%
US - Illinois	2	5.0%
US – Massachusetts	2	5.0%
US – Maryland	6	13.6%
US - North Carolina	7	15.9%
US – New York	4	9.1%
US – South Carolina	2	5.0%
US – Virginia	4	9.1%
Canada	2	5.0%
Germany	1	2.5%
New Zealand	1	2.5%
No response	7	15.9%

The researcher also looked at the mean and standard deviation of the moderator. The five items in the cultural difference moderator indicate how different each SA perceive their culture to be from the new team culture.

Table 4.20 *Descriptive Statistics – Pre Questionnaire*

Code	N	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation
PQ1	43	0	5	3.05	1.413
PQ2	43	0	5	2.91	1.556
PQ3	43	1	5	2.33	1.286
PQ4	43	0	5	2.67	1.658
PQ5	43	1	5	2.33	1.229

Items PQ3 and PQ5 have a value of 2.33 which is farther from 3, neutral value. The responses ranged in a 5-point Likert scale from 1 strongly disagreeing with 5 strongly agreeing. Therefore, a 2.33 mean would indicate that the SA disagrees with the statements:

“I feel very different from teammates, coaches and members of this team” and “I do not always know how to act around teammates, coaches and members of this team”. The following table report on the mean, median and standard deviation of the outcome items.

Table 4.21 *Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Sense of Belonging - Satisfaction*

Code	N	Minimu	Maximu	Mean	Std.
		m	m		Deviation
OB1	43	1	5	4.28	1.278
OB2_REC	37	2	5	3.89	1.242
OB3_REC	43	2	5	3.98	1.263
OB4	43	1	5	3.95	1.308
OB 5	43	1	5	4.37	1.415
OB6_REC	37	2	5	4.38	0.758
OB7	43	1	5	4.02	1.697
OB8	43	1	5	4.33	1.304
OS1	43	4	5	4.58	.499
OS2_REC	40	2	5	4.10	1.105
OS3	43	1	5	4.23	1.377

The sense of belonging outcome and satisfaction outcome report a mean of 4 in most of the items which indicate “agree”. Based on the results the researcher assumes that the respondents feel a strong sense of belonging to their teams and they feel satisfaction in the way they have been socialized into their teams.

Table 4.22 *Descriptive Statistics of Constructs Coach’s Cultural Competence*

Code	N	Minimu	Maximu	Mean	Std.
		m	m		Deviation
CC1	43	1	5	3.84	1.326
CC2	43	1	5	3.58	1.607
CC3	43	1	5	2.98	1.711
CC4	43	1	5	3.86	1.283
CC5	43	1	5	3.84	1.647
CC6	43	2	5	4.35	0.686

The largest standard deviation of CC3 “I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths as a person” was 1.711 meaning that the responses had a lot of variation. Additionally, CC6 “I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs” had a mean of 4.35, which indicates, “agree” and show a positive perception from the student-athletes about how the coach values their values.

Table 4.23 *Descriptive Statistics of Construct Mentorship*

Code	N	Minimu	Maximu	Mean	Std.
		m	m		Deviation
CM1	43	1	5	3.72	1.403
CM2	43	1	5	3.58	1.651
CM3	43	1	5	3.09	1.810
CM4	43	1	5	4.00	1.345
CM5	43	1	5	3.42	1.721
CM6	43	3	5	4.30	0.599
CM7	43	1	5	3.72	1.221
CM8	43	3	5	4.63	0.578

The descriptive statistics of the construct mentorship show high response values all of the items had a mean greater than 3. Additionally CM4 “Having a coach-mentor has helped me in getting adjusted to the new environment on the team” CM6 “The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor” and CM8 “I feel like the coaching staff on my team cares about my well-being” have a mean value greater than 4 which means “agree”. Based on these values we can imply that student-athletes positively perceive the help of a mentor during their socialization process.

Table 4.24 *Descriptive Statistics of Construct Introduction to Norms and Roles*

Code	N	Minimu		Mean	Std. Deviation
		m	m		
CN1	43	1	5	3.28	1.638
CN2	43	1	5	4.05	1.396
CN3	43	1	5	3.44	1.333
CN4	43	1	5	3.63	1.215
CN5	43	1	5	3.63	1.528
CN6	43	1	5	3.93	1.421
CN7	43	1	5	3.79	1.684

The descriptive statistics of the construct introduction to norms and roles show high response value, all of the items had a mean greater than 3 and most closer to 4, which indicates "agree". Item CN2 "the coaching staff makes certain that I know how I should behave as a member of this team" has a mean value of 4.05, which means, "agree" to the statement.

Table 4.25 *Descriptive Statistics of Construct Prosocial Behavior*

Code	N	Minimu		Mean	Std. Deviation
		m	m		
CP1	43	1	5	4.09	1.231
CP2	43	1	5	4.12	1.349
CP3	43	1	5	3.91	1.360
CP4	43	1	5	3.95	1.308
CP5	43	1	5	4.30	1.282
CP6	43	1	5	3.30	1.536

The descriptive statistics of the construct prosocial behavior show high response value, all of the items had a mean greater than 3 and most closer to 4, which indicates "agree". Additionally, the following items had a mean value above 4.00, which means, "agree" to the statement. Item CP1 "I feel the coaching staff encourages other members of

the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility” CP2 “I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me” CP5 “I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me” has a mean value above 4.00 which means “agree” to the statement.

Table 4.26 *Descriptive Statistics of Construct Introduction to Support Services*

Code	N	Minimu m	Maximu m	Mean	Std. Deviation
CS1	43	1	5	3.65	1.429
CS2	43	1	5	3.16	1.511
CS3	43	1	5	3.91	1.306
CS4_REC	37	1	5	4.14	1.273
CS5_REC	40	2	5	4.10	0.928
CS6	43	1	5	3.35	1.675
CS7	43	1	5	3.49	1.609
CS8	43	1	5	3.77	1.269

The descriptive statistics of the construct support services show response values above 3, however, CS4\_REC and CS5\_REC have values above 4. It is important to point out that these two items were negatively worded therefore for the analysis the researcher reversed the values.

#### **4.4 Stage 4: Reliability and validity assessment**

##### **4.4.1 Reliability test**

Different methods are used to measure reliability. Following Churchill (1979), Cronbach’s Alpha scores were used to measure the reliability of each of the factors.

Table 4.27 *Reliability of each construct*

Levels	Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha Score
<u>Pre-Questionnaire</u>	Cultural Difference	0.864
<u>New Scale</u>	Coach's Cultural Competence	0.878
	Mentorship	0.832
	Introduction to Norms and Roles	0.857
	Prosocial Behavior	0.872
	Introduction to Support Services	0.708
<u>Outcomes</u>	Sense of Belonging	0.811
	Satisfaction	0.926

*Note: Pre-questionnaire and Outcomes are not part of the new scale.*

All of the constructs from the newly created scale had a Cronbach's Alpha score above 0.7 (Nunnally & Bemstein, 1994) which indicates the reliability of all the constructs of the scale. The outcome 2 "Satisfaction" shown above is below the benchmark score of 0.7 (Nunnally & Bemstein, 1994). This indicates that the satisfaction outcome has a reliability issue that needs to be addressed.

It is important to mention that the outcome 2 is not part of the newly created scale. The items for outcome satisfaction were based on a Keaveney and Madhavan (2001). There are three items on the original scale and the reported reliability was 0.75. The author used the three items of the scale and modified the language to fit the context of the study. One of the items was reversed, which can be one of the reasons for the Cronbach's Alpha score. The purpose of having the satisfaction scale as one of the outcomes is to analyze external validity.

In the following tables, the researcher will analyze each construct's Cronbach's Alpha, Item-Total Statistics and Inter-Item Correlation Matrix in order to determine the reliability of each item and which items should be eliminated from the scale after the pilot study.

**4.4.1.1 Cultural Competence Construct.** This construct has six items originally. The Cronbach's Alpha for the construct is 0.878 making this construct reliable. However, CC6 has a 0.929 Cronbach's Alpha if item deleted and item-to-total correlation of CC6 is -0.074 which is problematic. The inter-item correlation also shows low values for CC6 which indicates that item CC6 "I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs" should be eliminated.

**4.4.1.2 Mentorship Construct.** This construct has eight items originally. The Cronbach's Alpha for the construct is 0.832 making this construct reliable. However, CM6 has a 0.863 Cronbach's Alpha if the item deleted and CM8 has a 0.853 Cronbach's Alpha if the item deleted. The item-to-total correlation of CM6 is -0.160, which is problematic, and CM8 is 0.047, which is also problematic. The inter-item correlation also shows low values for CM6 and CM8 which indicates that the following items should be eliminated CM6 "The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor" and CM8 "I feel like the coaching staff on my team cares about my well-being".

**4.4.1.3 Introduction to Norms and Roles.** This construct has seven items originally. The Cronbach's Alpha for the construct is 0.857 making this construct reliable. However, CN4 has a 0.906 Cronbach's Alpha if the item deleted. The item-to-total correlation of CN4 is -0.008 which is problematic. The inter-item correlation also shows

low values for CN4 which indicates that items CN4 “I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team interact with each other” should be eliminated.

**4.4.1.4 Prosocial Behavior.** This construct has six items originally. The Cronbach’s Alpha for the construct is 0.872 making this construct reliable. However, CP1 has a 0.935 Cronbach’s Alpha if the item deleted. The item-to-total correlation of CP1 is 0.075 which is problematic. The inter-item correlation also shows low values for CP1 which indicates that items CP1 “I feel the coaching staff encourages other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility” should be eliminated.

**4.4.1.5 Introduction to Support Services.** This construct has eight items originally. The Cronbach’s Alpha for the construct is 0.708 making this construct reliable. However, CS4 has a 0.740 Cronbach’s Alpha if the item deleted. The item-to-total correlation of CS1 is 0.44, CS2 is 0.345, CS3 is 0.373, CS4 is 0.176, CS5 is 0.330, CS7 is 0.475 which is problematic.

Table 4.28 *Item-to-total Statistic: Pre-Questionnaire and Outcomes*

Item	Statistic	Item Information
<u>Pre-Questionnaire Cultural Difference</u>		
PQ1	0.700	The culture on this team is so different from where I am from
PQ2	0.887	Teammates, coaches, and members of this team here think and act differently from where I am from
PQ3	0.713	I feel very different from teammates, coaches, and members of this team
PQ4	0.830	In conversations with teammates, coaches, and members of this team, I do not always know what the appropriate response is
PQ5	0.320	I do not always know how to act around teammates, coaches, and members of this team.
<u>Outcome 1 Sense of Belonging</u>		
OB1	0.21	I feel like a real part of my team
OB2	0.441	It is hard for people like me to be accepted on this team
OB3	0.642	Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong on this team



OB4	0.322	I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes
OB5	0.623	I can really be myself on this team
OB6	0.383	I wish I were on a different team
OB7	0.488	I feel proud of belonging to this team
OB8	0.527	Other students-athletes here like me the way I am
<u>Outcome 2 Satisfaction</u>		
OS1	0.575	Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.
OS2	-0.256	Overall, my negative experiences far outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete
OS3	0.452	In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience

*Note: The acceptable value is higher than 0.5 (Hair et al., 1998)*

Table 4.29 Item-to-total Statistic: Constructs

Item	Statistic	Item Information
<u>Coaches' Cultural Competence</u>		
CC1	0.749	I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths as a person.
CC2	0.871	I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me
CC3	0.796	I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses as a person
CC4	0.789	I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person
CC5	0.858	I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.
CC6	-0.074	I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.
<u>Mentorship</u>		
CM1	0.78	I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor
CM2	0.784	I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time
CM3	0.68	My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team
CM4	0.812	Having a coach-mentor has helped me in getting adjusted to the new environment on the team.
CM5	0.615	I wish I received more mentorship from my coaching staff
CM6	-0.16	The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor
CM7	0.614	I feel like the coaching staff on my team knows how to motivate me
CM8	0.047	I feel like the coaching staff on my team cares about my well-being.
<u>Introduction to Norms and Roles</u>		
CN1	0.75	I feel the coaching staff explained to me "how people do things around here"

CN2	0.852	The coaching staff makes certain that I know how I should behave as a member of this team.
CN3	0.699	The coaching staff gave me options when I was not comfortable with how things are done around here.
CN4	-0.008	I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team interact with each other
CN5	0.731	The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are on this team.
CN6	0.706	I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when they assigned those responsibilities to me.
CN7	0.656	I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role on the team that I am happy with

#### Prosocial Behavior

CP1	0.075	I feel the coaching staff encourages other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.
CP2	0.96	I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me.
CP3	0.747	I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.
CP4	0.826	I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.
CP5	0.893	I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.
CP6	0.636	I feel the coaching staff appreciate it that other members of the team have to help me.

#### Introduction to Support Services

CS1	0.44	The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.
CS2	0.345	I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these support services.
CS3	0.373	I feel comfortable using any support services that I might need.
CS4	0.176	I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services.
CS5	0.33	I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the support services.
CS6	0.706	My coaching staff encourages me to use the support services
CS7	0.475	My coaching staff encourages everyone to use the support services
CS8	0.549	I feel the coaching staff likes when I use the support services

*Note: The acceptable value is higher than 0.5 (Hair et al., 1998)*

The inter-item correlation also shows low values for all the items. The initial findings suggested that the wording of items should be improved, and the problem with the

reverse scoring items suggests that the design and setting of the items in this construct may need to be revised.

Table 4.30 *Inter-item correlation Pre-Questionnaire and Outcomes*

Construct	Range of Score	Problematic Relations
<u>Pre-Questionnaire</u>		
Cultural Difference	.101 to .837	Item CD4 has a high correlation with CD2 .837 Item CD5 has a low correlation with CD1, CD3 (.101, .248)
<u>Outcomes</u>		
Sense of Belonging	-.049 to .560	Item SB2 has a low correlation with SB1 .279 Item SB3 has a low correlation with SB1 .136 Item SB4 has a low correlation with SB1, SB2 (-.049, .090) Item SB5 has a low correlation with SB1 .128 Item SB6 has a low correlation with SB1, SB2, SB4 (.004, .104, .248) Item SB7 has a low correlation with SB1, SB2, and SB4 (.094, .174 .019) Item SB8 has a low correlation with SB4, SB6 (.068, .011)
Satisfaction	-.071 to .060	Item S2 has a low correlation with S1 -.071 Item S3 has a low correlation with S1, S2 (.060, .021)

*Note: The acceptable values are between 0.3 and 0.8 (Hair et al., 1998)*

Table 4.31 *Inter-item correlation 5 Constructs*

Construct	Range of Score	Problematic Relations
Coach's Cultural Competence	-.015 to .945	Item CC6 has low correlations with all other items ( -.015, -.145, -.013, .057, -.180) Item CC1 has a high correlation with CC4 .826 Item CC2 has a high correlation with CC5 .945

Mentorship	-.278 to .808	Item M6 has low correlations with M1, M2, M3, M4, M5 (-.067, -.278, -.180, -.148, -.172) Item M7 has low correlations with M6 -.077 Item M8 has low correlations with M1, M2, M3, M4, M5, M7 (.250, -.092, -.080, -.092, -.031, .153)
Introduction to Norms and Roles	-.202 to .854	Item INR4 has low correlations with INR1, INR2, INR3 (.006, .151, -.014) Item INR5 has low correlations with INR4 .129 Item INR6 has low correlations with INR4 -.084 and high correlations with .854 INR7 has a high correlation with INR1 .842 and a low correlation with INR4 -.202
Prosocial Behavior	-.018 to .915	Item PB1 has a low correlation with all other items (.280, .034, .032, -.018, .010) Item PB2 has a high correlation with PB3, PB4, PB5 (.837, .853, .915) Item PB4 has a high correlation with PB5 .874
Introduction to Support Services	-.255 to .858	Item ISS2 has a high correlation with ISS .858 Item ISS3 has a low correlation with ISS1 ISS2 (.112, .148) Item ISS4 has a low correlation with ISS1, ISS2, ISS3 (-.151, -.184, -.002) Item ISS5 has low correlations with ISS1, Iss2 (-.175, -.255) and a high correlation with ISS4 .847 Item ISS6 has a low correlation with ISS2, ISS4 (.275, .261) Item ISS7 has a low correlation with ISS3, ISS4, ISS5 (.025, -.061, -.149) Item ISS8 has a low correlation with ISS1, ISS2, ISS4 (.178, .041, .154)

*Note: The acceptable values are between 0.3 and 0.8 (Hair et al., 1998)*

#### 4.5 Stage 5: Item Purification

The item purification focused on the items that had a low-reliability score. As stated before, the elimination of items was done as a last resort and kept to a minimum based on the exploratory nature and the small sample size of the pilot study. The purpose of this

study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to assess the student-athlete's perceptions of the tactics used by the coach during the socialization process of newcomers. The multi-dimensional construct instrument will focus on the student-athletes perception, based on the socialization constructs presented by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017).

The original items of the newly created scale were reviewed and edited based on insights from experts on the socialization of student-athletes and international student-athletes. After the first collection of data the items were reviewed and based on the reliability statistics, these items were either maintained, reworded or deleted. A full overview of these changes is demonstrated in the following table.

Most of the rewording of the items was done after considering the expert's feedback. The final rewording was for item OS2 into "overall, my positive experiences far outweigh my negative experiences as a student-athlete". With this rewording, the author seeks to eliminate possible confusion for the respondents, in addition to avoiding the reverse score for that item.

Table 4.32 *Items deleted from the new scale*

Code	Old Item	Action
<u>Pre-Questionnaire</u>		
PQ5	I do not always know how to act around teammates, coaches, and members of this team.	Deleted
<u>Cultural Competence</u>		
CC6	I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.	Deleted
<u>Mentorship</u>		
CM6	The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor	Deleted
CM8	I feel like the coaching staff on my team cares about my well-being	Deleted

<u>Introduction to team Norms and Roles</u>		
CN4	I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team interact with each other	Deleted
<u>Prosocial Behavior</u>		
CP1	I feel the coaching staff encourages other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.	Deleted
<u>Support Services</u>		
CS2	I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these support services	Deleted
CS3	I feel comfortable using any support services that I might need	Deleted
CS4	I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services	Deleted
CS5	I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the support services	Deleted
<u>Outcome: Sense of Belonging</u>		
OB1	I feel like a real part of my team	Deleted
OB4	I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes	Deleted
OB6	I wish I were on a different team.	Deleted
<u>Outcome: Satisfaction</u>		
OS2	Overall, my negative experiences far outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete	Reworded

The items PQ5, CC6, CM6, CM8, CN4, CP1, were deleted based on Item-to-total correlation and Cronbach's Alpha "if an item was deleted" information. For items, CS2, CS3, CS4, CS5, OB1, OB4, and OB6 the values of Item-to-Item correlation were important to make the decision of which item was most problematic for the construct. Finally, the OS2 was reworded with the intent to avoid misunderstandings for the respondent.

#### **4.6 Stage: 6 Second Data Collection**

The second data collection was obtained through various methods such as online surveys sent to various institutions after contacting the SWA of the Athletic Department at each institution. Snowball sampling where the researcher requested close connections to fill out the survey and pass it to other student-athletes. Finally, the researcher also conducted an in-person data collection at three southeastern institutions where student-athletes voluntarily took the survey. The total number of responses was N=302. The

collection of data was difficult due to the time constraints of student-athletes and the athletic department authorities' desire to protect information and the student-athletes time. Due to the difficulty in collecting enough responses to perform EFA and CFA, the researcher decided to increase the respondent's criteria from the only freshman to sophomore, freshman and transfer student-athletes of any sport of NCAA Institutions from Division I and II. In order to conduct exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, the sample was randomly split into two samples (n=151, n=151). The demographics of the two samples of the second data collection are given in the following tables.

Table 4.33 *Demographics 2<sup>nd</sup> Data Collection*

Factor	Sample 1		Sample 2	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Gender</u>				
n	151	100.0%	151	100%
Male	76	50.3%	78	51.7%
Female	62	41.1%	60	39.7%
No response	13	8.6%	13	8.6%
<u>Race</u>				
n	151	100%	151	100%
American Indian or Black or African	1	0.6%	1	0.6%
Hispanic or Latino	17	11.3%	24	16%
White	14	9.3%	8	5.3%
Asian	104	68.9%	102	67.5%
Other	7	4.6%	8	5.3%
No response	3	2.0%	3	2.0%
	5	3.3%	5	3.3%
<u>Sport</u>				
n	151	100%	151	100%
Baseball	10	6.6%	4	2.6%
Basketball	17	11.3%	17	11.3%
Cross Country	1	0.7%	0	0%
Football	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
Golf	4	2.6%	2	1.3%
Ice Hockey	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
Lacrosse	22	14.6%	0	0%
Rifle	1	0.7%	0	0%
Soccer	29	19.2%	36	23.8%
Softball	11	7.3%	33	21.9%
Swimming / Diving	4	2.6%	3	2.0%
Tennis	13	8.6%	12	7.9%

Track	3	2.0%	1	0.7%
Volleyball	12	7.9%	11	7.3%
Wrestling	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
No response	19	12.6%	27	17.9%
<u>Born on</u>				
n	151	100%	151	100%
1998	25	16.6%	32	21.2%
1999	50	33.1%	44	29.1%
2000	49	32.5%	40	26.5%
2001	19	12.6%	25	16.6%
No response	8	5.3%	10	6.6%

Table 4.34 *Demographics Background 2<sup>nd</sup> Data Collection*

Factor	<u>Sample 1</u>		<u>Sample 2</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<u>Origin</u>				
n	151	100.0%	151	100%
US-AZ	1	0.7%	0	0
US-CO	1	0.7%	0	0
US-DC	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
US-FL	3	2.0%	7	4.6%
US-GA	5	3.3%	7	4.6%
US-IO	1	0.7%	0	0
US-KY	1	0.7%	0	0
US-MA	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
US-MD	10	6.6%	6	4.0%
US-MS	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
US-NC	17	11.3%	20	13.2%
US-NJ	4	2.6%	2	1.3%
US-NY	7	4.6%	3	2.0%
US-OH	4	2.6%	2	1.3%
US-PA	2	1.3%	3	2.0%
US-RI	1	0.7%	0	0
US-SC	55	36.4%	54	35.8%
US-TN	0	0	1	0.7%
US-TX	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
US-VA	5	3.3%	3	2.0%
Australia	3	2.0%	2	1.3%
Bahamas	0	0	1	0.7%
Canada	1	0.7%	1	0.7%
China	4	2.6%	1	0.7%
Colombia	1	0.7%	0	0
Djibouti	1	0.7%	0	0
England	2	1.3%	2	1.3%
Germany	3	2.0%	3	2.0%
Guatemala	1	0.7%	0	0
Italy	0	0	1	0.7%
Norway	1	0.7%	1	0.7%



Puerto Rico	1	0.7%	0	0
Spain	3	2.0%	0	0
No Response	8	5.3%	26	17.2%

The frequency distribution illustrated that both groups of data had very similar demographics in gender, sport, age, and background. The researcher noticed some variability in the age range, this might be a result of the change of criteria which added freshman, sophomore and transfer student-athletes. For the purpose of the study, it would have been better to additionally ask for the year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, transfer). The demographic information showed a great variety of years that student-athletes were born in, but it does not determine what year in school they are in.

#### **4.7 Stage 7: Reliability and Validity Assessment of Second Data Collection**

##### ***4.7.1 Reliability Assessment***

To assess the internal consistency of the items on each construct, the researcher evaluated the Cronbach's Alpha score, inter-item correlations, and the item-to-total. Prior to these examinations, psychometric diagnostics should be performed and the results should be evaluated.

Foremost in this examination should be the mean scores since they should be located near the center to allow for sufficient variance and the ability to co-vary with other items (DeVellis, 1991). The mean of items in construct one "Coach's Cultural Competence" was between 3.46 and 4.19 for item CC5. In this case, the researcher will analyze if the item should be deleted if further reliability examination supported the notion that these items lack variance and the ability to co-vary with other items.

Table 4.35 *Reliability Assessment Construct 1 Coach's Cultural Competence*

Items	Scale Mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CC1	15.11	0.718	0.803
CC2	14.99	0.662	0.817
CC3	15.4	0.647	0.822
CC4	15.25	0.736	0.797
CC5	14.67	0.541	0.847
Standardized Alpha		0.849	

The mean of items in construct two “Mentorship” was between 3.13 and 4.00. The Cronbach’s Alpha and the time-to-total correlation scores are reported in the following table.

Table 4.36 *Reliability Assessment Construct 2 Mentorship*

Items	Scale Mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CM1	18.6	0.704	0.556
CM2	18.48	0.693	0.558
CM3	18.25	0.709	0.567
CM4	18.39	0.708	0.567
CM5	19.13	-0.371	0.871
CM7	18.44	0.442	0.652
Standardized Alpha		0.697	

The researcher found the Cronbach’s Alpha 0.697 to be too low and the Item-to-total correlation for item CM5 -0.371 and Alpha if deleted 0.871 values to be examined. Since this construct has 6 items the researcher decided to drop CM5 and run the analysis again. The following table shows the results.

Table 4.37 *Reliability Assessment Construct 2 Mentorship without CM5*

Items	Scale mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CM1	15.47	0.765	0.827
CM2	15.35	0.737	0.835
CM3	15.12	0.74	0.835
CM4	15.26	0.763	0.829
CM7	15.31	0.501	0.889
Standardized Alpha		0.871	

The value for Cronbach's Alpha 0.871 improved considerably and the only value to be aware of was Alpha if deleted 0.889 for item CM7, Item-to-total correlation for item CM7 was 0.501, which is acceptable. The mean of items in construct three "Introduction to Norms and Roles" was between 3.4 and 4.29. The Cronbach's Alpha and the item-to-total correlation scores are reported in the following table.

Table 4.38 *Reliability Assessment Construct 3 Introduction to Norms and Roles*

Items	Scale Mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CN1	19.12	0.515	0.799
CN2	18.39	0.429	0.815
CN3	19.29	0.555	0.791
CN5	18.59	0.591	0.783
CN6	18.98	0.716	0.755
CN7	19.03	0.669	0.765
Standardized Alpha		0.815	

The value of Cronbach's Alpha 0.815 suggests reliability. The only value to be aware of was Alpha if deleted 0.815 for item CN2 which does not indicate any improvement of the Standardize Alpha, Item-to-total correlation for item CN2 was 0.429

which falls below the 0.5 benchmark but not significantly, therefore the researcher decided to maintain all the items for construct three “Introduction to Norms and Roles”. The mean of items in construct four “Prosocial Behavior” was between 3.71 and 3.96.

Table 4.39 *Reliability Assessment Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior*

Items	Scale Mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CP2	15.29	0.668	0.817
CP3	15.44	0.649	0.823
CP4	15.24	0.581	0.839
CP5	15.33	0.746	0.795
CP6	15.49	0.66	0.819
Standardized Alpha		0.85	

The value for Cronbach’s Alpha 0.85 suggests reliability and all the other values are within the benchmarks for each one, therefore the researcher will keep all the items for this construct. The mean of items in construct five “Introduction to Support Services” was between 3.77 and 3.87. The Cronbach’s Alpha and the time-to-total correlation scores are reported in the following table.

Table 4.40 *Reliability Assessment Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services*

Items	Scale Mean if deleted	Item-to-total correlation (Min 0.5)	Alpha if deleted (Min 0.7)
CS1	11.44	0.723	0.898
CS6	11.48	0.872	0.847
CS7	11.46	0.861	0.848
CS8	11.54	0.696	0.908
Standardized Alpha		0.904	

The value for Cronbach’s Alpha 0.904 suggests reliability and all the other values are within the benchmarks, except for Alpha if deleted for item CS8=0.908 which is

slightly more than Standardized Alpha=0.904. Since this value is not significantly greater than the researcher will keep all the items for this construct.

The coefficient alpha's for the five proposed constructs based on Sample 1 (N=151) were 0.849 (Coach's Cultural Competence), 0.871 (Mentorship without CM5), 0.815 (Introduction to Norms and Roles), 0.85 (Prosocial Behavior), 0.904 (Introduction to Support Services). All the constructs suggested reliability. Although there is not a prescribed benchmark for the item-to-total correlation, a general rule of thumb suggests that this correlation should exceed 0.50 (Hair et al., 1998). If an item significantly dropped below this 0.5 benchmark, and the alpha could be improved significantly if the item was deleted, then the item was dropped from the scale.

In this analysis, only CM5 (Mentorship) was dropped from the original scale. Examining the inter-item correlations could provide more insight into the internal consistency of the scale and could check for redundant items, or lack of consistency between items. As with the item-to-total correlation, no prescriptive number is given regarding what constitutes a minimum value, but 0.30 is the benchmark used as a rule of thumb (Hair et al., 1998). Only the analysis of construct two "Mentorship" showed values of -0.334 and -.289 for item CM5. Based on these and other values the researcher decided to drop this item from the scale. All other inter-item correlations were well above the 0.3 benchmark and only one inter-item correlation (CS6, CS7) exceeded 0.8, which could indicate redundancy (Hair et al., 1998), but it exceeded 0.8 so slightly (0.874) that both items were maintained.

#### ***4.7.2 Confirmatory factor analysis***

The researcher decided not to perform Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in SPSS because there was already a strong underlying theory supporting the dimensionality of the five constructs that form the newly created scale. Additionally, the new instrument went through a rigorous Content Validity procedure and Item-Development procedure. The Content Validity procedure was performed by five experts in the field of socialization of student-athletes and international student-athletes.

It is also important to mention that the items have already a strong conceptual underpinning, based on the literature of well know areas developed for the constructs such as Cultural Competency, Mentorship, Norms, and Prosocial Behavior. The researcher performed Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using the software AMOS, which highlighted clues about which items are not working well, and why.

The CFA was performed via AMOS 26, using the maximum likelihood method in order to further assess the unidimensionality and to refine the scales (Byrne, 1998). Several fit indices were used to verify the sub-scale structure of the instrument. These were: 1) Likelihood-ratio chi-square statistic ( $\chi^2$ ), 2) Root mean error of approximation (RMSEA), 3) Expected Cross-Validation index (ECVI), 4) Normed Fit Index (IFI), 8) Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and 9) Goodness-of-fit index (GFI). From these the three main model fit indices in CFA are: 1) Model chi-square, which is obtained from the maximum likelihood statistic 2) CFI the confirmatory factor index and its values range between 0 and 1. The values greater than 0.90 are acceptable but 0.95 is preferred to indicate a good fit 3) RMSEA is the root mean square error of approximation

and its values range from 0.1 indicate mediocre fit, 0.05 indicates good fit and 0.08 indicate excellent fit.

For this study, the researcher performed a 5-factor confirmatory factor analysis with 26 items, retained from the reliability assessment of the alpha scores. The following table indicates several fit indices.

Table 4.41 *Fit indices for model 1 (26 items – sample 1)*

Index	Value		Indication of Fit
X2	545.200	(DF=289; p= 0.000)	Good model
RMSEA	0.077	(90% CI:0.067; 0.087)	Acceptable fit
ECVI	4.461	(90% CI:4.048; 4.048)	Not applicable
NFI	0.788		Unacceptable
TLI	0.872		Unacceptable
CFI	0.886		Less than acceptable
IFI	0.888		Unacceptable
RMR	0.067		Good fit
GFI	0.797		Unacceptable

For model 1, the X2-value was statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$ . Although this indicates that the model might not be a good fit, in itself it is not conclusive to reject the model, and the value should be used as a guide, rather than an absolute fit of the index (Bearden et al., 1982; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Especially with small samples, as in this case, the X2 statistic is too conservative to be used by itself (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, and Mueller (2003) stated that if the chi-square score is less than twice the score of the degrees of freedom, the model could be regarded as good. The Chi-square was  $545/289 = 1.88$ , which is less than 2 and a really good fit. If the chi-square score is less than three times the degrees of freedom, the model is regarded as

acceptable. However, to evaluate the overall fit of the model, other indices should be applied in addition to the chi-square test.

The root mean error of approximation (RMSEA) is the average of residuals between the observed and estimated matrices (Kelloway, 1998). The closer the RMSEA value is to zero, the better the fit of the model is. Values lower than 0.05 indicate a “good” fit, values less than 0.08 indicate an “acceptable” fit, and RMSEA values higher than 0.10 should be rejected (McDonald & Ho, 2002). The RMSEA value of model 1 is 0.077, indicating an acceptable fit.

The ECVI is a cross-validation index developed to assess the degree to which a set of parameter estimates in one sample would fit if used in another similar sample (Stevens, 2002). The ECVI has a lower bound of zero, but the upper bound should be used as a comparative index, rather than an absolute index. In itself, the 4.461 ECVI in model 1 is good but it can be improved with the adjustment of the model, which will be conducted after this assessment.

The value of the Normed Fit Index (NFI) indicates the fit of the model compared to a null model in which the observed variables are uncorrelated. For example, if the NFI indicates a score of 0.85, this means that the relative fit of the model is 85% better than the fit of the null model, estimated with the same sample data. As with most indices, there is no absolute value indicating a good fit, but it is common in research to use a 0.90 benchmark (Hair et al., 1998). The score of 0.788 for model 1 indicated that the model needed considerable modification.



The Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) is a comparative fit index (Browne et al., 2002) and represents the percentage of improvement of the fit compared to the baseline model. The TLI can be interpreted as the increment in fit per degree of freedom obtained, relative to the best possible fit obtained by the hypothesized model (Stevens 2002; Kang, 2004). As with the NFI, there is no absolute value but the 0.90 benchmark is used as an indication of a good fit. Model 1 had a TLI of 0.872, indicating that the model needed to be improved.

Both the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Incremental Fit Index (IFI) represent a comparison between the estimated model and a null or independence model (Hair et al., 1998; Kan, 2004). In contrast to the NFI, the CFI is less sensitive to small samples and the danger of underestimation of the fit is considerably smaller (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). As with the other fit indices, the 0.9 benchmark is used as an indication for a good fit. For model 1, CFI 0.886 and IFI 0.888 both indices demonstrated a fit below 0.9.

The Goodness of Fit (GFI) measures the fit of the model compared to the null model when all parameters are fixed to zero. As with the other indices, a value of 0.90 indicates a reasonable fit. There are several challenges to the GFI, among them the dependency on the chi-square score and the bias towards a complex model (Schermelleh-Engel, et al., 2003). The score of 0.797 in model 1 indicates that the model needs improvement.

The Root Mean Square Residual Index (RMR) by Joreskog and Sorbom (1981) is an overall goodness-of-fit index that is based on the fitted residuals and is defined as the square root of the mean of the squared fitter residuals. RMR values close to zero indicate a good fit, but unless the RMR is standardized, the value itself is impossible to qualify as either acceptable or unacceptable. Instead, the RMR should be used as a comparative index

to further model improvement. The standardization of the RMR (SRMR) could provide a value that can be used as an indication for a good or bad fit. Unfortunately, the researcher had no access to data analysis instruments to compute this value. Even if the RMR is standardized, this value is still very sensitive to sample size (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). The value of 0.067 for the RMR in model 1 indicates a good fit.

#### 4.7.3 Improvement of the model

There are statistical methods to examine how the model can be improved, such as factor loadings, the correlation matrix, and high standardized residuals. Another way to improve the model is to perform another content analysis to conceptually improve the model (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In this study, factor loadings and standardized residuals were examined to ascertain what initial improvements could be made. Content analysis was then performed to identify further improvements. Factor loadings that fall below 0.7 could indicate a problem because of the reliability issues related to these loadings (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The loadings of the individual items are shown in the following table. It was suggested by Hair et al. (1998) that factor loadings greater than 0.30 meet the minimal level, factor loadings higher than 0.40 are important and loadings higher than 0.50 are being regarded as significant.

Table 4.42 *Factor Loadings of the 26 items in model 1*

Item	Loading	Indication	Item	Loading	Indication
CC1	0.80	Significant	CN3	0.56	Significant
CC2	0.73	Significant	CN5	0.72	Significant
CC3	0.72	Significant	CN6	0.74	Significant
CC4	0.85	Significant	CN7	0.77	Significant
CC5	0.62	Significant	CP2	0.71	Significant
CM1	-0.83	Unacceptable	CP3	0.67	Significant

CM2	-0.81	Unacceptable	CP4	0.71	Significant
CM3	-0.72	Unacceptable	CP5	0.79	Significant
CM4	-0.78	Unacceptable	CP6	0.71	Significant
CM5	-0.49	Unacceptable	CS1	0.77	Significant
CM7	-0.59	Unacceptable	CS6	0.92	Significant
CN1	0.48	Important	CS7	0.93	Significant
CN2	0.53	Significant	CS8	0.81	Significant

Additionally, the standardized regression weight estimates also informed what items should be deleted in order to improve the model. In order to improve the model, the researcher will eliminate the items with values less than 0.6 (positive or negative).

Table 4.43 *Standardized Regression Weights*

	Estimate	Items to be deleted
CC5 – Coaching	0.620	
CC4 - Coaching	0.850	
CC3 - Coaching	0.718	
CC2 - Coaching	0.735	
CC1 - Coaching	0.803	
CM5 - Mentorship	0.486	Less than 0.6
CM4 - Mentorship	-0.779	
CM3 - Mentorship	-0.723	
CM2 - Mentorship	-0.811	
CM1 - Mentorship	-0.830	
CN6 - Norms	0.738	
CN5 - Norms	0.723	
CN3 - Norms	0.561	Less than 0.6
CN2 – Norms	0.535	Less than 0.6
CN1 – Norms	0.484	Less than 0.6
CP6 – Prosocial	0.713	
CP5 – Prosocial	0.788	
CP4 – Prosocial	0.709	
CP3 – Prosocial	0.673	
CP2 – Prosocial	0.714	
CM7 – Mentorship	-0.589	Less than 0.6
CN7 – Norms	0.767	
CS8 - Support	0.806	
CS7 – Support	0.9281	
CS6 - Support	0.915	
CS1 - Support	0.770	

Based on the standardized regression weights, the following items were deleted CM5 CM7 CN1 CN2 CN3 which are the items that had lower values in the factor loadings. The deleted items were CM5 “I wish I received more mentorship from my coaching staff”, CM7 “I feel like the coaching staff on my team knows how to motivate me”, CN1 “I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”, CN2 “The coaching staff makes certain that I know how I should behave as a member of this team”, CN3 “ The coaching staff gave me options when I was not comfortable with how things are done around here. Then, another CFA has performed with sample 1 and the adjustment to the model for a total of 21 items. The following table shows the improvements to the model.

The Cronbach alpha’s and the calculation of the average variance extracted (AVE), which reflects the overall amount of variance explained by the construct relative to the amount of variance that may be attributed to measurement (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 1998), could give further insight on the reliability of the model. In addition, the AVE could be used in the assessment of discriminant validity.

Table 4.44 *Reliability measures Model 1 Sample 1*

Construct	Range of factor Loadings	Cronbach’s Alpha	AVE
Coach Cultural Competence	0.62 ~ 0.85	0.849	0.561
Mentorship	-0.83 ~ -0.49	0.697	0.509
Introduction to Norms	0.48 ~ 0.77	0.815	0.415
Prosocial Behavior	0.67 ~ 0.79	0.850	0.518
Introduction to Support	0.77 ~ 0.93	0.904	0.735

These results showed that the instrument needs some refinement, especially for the Mentorship and Introduction to Norms constructs. The constructs anchored their loading factors on the wrong items. After deleting the items CM5, CM7, CN1, CN2 and CN3, the issue was fixed. The researcher decided to delete those items because they had the lowest values (0.486, -0.589, 0.484, 0.535, and 0.561) all those values under the benchmark of 0.6.

Additionally, the Cronbach Alpha score of Mentorship 0.697 is below the recommended benchmark of 0.7. In order to improve this value, the researcher will eliminate CM5 based on the Alpha if deleted values. Additionally, the AVE value of the Introduction to Norms and Roles construct is 0.415 while the indication score for a reliable and valid construct is 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981) therefore the researcher proceeded to delete CM5, CM7, CN1, CN2 and CN3 from the instrument for a second and improved model.

Table 4.45 CFA model 2 compared to model 1

Analysis	Model 1 – 26 items	Indication	Model 2 – 21 items	Indications
X2	545.200 – 289 df	Good model	330.664 – 179 df	Acceptable
RMSEA	0.077	Acceptable fit	0.075	Acceptable
ECVI	4.461	Not applicable	2.898	Improved
NFI	0.788	Unacceptable	0.846	Improved
TLI	0.872	Unacceptable	0.908	Acceptable
CFI	0.886	Unacceptable	0.922	Acceptable
IFI	0.888	Unacceptable	0.923	Acceptable
RMR	0.067	Good fit	0.065	Good Fit
GFI	0.797	Unacceptable	0.838	Improved

The fit indices show improvement with the deletion of CM5 CM7 CN1 CN2 CN3.

The chi-square test showed that the findings were good because the chi-square score was

less than three times the score of the degree of freedom (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). However, several authors have warned about the sensitivity of the chi-square test to the sample size as well as the violation of the multi-variate test to the sample size as well as the multi-variate normality assumption (Curran, West, & Finch, 1996; Hu, Bentler, & Kano, 1992; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003) and should be used as a guide towards the improvement of the model (Bearden et al., 1982; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

To assess the overall fit of the model, the RMSEA is less sensitive to the sample size and therefore is a better index to depend on. According to the RMSEA value, model 2 has an acceptable fit (0.075). The NFI is sensitive to the sample size, and the use of CFI and TLI should be preferred above the use of the NFI, in case of a small sample (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger & Mueller, 2003). Both CFI and TLI are less sensitive to the sample size, and both indices showed a score that was above the 0.9 benchmark (CFI 0.922; TLI 0.908). Despite the fact that the GFI in model 2 (0.838) is still too low to accept, the improvement of the value showed that the model provided a valuable ground for future refinement. The following table shows the values for the second improved model.

Table 4.46 *Factor Loadings of the 21 items in model 2*

Item	Loading	Indication	Item	Loading	Indication
CC1	0.80	Significant	CR7	0.81	Significant
CC2	0.73	Significant	CP2	0.72	Significant
CC3	0.72	Significant	CP3	0.67	Significant
CC4	0.85	Significant	CP4	0.70	Significant
CC5	0.62	Significant	CP5	0.79	Significant
CM1	0.85	Significant	CP6	0.72	Significant
CM2	0.83	Significant	CS1	0.77	Significant
CM3	0.72	Significant	CS6	0.92	Significant
CM4	0.76	Significant	CS7	0.93	Significant
CR5	0.70	Significant	CS8	0.80	Significant
CR6	0.77	Significant			

Table 4.47 *Reliability measures Model 2 Sample 1*

Construct	Range of factor Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	AVE
Coach Cultural Competence	0.62 ~ 0.85	0.849	0.561
Mentorship	0.72 ~ 0.85	0.889	0.509
Introduction to Roles	0.70 ~ 0.81	0.789	0.601
Prosocial Behavior	0.67 ~ 0.79	0.850	0.555
Introduction to Support	0.77 ~ 0.93	0.904	0.521

These results showed that the instrument has internal consistency, all the Cronbach's Alpha scores are above the benchmark of 0.7 indicating the reliability of the scale model 2. The AVE scores are also above 0.5 which is the indication score for a reliable and valid construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

#### 4.7.4 Assessment of discriminant and convergent validity (model 2 sample 1)

Examining the relationships between the constructs in the instrument is one approach to assessing discriminant validity. If the correlations between the constructs are not excessively high, then there is evidence of discriminant validity. If the correlations appear high, the assessment of the AVE's could indicate whether discriminant validity exists. For discriminant validity, the AVE scores should be higher than the squared correlation between the construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 4.48 *Correlation between the constructs*

Constructs	Coaching	Mentorship	Roles	Prosocial	Support
Coaching	1.00	-	-	-	-
Mentorship	0.74	1.00	-	-	-
Roles	0.79	0.58	1.00	-	-
Prosocial	0.70	0.63	0.77	1.00	-
Support	0.51	0.37	0.59	0.60	1.00

Table 4.49 *Assessment of discriminant validity by AVE's*

Constructs	Coaching	Mentorship	Roles	Prosocial	Support
Coaching	<b>0.56</b>	-	-	-	-
Mentorship	0.54	<b>0.59</b>	-	-	-
Roles	0.63	0.34	<b>0.60</b>	-	-
Prosocial	0.48	0.40	0.60	<b>0.55</b>	-
Support	0.26	0.14	0.35	0.36	<b>0.52</b>

The discriminant validity assessment showed two problems. First, the correlation between Coaching and Roles. Future research should focus on further refining the two constructs. Second, the validity assessment showed that Roles and Prosocial need further refinement as well. The researcher identified convergent validity exist since all the AVE values for the five constructs are higher than 0.5 which is the benchmark value.

#### 4.7.5 Data Analysis Sample 2

The model 2, with 21 items is a reliable measurement tool. To provide evidence that the indices were not sample-related, and can be generalized to other samples, another CFA was performed on sample 2 of the data collected (N=151).

Table 4.50 *CFA for Model 2 Sample 2 compared to Sample 1*

Analysis	Sample 1	Indication	Sample 2	Indication
X2	330.664 – 179 df	Acceptable	320.008 – 179 df	Acceptable
RMSEA	0.075	Accetable fit	0.072	Acceptable fit
ECVI	2.898	Improved	2.827	Improved
NFI	0.846	Improved	.854	Improved
TLI	0.908	Acceptable	0.916	Acceptable
CFI	0.922	Acceptable	0.929	Acceptable
IFI	0.923	Acceptable	0.930	Acceptable
RMR	0.065	Good Fit	0.060	Good Fit
GFI	0.838	Improved	0.846	Improved



All the indices obtained similar values with the information from sample 2, suggesting that model 2 is a good fit. To assess reliability for the second sample, the range of factor loadings, the Cronbach's alpha scores, and the AVE scores are presented in the following table.

Table 4.51 *Factor Loadings of the 21 items in model 2 for Sample 1 and 2*

Item	Loading		Indication	Item	Loading		Indication
	<u>S 1</u>	<u>S 2</u>			<u>S 1</u>	<u>S 2</u>	
CC1	0.80	0.77	Significant	CN7	0.81	0.78	Significant
CC2	0.73	0.75	Significant	CP2	0.72	0.76	Significant
CC3	0.72	0.82	Significant	CP3	0.67	0.68	Significant
CC4	0.85	0.82	Significant	CP4	0.70	0.64	Significant
CC5	0.62	0.58	Significant	CP5	0.79	0.80	Significant
CM1	0.85	0.85	Significant	CP6	0.72	0.74	Significant
CM2	0.83	0.84	Significant	CS1	0.77	0.78	Significant
CM3	0.72	0.77	Significant	CS6	0.92	0.94	Significant
CM4	0.76	0.79	Significant	CS7	0.93	0.93	Significant
CR5	0.70	0.64	Significant	CS8	0.80	0.73	Significant
CR6	0.77	0.83	Significant				

Table 4.52 *Reliability measures Model 2 Sample 1 and 2*

Construct	Range of factor Loadings		Cronbach's Alpha		AVE	
	<u>S 1</u>	<u>S 2</u>	<u>S 1</u>	<u>S 2</u>	<u>S 1</u>	<u>S 2</u>
Cultural Competence	0.62 ~ 0.85	0.58 ~ 0.82	0.849	0.861	0.561	0.536
Mentorship	0.72 ~ 0.85	0.77 ~ 0.85	0.889	0.870	0.509	0.664
Introduction to Roles	0.70 ~ 0.81	0.64 ~ 0.83	0.789	0.802	0.601	0.564
Prosocial Behavior	0.67 ~ 0.79	0.64 ~ 0.80	0.850	0.848	0.555	0.529
Introduction to Support	0.77 ~ 0.93	0.73 ~ 0.94	0.904	0.912	0.521	0.721

By examining the AVE scores for the second sample, the values are within the acceptable range of higher than 0.5. The fifth construct Introduction to Support Services

improved in the second sample. These values indicate that the model is reliable among other samples. Both the AVE scores as the model fit indices indicate that the 21-item instrument is valid.

#### 4.7.6 Assessment of discriminant and convergent validity (model 2 sample 2)

When the correlations between the construct are not excessively high, then there is evidence of discriminant validity. If the correlations appear high, the assessment of the AVE's could indicate whether discriminant validity exists. For discriminant validity, the AVE scores should be higher than the squared correlation between the construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 4.53 Correlation between the constructs sample 2

Constructs	Coaching	Mentorship	Roles	Prosocial	Support
Coaching	1.00	-	-	-	-
Mentorship	0.756	1.00	-	-	-
Roles	0.863	0.574	1.00	-	-
Prosocial	0.817	0.676	0.771	1.00	-
Support	0.523	0.387	0.541	0.588	1.00

Table 4.54 Assessment of discriminant validity by AVE's sample 2

Constructs	Coaching	Mentorship	Roles	Prosocial	Support
Coaching	<b>0.536</b>	-	-	-	-
Mentorship	0.572	<b>0.664</b>	-	-	-
Roles	0.745	0.329	<b>0.564</b>	-	-
Prosocial	0.667	0.457	0.594	<b>0.529</b>	-
Support	0.274	0.150	0.293	0.346	<b>0.721</b>

The researcher identified convergent validity exist since all the AVE values for the five constructs are higher than 0.5 which is the benchmark value. However, the

discriminant validity assessment showed four problems. First, the correlation between Coaching-Mentorship (0.53-0.572), Coaching-Roles (0.53-0.745) and Coaching-Prosocial (0.536-0.667), Roles-Prosocial (0.561-0.594). The AVE values are not higher than the value of the square-correlations between the constructs. Future research should focus on further refinement of the instrument.

#### 4.7.7 External validity

External validity refers to the extent to which the scale measures what it was set out to measure. It also involves the extent to which the results of a study can be generalized beyond the sample. For external validity purposes, the author used the Psychological Sense of School Membership PSSM scale by Carol Goodenow (2003) and the Satisfaction scale by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001). A high correlation between these scales and the scores for the different socialization constructs indicated a certain degree of external validity. Additionally, concurrent validity uses comparisons between different instruments to test the same construct at the same point in time.

Table 4.55 *Correlation between the Constructs and the two Outcomes*

	Coaching	Mentorship	Roles	Prosocial	Support
Belonging	0.642**	0.453**	0.570**	0.595**	0.343**
Satisfaction	0.562**	0.448**	0.613**	0.638**	0.346**

Note: \*\* The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

When the value of the coefficient lies between 0.5 and 1, then it is said to be a strong positive correlation as it is the case with Coaching, Roles and Prosocial construct and the outcomes Sense of Belonging and Satisfaction. In addition, it is a moderate degree

when the values lie between 0.3 and 0.49. In this study, the constructs Mentorship and Support are considered to have a moderate positive correlation with the outcomes Sense of Belonging and Satisfaction.

#### **4.8 Stage 8: Develop norms**

The results provided initial evidence of reliability and validity for the new scale, and a promising start to a new scale that could have a big impact on coaching effectiveness. Construct validity can only be proven over time, through multiple studies that shed light upon the different facets of validity (Cronbach, 1971). This study provides the first step to the process of refining the instrument. The purpose of the instrument was to measure student-athletes' perceptions of the tactics used by their coach during the socialization process of newcomers into college athletics.

The new scale is multi-dimensional with 5 constructs and 21 items in total. There are two constructs that need more refinement such as Mentorship and Support services. From the information obtained in the study the researcher identified that Mentorship was an overarching theme, therefore it might be included in all aspects of the socialization process. On the other extreme, the construct Support Services needs more refinement.

Based on theory and previous literature, the researcher identified that the support services offered at the institutions might not be used effectively by the student-athletes. Some literature identified a stigma or stereotype being associated with student-athletes that use those services. In addition, the support services are not controlled by the coaching staff, therefore the introduction to the support services and the acceptance of the coaching staff towards student-athletes using the services is what should be analyzed.

Testing the model with a larger sample might also be useful for the further refinement of the model. The size for both samples was  $N=151$ , which is regarded as a minimum in order to perform factor analysis. In the future, the sample should be greater than 200 respondents in order to refine this instrument.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION**

This chapter provides a discussion of the findings and results of the study and gives an assessment of the proposed instrument. It also presents the implications of this study for future research and for practitioners.

#### **5.1 General discussion of the results**

The purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to measure the SA's perceptions of the tactics used by their coach during the socialization process of newcomers into college athletics, based on the scale development procedure by Churchill (1979). The author focuses on the coach's ability to structure and shape the socialization process, by taking into account the newcomers' diverse characteristics. Based on the results from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) that state that each athlete has a different background and different factors that influence their reality, which might hinder the effectiveness of universal treatment. For this study, the author has conceptualized the five concepts proposed by Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) into five constructs. Based on an extensive literature review the researcher identified the five following constructs coach's cultural competence, mentorship, introduction to norms and roles, prosocial behavior and introduction to support services. The newly created scale was reduced from a 35-item 5 construct scale to 21-items under the following constructs coach's cultural competence (CC 5 items), Mentorship (CM 4 items), Introduction to roles (CR 3 items), Prosocial

Behavior (CP 5 items) and Introduction to support services (CS 4 items). In addition, the 5-item pre-questionnaire was reduced to 4-items. Finally, the outcomes of sense of belonging and satisfaction 11-items were reduced to 8-items. Numerous quantitative indicators supported the model reduction; however, it is important to mention that the creation/modification of the items followed a very strict content analysis procedure. The reasons why the items were reduced are explained in the following paragraphs.

### ***5.1.2 Coach's Cultural Competence***

The coaching staff seeks to treat each player based on their specific needs. The items for this construct were based on the five elements that describe cultural competency, cultural awareness, cultural knowledge (Campinha-Bacote et al., 1996), cultural skills (Andrews & Boyle, 2015), cultural encounters (O'Hagan, 2001) and cultural desire (Campinha-Bacote et al., 1996). It is important to note that all of the items focus on the perspective of the student-athlete on how the coach/coaching staff manages the socialization process for the newcomer. After the statistical analysis, the item CC6 "I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs" was deleted.

The author analyzed closely and determine that the coach/coaching staff do not have to value but respect different beliefs. The other five items of this construct reflect the concepts presented in previous cultural competence literature. Due to the nature of collegiate athletics and the high international recruiting rates, a large number of the coaches are exposed to the diversity of cultures, therefore they are aware and have had many encounters with other cultures.

### ***5.1.3 Mentorship***

The mentorship construct started with 8 items and was reduced to 4 items. The statistical analysis made initial suggestions for the potential deletion of four items. After performing a qualitative assessment and based on the theory previously presented in the literature review, the author concluded that those four items did not focus on mentorship as a socialization tactic. The deleted items were CC5 “I wish I did not have a coach-mentor” (reversed), CC6 “the coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor”, “I feel the coaching staff knows how to motivate me”, “I feel the coaching staff cares about my well-being”. Those questions do not focus on the effects of mentoring as a socialization tool, but instead, they are asking about ways that the coaching staff relates to the student-athletes without having to use a formal mentorship tactic. Another important point to emphasize was that the construct mentorship and the effects it has within the socialization process might be seen as an overarching topic rather than an independent construct that will not overlap with other constructs. Future research should also clarify if the programs use a formal mentoring program during the socialization process.

### ***5.1.4 Introduction to Roles***

According to Van Maanen and Schein (1979), organizational socialization is the process in which the newcomer learns “the ropes” of a particular organizational role. This construct focuses on the way in which the newcomers are introduced to the group team norms and roles. However, the results gave indication that the author might have proposed a double barreled construct focusing on both Norms and Roles. The original construct contained 9 items, and after the statistical analysis, 6 items were deleted. The deleted items



CN1 “I feel the coaching staff explained to me how people do things around here”, CN2 “I feel familiar with how I should behave as a member of this team”, CN3 “I feel comfortable with how to do things around here”, CN4 “I agree with how things work around here” were questioning the norms and how familiar the student-athletes felt with the team norms.

However, the author identified that student-athletes might not be familiar with the concept “norms” which is described in these deleted items as “how to do things around here”. In future studies, it will be important for the researcher to clarify the term norms and the “process of learning about the norms”. In previous literature, it was stated that after an individual has developed an integrated set of assumptions “mental map”, he/she would be maximally comfortable with others who share the same set of assumptions. The same individual will feel very uncomfortable and vulnerable in situations where different assumptions operate because either he/she will not understand what is going on, or worse, he/she will misperceive and misinterpret the actions of others (Douglas, 1986; Bushe, 2009). The ideal tactic would be that the coach/coaching staff introduce the norms to the student-athletes before they have to learn from a trial and error process.

The other two deleted items were CN8 “I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role within the team”, and CN9 “I like my role within the team”, that focus on the role of the newcomer, therefore, diverting the attention of the construct from the introduction to the norms to the roles within the team. The author analyzed the items within the construct and identified that this was a double barreled construct. In the present study, the process of creation of the new scale allowed the researcher to focus on the introduction to roles only, with 3 items for this construct.

However, the items that were left on the scale are very clear to ask how the student-athletes perceive the actions of the coach/coaching staff during the socialization process. CR5 “The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are on this team”, refers to how the coach/coaching staff introduce the roles to the newcomer student-athletes. The other two items CR6 “The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are within the team”, and CR7 “I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me” refers to the introduction of the student-athletes’ roles in the team. Future studies should include an independent construct for introduction to the norms of the team, in addition to the current introduction to the roles construct. from focusing more on the way the coach/coaching staff communicates the norms of the team to their newcomers.

#### ***5.1.5 Prosocial Behavior***

The author based the items on the definition by Brief and Motowidlo (1996). Prosocial behavior is behavior that is performed by a member of an organization, directed toward an individual while carrying out his or her role, and performed with the intention of promoting the welfare of the individual. This is a strong construct within the newly created scale because based on statistical analysis only one item was deleted, CP1 “I feel the coaching staff promotes other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility”. Previous literature states that in the context of collegiate athletics, the existence of prosocial behavior in a sports team is highly valued by head coaches (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). Coaches stated that one benefit of being part of a sports team is the “all-inclusive-family” feeling where other members of the team are on the lookout for the well-being of the newcomers (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). The “all-inclusive-family” term

is equivalent to prosocial behavior, where a member of the team is willing to help the newcomer. Prosocial behavior is a socialization tactic mentioned by the coach/coaching staff as one of the great benefits of being part of an athletic team.

### ***5.1.6 Introduction to Support Services***

It is important to mention that the construct “introduction to supporting services” implies the fact that the coach can only introduce the student-athletes to the support services and promote a positive attitude towards the use of the services. Based on statistical analysis 4 items were deleted from the original scale CS2 “I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these services”, CS3 “I feel comfortable using any services that I might need”, CS4 “I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services” (reversed), CS5 “I feel like the coaching staff will think less of me if I use the support services” (reversed). Two of the deleted items were reversed items which usually cause confusion among the respondents. The other two items do not focus on the introduction of the support services he coach/coaching staff. This construct needs further refinement in future studies, where the researcher can focus more on the tactics used by the coach in order to introduce, facilitate and encourage the use of support services. Those services exist with the main objective to help student-athletes navigate through all the challenges of being an elite athlete and a full-time student at the same time.

## **5.2 Reliability**

Reliability is defined as the degree to which the measures that are being used are free of error and therefore deliver consistent and reliable results. The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha and item-to-total statistics in order to measure the internal consistency

of the factors. After the elimination of the problematic items, the items to measure the different factors were consistent with each other and reliability was supported. Then confirmatory factor analysis was used to provide further evidence of the instrument reliability. All the items loaded significantly on their respective factors, and the overall fit of the model was acceptable as well. A second CFA on an independent sample provided additional support for the reliability of the model. Finally, AVE scores provided further evidence of the reliability of the factors.

### **5.3 Validity**

Construct validity is regarded as the most critical component of validity testing and is initially based on the literature review and the logical reasoning of the researcher (Litwin, 1995). The construct and items developed in the new scale have strong logical reasoning of the researcher since they were developed from a previous qualitative study performed by the same author. The theoretical background is also very strong since the author performed an in-depth literature review of the socialization process, socialization tactics, leadership as well as existing theory and current studies of each of the constructs. In addition, several techniques are used to examine the construct validity of an instrument content analysis, discriminant validity, and external validity.

First, content analysis was performed by five experts in the field. The experts have a background in the socialization process, international student-athletes, athlete's adaptation, network theory, adaptation to new environments and student-athlete experience. In the literature review section, the researcher mentioned and used information from each one of the experts' previous studies. The researcher asked the experts to review

the proposed instrument and rate the quality of the items relative to the definition of a respective factor. Based on the experts' feedback the researcher made changes to improve the content validity of the new scale.

Second, discriminant validity was used to assess the independence of each construct in the new scale. A factor is regarded as independent from other factors in an instrument if the squared correlation of the factor with all other factors is lower than the AVE of the particular factor (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The results for discriminant validity indicated there were four issues that needed to be examined in order to obtain full discriminant validity. It is important to emphasize that validity cannot be proven through one study; it takes several studies to refine the instrument (Cronbach, 1971).

The issues were the correlation between Coaching-Mentorship (0.53-0.572), Coaching-Roles (0.53-0.745) and Coaching-Prosocal (0.536-0.667), Roles-Prosocal (0.561-0.594). The Construct Coach's Cultural Competence is involved in three of the issues with discriminant validity. After analyzing the information the author concluded that a cultural competent coach would be more open to using socialization strategies such as Mentoring and Introduction to Roles and Prosocal Behavior, however, those constructs are different tactics that can be used. For the discriminant validity issue between Roles-Prosocal, the author identified that a part of the introduction to roles construct is learning about the responsibilities and roles of the newcomer within the team, as well as the construct prosocal behavior refers to the behavior of other members of the team.

Finally, external validity refers to the extent to which the scale measures what it was set out to measure. The author used the Psychological Sense of School Membership

PSSM scale by Carol Goodenow (2003) and the Satisfaction scale by Keaveney and Madhavan (2001). A high correlation between these scales and the scores for the constructs indicated external validity. In addition, a second data set was analyzed and a CFA was performed to successfully confirm external validity. This is important because while there might be some ambiguity about the discriminant validity of each of the constructs and how they overlap, they do individually have a strong impact on important outcomes such as the sense of belonging and satisfaction.

#### **5.4 Contributions to the research**

The socialization process of newcomer student-athletes into their collegiate teams is a key element and the effectiveness in this process sets a foundation for a better experience and successful outcomes in the athletic and the academic aspects. The NCAA Collegiate Athletics model is set up to have a continuous influx of student-athletes into the athletic teams. Each student-athlete has four years of eligibility therefore an effective socialization process will help those newcomers successfully adapt to their new teams and it would also help them to navigate through the challenges of being a student-athlete.

In a globalized world, it is also important to emphasize that cultural diversity is more common every day. Each student-athlete and every sports team is situated within a unique environmental context (i.e., physical, task, social, personal) that is characterized by a distinct social reality (Martin, Bruner, Eys & Spink, 2014). Considering that, the integration of newcomer athletes is a process that happens on a large scale at the beginning of every season, delineating the tactics sports teams employ to facilitate this process warrants considerable attention (Benson, Evan, & Eys, 2016). Theory regarding

organizational socialization offered a promising framework to examine how sports teams manage initial entry experiences because it presumes that teams are active agents in newcomer socialization – using tactics that ideally combine to maximize outcomes for the individual as well as the group (Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

The author took special attention to student-athlete's perception of the coach's ability to structure the socialization process taking into account the newcomers' diverse characteristics. Based on the results from Jara-Pazmino et al. (2017) that state that each athlete has a different background and different factors that influence their reality, which might hinder the effectiveness of universal treatment. There is abundant literature on the socialization of newcomers within the management field as well as an emphasis on socialization of foreign managers into their new international assignments.

However, there are few studies that focus on the socialization of athletes within the collegiate athletics context (Jara-Pazmino et al., 2017). Among these studies, no scales had been developed to measure the student-athlete's perception of the socialization tactics structured by the head coach of the athletic team. Which means that our knowledge of what coaches do to socialize student-athletes consisted of anecdotal evidence. Because of the high-pressure culture of collegiate athletics, we need to better understand what tactics coaches implement to socialize their student-athletes into their teams. This study contributed by creating a new multidimensional scale to measure the student-athlete's perceptions of the tactics used by the coach during the socialization process of newcomers.

The new scale will inform the coach/coaching staff of each team on how effective the socialization process has been and where it can be improved. The multi-dimensional

scale can also serve to compare the effects of the socialization process in different recipients such as male vs. female athletes, team sports vs. individual sports, international and regional student-athletes vs. local student-athletes among other groups. As well as winter sports, vs spring sports and age related freshman vs sophomore vs transfer student-athletes. The new SSA scale focused on socialization of student-athletes is reliable and valid however, it will have to be perfected by using the scale in future studies.

### **5.5 Implications for future research**

First, future research should focus on the refinement of the scale, especially the Mentorship and Introduction to Support Services constructs. The mentorship construct showed to be an overarching topic that might be too similar to other constructs. However, future studies can analyze the scale with a bigger sample, more than 200. The “Introduction to Support Services” construct also needs to be refined. There were statistical values that showed the need to improve this construct in order to increase the validity of the scale. Based on the theory presented in the literature review, support services are independent of the control of each coach and previous studies have identified a stigma attached to the use of the services. The way that the coach encourages and relays on the use of those services by the student-athletes, especially the newcomers, are key elements in changing the current stigma associated with their use.

According to Hughes and Coakley (1991) in the Sport Ethic framework state that athletes are supposed to strive for distinction, make sacrifices for their sport, refuse any kind of limit, accept risks and play through pain. When student-athletes reach out to support services (tutors, nutritionists, and psychologist) can be seen as a sign of weakness or under-



conformity to the team norms. Based on this situation this construct should focus on how well the coaches incorporate support services into their socialization strategies.

Second, future studies can test the current model using the level of cultural distance as a moderator in order to indicate best socialization practices based on the newcomer's level of the cultural distance. The cultural distance is a function of differences in values and communication styles that are rooted in culture (demographic or organizational). The results from the present study informed future research about the variability of cultural distance, based on nationality (international vs local), regional origin (west, south vs north), socio-economic background (low vs high), race (minorities vs white), language (native vs English as a second language) and many other factors that influence the cultural distance between newcomers and the team members.

The student-athlete self-perception of cultural distance will also be more accurate. In the present study, the researcher sought to ask the student-athlete if they felt their culture was different from the team culture, however, for future studies, it might be more useful to divide levels of cultural distance, for example, none, low, high and correlate those to the effectiveness of each socialization tactic.

Third, researchers can use the new instrument to analyze those student-athletes that did not have a good adjustment and decided to transfer or quit participation in the sport. The researcher would attempt to identify the weak areas of the socialization process. It might be better to perform a mix-method study in order to search for in-depth information about the reasons for which the newcomer student-athletes might not feel adjusted to the team or have doubts about belonging to their new team.

Finally, future studies should analyze and compare the results given by male and female student-athletes, individual vs team sports, winter vs spring sports and freshman vs sophomore vs transfer student-athletes. Those aspects might also affect the socialization process as moderators. By analyzing this information the researcher can inform the coach/coaching staff if some socialization tactics work better in a female team vs a male team or an individual vs a team sport. If the student-athlete is part of an individual sport, then this person might have other expectations concerning interactions between the members of the team. The socialization process carried out by the winter sport such as football or basketball is different from the socialization process carried out by the spring sports such as baseball.

By using the new instrument, the researcher would be able to identify weaknesses and strengths of each process. In addition, future research should also focus on the differences between freshman, sophomore and transfer student-athletes. All these student-athletes will go through the socialization process however; each of these groups might perceive the specific socialization strategy differently. The next step to the socialization process studies would be to research on how to create commitment within the new athletes and their new institutions with the final goal to increase the retention rate of student-athletes as well as the overall wellbeing of student-athletes.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

The United States collegiate athletic system exists in an environment filled with a superior level of athletic competition, high pressure to perform, and abundant expectations. In this era of multi-million dollar paydays, the need to fill arenas and the pressure to win

has increased dramatically. In order to build a winning program, the coaching staff turns to national and international recruiting. According to David Ching, Senior Contributor of Forbes, “Nearly every Power Five college athletics program spends more than \$1 million per year on recruiting” Ching (2018). On the other hand, in the publication by the National Collegiate Athletic Association NCAA, Carr and Davidson (2014) stated, “Student-athletes, coaches, and staff tend to minimize mental disorders or psychological distress because of the expectations of strength, stability and mental toughness inherent in the sports culture”. An effective process of socialization of newcomer student-athletes can alleviate these two challenges. To make this process more effective, we need to gain a stronger understanding of how coaches are currently socializing their incoming student-athletes into their team.

Nowadays, the process of transferring from one institution to another one has been simplified, making it easier than ever for student-athletes to change their institutions for various reasons, among them an unsuccessful socialization process that might lead to a poor adjustment to the new team and the new expectations. In the situation, that the student-athlete transfers to another institution or quits the sport, then the investment made by the institution in recruiting and training would be lost.

The present study is the first of its kind and created a new multi-dimensional scale to measure the student-athletes’ perspective of the socialization tactics structured by the coach/coaching staff. By being able to measure the socialization process, we can begin to understand and evaluate the effectiveness of the tactics structured by the coach. The ultimate goal is to inform, coaches, student-athletes, and administrators about the strengths and weaknesses of the socialization process by measuring it with a new scale.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (2015). *Individual Psychology. Theories and their applications*. Sage Publications.
- Alreck, P. L. & Settle, R. B. (1985). *The survey research handbook*. Homewood, Ill: Irwin.
- Anderson, J. & Gerbing, D. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(1), 411-423.
- Anderman, L. (2003). Academic and Social Perceptions as Predictors of Change in Middle School Students' Sense of School Belonging. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 72(1): 5-22.
- Andrews, M. M., & Boyle, J. S. (2015). *Transcultural concepts in nursing care*. 7 ed. Philadelphia, PA: Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott, Williams, & Wilkins.
- Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (1996). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 199-214.
- Ashford, S. & Nurmohamed, S. (2012). *From past to present and into the future: A Hitchhiker's guide to the socialization literature*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring school communities. *Educational Psychologist* 32(3): 137-151.
- Bauer, T. N. (2010). Onboarding new employees: Maximizing success. *SHRM Foundation's Effective Practice Guideline Series*. Society for Human Resource Management. Retrieve from <http://www.shrm.org/about/foundation/products/Pages/OnboardingEPG.aspx>
- Bauer, T. N., Bodner, Erdogan, B., Truxillo, & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: a meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1) 707-721.
- Bauer, T. N., Erdogan, B., Liden, R. C., & Wayne, S. J. (2006). A longitudinal study of the moderating role of extraversion: Leader-member exchange, performance, and turnover during new executive development. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 298-310.
- Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2010). Organizational socialization: The effective onboarding of new employees. In S. Zedeck, H. Aguinis, W. Cascio, M. Gelfand, K. Leung, S.

- Parker, & J. Zhou (Eds.) *APA Handbook of I/O Psychology*, (3) 51-64 Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bauer, T. N., & Green S. G. (1998). Testing the combined effects of newcomer information seeking and manager behavior on socialization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 72-83.
- Bauer, T. N., Morrison, E. W., & Callister, R. R. (1998). Organizational socialization: A review and directions for future research. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resource management*, (16) 149-214.
- Beauchamp, M. R., Eys, M. A., Carron, A. V. & Bray, S. R. (2002). Role ambiguity, role efficacy, and role performance: Multidimensional and mediational relationships within interdependent sport teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice* (3), 229-242.
- Benne, K., & Sheats, P. (1948). Functional roles of group members. *Journal of Social Issues*, 4, 41-49.
- Benson. A. J., Evans, M. B., & Eys, M. A. (2016). Organizational socialization in team sport environments. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*. 26(1) 463-473.
- Bennett, M. (1999). Intercultural Communication: a current perspective. Milton Bennett (ed). *Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Benson, A. J., Evans, M. B. & Eys, M. A. (2016). Organizational socialization in team sport environments. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*. 26(1) 463-473.
- Biddle, B. J., & Thomas, E. J., (Eds.). *Role theory: Concepts and research*. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Blake-Beard, S. D. (2001). Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs: A consideration of potential challenges facing women. *Journal of Management Development*. 20(4), 331-345.
- Blancero, D. M., & Cotton-Nessler, N. C. (2017). Mentoring Latinos: An examination of cultural values through the lens of relational cultural theory. *Mentoring Diverse Leaders*. Murrell and Blake-Beard (Eds), Taylor & Francis Group.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., Petipas, A. J., Bachman, A. D., & Weinhold, R. A. (1998). Newspaper portrayals of sport psychology in the United States, 1985-1993. *The Sport Psychologist*, 12, 89-94.
- Brief, A., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *The Academy of Management Review*. 11(4): 710.

- Brooks, D. D., Ziatz, D., Johnson, B., & Hollander, D. (2000). Leadership behavior and job responsibilities of NCAA division 1A strength and conditioning coaches. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 483-492
- Broughton, E., & Neyer, M. (2001). Advising and counseling student-athletes. New directions for student services. Jossey-Bass, Unit of John Wiley & Sons.
- Burke, R. J., & McKeen, C. A. (1997). Benefits of mentoring relationships among managerial and professional women: A cautionary tale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(1), 43-57.
- Bushe, G. R. (2009). Clear leadership (Rev. ed.). Mountain View, CA: Davis-Black.
- Cable, D. M., & Parsons, C. K. (2001). Socialization tactics and person-organization fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 54, 1-23.
- Campinha-Bacote, J., Yahle, T., & Langenkamp, M. (1996). The challenge of cultural diversity of nurse educators. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 27(2), 59-64.
- Carr, C., & Davidson, J. (2014). Mind, body, and sport: The psychologist's perspective. Understanding and Supporting Student-athletes Mental Wellness. NCAA publications.
- Chao, G. (2012). Organizational socialization: Background, basics, and a blueprint for adjustment at work. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology*. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed). Oxford University Press.
- Chapdelain, R. F. & Alexitch, L. R. (2004). Social Skills Difficulty: Model of Culture Shock for International Graduate Students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 167-184
- Chatman, J. A. (2010). Norms in mixed-race and mixed-sex workgroups. In J. P. Walsh and A. P. Brief (Eds.). *Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 447-484.
- Chelladurai, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6, 27-41.
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*, 3(1), 85-92.
- Chelladurai, P., & Carron, A. V. (1981). Applicability to youth sports of the leadership scale for sports. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 49, 363-369.
- Chelladurai, P., Imamura, H., Yamaguchi, Y., Oimnuma, Y., & Miyauchi, T. (1988). Sport leadership in a cross-national setting: the case of Japanese and Canadian university athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 10, 374-389.

- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-45.
- Chelladurai, P.; & Arnott, M. (1985). Decision styles in coaching: Preferences of basketball players. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 56(1), 15-24.
- Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T. R. (1978). A normative model of decision styles in coaching. *Athletic Administration*. 13, 6-9.
- Ching, D. (2018, June 5). For Colleges, Spending Big On Recruiting Does Not Necessarily Translate To All-Sports Success. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidching/2018/06/05/spending-big-on-recruiting-does-not-necessarily-translate-to-all-sports-success/#3fece95a7044>
- Churchill, G. A., Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64-73.
- Comeaux, E. & Harrison. C. K. (2007). Faculty and male student-athletes: racial differences in the environmental predictors of academic achievement. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. 10(2), 199-214.
- Cooper & Dougherty, S. (2015). Does Race Still Matter?: A Post Bowl Championship Series (BCS) Era Examination of Student-Athletes' Experiences at a Division I Historically Black College/University (HBCU) and Predominantly White Institution (PWI). *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*. 8, 74-101.
- Cox, T. H. & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 5(3), 45-59.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1971). *Test validation in Educational Measurement*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., R.L. Thorndike, ed., Washington D.C. American Council on Education, 443-507
- Dannals, J. E., & Miller, D. T. (2017). Social norm perception in groups with outliers. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 146(9), 1342-1359.
- Day, D. V., Gordon, S., & Fink, C. (2012). The sporting life: exploring organization through the lens of sport. *Academy of Management Annals*. 6(1) 397-433
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Applied Social Research Methods Series. Newbury Park. CA: Sage Publications.
- Douglas, M. (1986). *How institutions think* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Dreher, G. F., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(5), 539-546.
- Dreher, G. F., & Cox, T. H., Jr. (1996). Race, gender, and opportunity: A study of compensation attainment and the establishment of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 297-308.

- Dwyer, J. J., & Fischer, D. G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the coach's version of leadership scale for sports. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 67(12), 795-798.
- Etze, E. F., Pinkney, J. W., & Hinkle, J. S. (1995). College student-athletes and needs assessment. In S. D. Stabb, S. M. Harris, & J. E. Talley (Eds.), *Multicultural Needs Assessment for College and Universities Populations*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Evans, M. G. (1970). The effects of supervisory behavior on the path-goal relationship. *Organisational Behavior and Human Performance*, 5, 277-298.
- Feldman, D. C. (1976b). A practical program for employee socialization. *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn:64-80.
- Feldman, D. C. (1981). The multiple socialization of organization members. *Academy of Management Review*, 6: 309-318.
- Feldman, D. C. (1997). Socialization in an International Context. *International Journal of Selection Assessments*, 5(1) 1-8.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fielder, F. E., & Garcia, J. E. (1987). *New approaches to leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fisher, C. D. (1986). Organizational socialization: An integrative review. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (4), 101-145.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-80.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2014). *Group Dynamics*. (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- George, J. M., & Bettenhausen, K. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover: A group-level analysis in a service context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 75, 698-709.
- Ghosh, R., & Reio, T. G. Jr. (2013). Career benefits associated with mentoring for mentors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 106-116.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Developing a questionnaire*. Continuum, London and New York.
- Jara-Pazmino, E. S., Heere, B., Regan, T., Blake, C., & Southall, R. (2017). Coaches' Perception of Organizational Socialization Process of International Student-Athletes and the Effect of Cultural Distance: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Exercise Science*, 10(6), 875-889.



- Gulas, I. (1974). Client-therapist congruence in prognostic and role expectations as related to client's improvement in short-term psychotherapy. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 35(05), 243.
- Hair, L. M, Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis: With readings*. New Jersey NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hardy, C. J. (1994). Nurturing our future through effective mentoring: Developing roots as well as wings. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 6(2), 196-204.
- Harrison, C. K., Comeaux, E. & Plecha, M. (2006). Faculty and male football and basketball players on university campuses: An empirical investigation of the "intellectual" as mentor to the student athlete. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(2) 277-284.
- Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2002). Organizational identity dynamics. *Human Relations* 55(1) 989-1018.
- Hawkins, B. (2001). *New plantation: The internal colonization of black student-athletes*. Winterville, GA: Sadiki.
- Heere, B. (2005). *Internal and External Group Identities of a Sports Team: The Development of a Multi-Dimensional Team Identity Scale*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Heimann, B., & Pittenger, K. S. (1996). The impact of formal mentorship on socialization and commitment of newcomers. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 8(1), 108-117.
- Heeler, R. M., & Ray, M. L. (1972). Measure validation in marketing, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 9 (November), 361-370.
- Hinkle, J. S. (1994). Psychodiagnosis for counselors: The DSM-IV. *Eric Digest*.(073)
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies Management Organization* 10(4) 15-41.
- Hofstede, G., (2009). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 2. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8>
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., and Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations. Software of the Mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3) 323-352.
- Horne, T., & Carron, A. V. (1985). Compatibility in coach-athlete relationships. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 137-149.
- Hughes, R. & Coakley, J. (1991). Positive Deviance among Athletes: The implications of over conformity to the sports ethic. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8(4), 307-325.

- Hughes, R., Ginnett, R. & Curphy, G. (2012). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. 7<sup>th</sup> Edn, McGraw-Hill Irwin, New York (ISBN:9780078112652).
- Hunt, S. D. (1991). *Modern Marketing Theory: Critical Issues in the Philosophy of Marketing Science*. Cincinnati: South Western Publishing.
- Jara-Pazmino, E. S., Heere, B., Regan, T., Blake, C., and Southall, R. (2017). Coaches' Perception of Organizational Socialization Process of International Student-Athletes and the Effect of Cultural Distance: An Exploratory Study. *International Journal of Exercise Science*, 10(6), 875-889.
- Johnston, W. B., & Parker, (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
- Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization Tactics, Self-Efficacy, and Newcomers' Adjustments to Organizations. *Academy of Management*. 29(2), 262-279.
- Johnson, B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33(1), 88-96.
- Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Wanberg, C. R. (2003). Unwrapping the organizational entry process: Disentangling multiple antecedents and their pathways to adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 779-794.
- Katz, D. (1964). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9(1), 131-133.
- Keaveney, S. and Madhavan P. (2001). Customer switching behavior in online services: An exploratory study of the role of selected attitudinal, behavioral and demographic factors. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 29(4), 374-390.
- Keenan, K. (1996). Motivasyon. (Translation: Koporan, E.). Istanbul: Remzi Bookstore
- Kline, R.B. (2011). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- Kavanaugh, K. & Kennedy, P. (1992). *Two nations: Black and White, Separate, hostile, unequal*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Kram, K. E. *Mentoring processes at work: Developmental relationships in managerial careers*. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1980.
- Kroshus, E. (2014). Risk factors in the sport environment. In Brown, G. T., (ed), *In Mind, Body and Sport: Understanding and Supporting student-athletes Mental Wellness*. Retrieved from [https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/events/Mind\\_Body\\_and\\_Sport.pdf](https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/events/Mind_Body_and_Sport.pdf)
- Lasser, W., Mittal, B., & Sharma, A. 1995. Measuring customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Customer Marketing*, 12(4):11-19
- Lawrence, S. M. (2005). African American athletes' experiences of race in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 40(1), 99-100.

- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., and McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Linder, D. E., Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & DeLange, N. (1991). A negative halo for athletes who consult sport psychologists: Replication and extension. *Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology*, 13(2), 133-148.
- Marsella, A. J., Dubanoski, J., Hamada, W. C., & Morse, H. (2000). The measurement of personality across cultures: Historical, conceptual, and methodological issues and considerations. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(1), 41-62.
- Martin, L., Bruner, M., Eys, M., and Spink, K. (2014). The social environment in sport: selected topics. *International Rev Sport exercise Psychology*, 7: 87-105.
- McDonald, R. P. (2002). *Structural model for the multivariate data*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, N.J.
- McKimm, J., Jollie, C., & Hatter, M. (2007). *Mentoring: Theory and Practice*. Imperial College, School of Medicine. London: NHSE.
- McSweeney, B. (2002). The essentials of scholarship: A reply to Geert Hofstede. *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1363–1372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00187267025511005>
- Megginson, D., & Clutterbuck, D. (1995). *Mentoring in action: a practical guide for managers*. Kogan Page, London.
- Mori, S. C. (2000). Addressing the Mental Health Concerns of International Students. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 78(2), 137-144.
- Murrell, A. J. & Blake-Beard, S. (2017). *Mentoring Diverse Leaders*. New York: NY Taylor & Francis Publications.
- Newby, T. J., & Heide, A. (1992). The value of mentoring. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 5(4), 3-173.
- Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- O'Hagan, K. (2001). *Cultural competence in the caring professions*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 42(2), 170-183.

- Packard, B. (2003). Web-based mentoring: challenging traditional models to increase women's access. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 11(1), 53-65.
- Person, D. R., Benson-Quaziana, M. & Rogers, A. M. (2001). Female student-athletes of color. *New Directions for Student Services*. 93(1) 1-80
- Petty, R. R., & Wgener, D. T. (1992). Attitude change: Multiple roles for persuasion variables. *In Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.
- Pittman, L. D. & Richmond, A. (2008), University belonging, friendship quality and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 76(4), 343-361.
- Popp, N., Love, A., Kim, S., & Hums, M. (2010). Cross-cultural adjustments and international collegiate athletes. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 3(1), 163-181.
- Ragins, B. R. (1999). *Gender and mentoring relationships: A review and research agenda for the next decade*. In G. Powell (Ed.) *Handbook of gender and work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ragins, B. R., & Cotton, J. L. (1993). Gender and willingness to mentor in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 19, 97-111.
- Ragins, B. R., & Kram, K. E. (2007). *The Handbook of Mentoring at Work: Theory, research and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1997). The way we were: Gender and the termination of mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 945-953.
- Ramaswami, A., Huang, J. & Dreher, G. (2014). Interaction of gender, mentoring, and power distance on career attainment: A cross-cultural comparison. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 153-173.
- Ridinger, L. & Pastore, D. (2000). A proposed framework to identify factors associated with international student-athlete adjustment to college. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 1(1), 424.
- Sage, G. H. (1975). An occupational analysis of the college coach. In D. W. Ball & J. W. Loy (Eds). *Sport and social order: Contributions to the sociology of sport*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Saks, A. M., Uggerslev, K. L., & Fassina, N. E. (2007). Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), 413-446.
- Salminen, S., Liukkonen, J., Hanin, Y., & Hyvonen, A. (1995). Anxiety and athletic performance of Finnish athletes: Application of the zone of optimal functioning model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19(5), 725-729.

- Sanstock, John W. A (2007). *Topical Approach to Life Span Development* 4th Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2007. Ch. 15, pp. 489–491
- Schein, E. H., (1984). Coming to a New Awareness of Organizational Culture. *Sloan Management Review*, 25(2) 3-16.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychological Association*, 45(2), 109.
- Simon, C., Bowles, D., King, S., & Roff, L. (2004). Mentoring in the careers of African American women in social work education. *Affilia*, 19(2), 134-145.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. R. (1989) Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19(1),
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1995). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory & practice*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: Wiley.
- Schwesinger, G., Muller, S., and Lundan, S. (2015). Governance Structures, Cultural Distance, and Socialization Dynamics: Further Challenges for the Modern Corporation. *Annual Conference 2016 (Augsburg): Demographic Change* from German Economic Association.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York, NY: Harpers and Row Publishers.
- Thomas, D. A. (1990). The impact of race on managers' experiences of developmental relationships (mentoring and sponsorship): An intra-organizational study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(1), 479-492.
- Tung, R. (1988). Career issues in international assignments. *Academy Management Executive* 2(3), 241-244.
- Van Maanen, J. & E. H. Schein (1979). Toward of Theory of Organizational Socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1: 209-264.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of proactivity in the socialization process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 37-385.
- Watson, J. C. (2005). College student-athletes' attitudes toward help-seeking behavior and expectations of counseling services. *Journal of College Student Development* 46(4), 442-449.
- Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, 51(1), 25-38.

- Wehlage, G. G. (1989). Dropping out: Can schools be expected to prevent it? In L. Weis, E. Farrar, & H. G. Petrie (Eds.), *Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas, and solutions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: An examination of motivational constructs underlying prosocial behavior and their influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 222-224.
- Williams, J., & Schwiebert, V. L. (2000). Multicultural aspects of the mentoring process. In: Schwiebert, V.L. (Ed) *Mentoring: Creating Connected, Empowered Relationships*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Zander, P. E. (2007). Cultural Competence: Analyzing the Construct. *Journal of Theory Construction & Testing*. 11(2) 50-54.

## APPENDIX A

### PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Abrev	Source	Items	Original Item/Rationale
<u>Prequestionnaire: Cultural Difference</u>			
CD1	Dev. by author	The culture in this team [place] is so different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD2	Dev. by author	People around here think and act so different from where I am from.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD3	Dev. by author	I feel very different from the people around me.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD4	Dev. by author	In conversations with people around here, I do not always know what the appropriate response is.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
CD5	Dev. by author	I do not always know how to act around people in my team.	Self-description of their cultural difference perception
<u>Construct 1: Coach's Cultural Competence</u>			
CC1	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC2	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent
CC3	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996 cultural competence and its elements
CC4	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person.	Based on Campinha-Bacote et al. 1996

CC5	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.	cultural competence and its elements Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent
CC6	Dev. by author	I feel the coaching staff values my cultural beliefs.	Based on Kavanaugh and Kennedy 1992 myths to avoid to become culturally competent

### Construct 2: Mentorship

CM1	Developed by author	I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996m need for formal mentoring
CM2	Based on Berk et al. 2005	I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time	Original item: My mentor was supportive and encouraging
CM3	Developed by author	My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM4	Developed by author	Having a coach-mentor helps me in getting adjusted to the new environment	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM5	Developed by author	I wish I did not have a coach-mentor (reversed)	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM6	Developed by author	The coaching staff encourages me to interact with my coach-mentor	Based on Heimann and Pittenger 1996 need for formal mentoring
CM7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff knows how to motivate me.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring
CM8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff cares about my well-being.	Based on Kram and Ragins 2007 functions of mentoring and its impact

### Construct 3: Introduction to team Norms and Roles

CN1	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me “how people do things around here”.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN2	Developed by author	I feel familiar with how I should behave as a member of this team.	Based on Schein 2010 characteristics of norms



CN3	Developed by author	I feel comfortable with how to do things around here.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN4	Developed by author	I agree with how thing work around here.	Based on Van Maanen 1976 and Schein 1978 definition of norms
CN5	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff shared with me how other members of the team behave.	Based on Hatch and Schultz 2002, importance of knowing group norms
CN6	Developed by author	The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are within the team.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when he assigned those responsibilities to me.	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group
CN9	Developed by author	I like my role within the team	Based on Biddle and Thomas 1966 importance of roles within a group

#### Construct 4: Prosocial Behavior

CP1	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff promotes other members of the team to help me even though it is not their responsibility.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP2	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team lookout for me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP3	Developed by author	I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP4	Developed by author	I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior
CP5	Developed by author	I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996

			definition of prosocial behavior
CP6	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff does not like that other members of the team have to help me (reversed)	Based on Brief and Motowidlo 1996 definition of prosocial behavior

Construct 5: Introduction to Support Services

CS1	Developed by author	The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS2	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff explained to me how to contact these services.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS3	Developed by author	I feel comfortable using any services that I might need.	Based on Watson, 2005 Underutilization of services
CS4	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff judges me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of used of services
CS5	Developed by author	I feel like the coaching staff was think less of me if I use the support services. (reversed)	Based on Etzel, Pinkney and Hinkle 1994 negative judgment of used of services
CS6	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages me to use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS7	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff encourages everyone to use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used
CS8	Developed by author	I feel the coaching staff likes it when I use the support services.	Based on the perspective of the SADC of the coach's socialization tactics used

Outcomes: Sense of Belonging

OB1	Goodenow 1993 PSSM 8-18	I feel like a real part of my team	I feel like a real part of (name of school).
-----	-------------------------	------------------------------------	--

OB2	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	It is hard for people like me to be accepted here. (reversed)	Same as original
OB3	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong here. (reversed)	Same as original
OB4	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I am treated with as much respect as other students-athletes	I am treated with as much respect as other students.
OB5	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I can really be myself at this team.	I can really be myself at this school.
OB6	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I wish I were at a different team. (Reversed).	I wish I were at a different school. (Reversed).
OB7	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	I feel proud of belonging to this team	I feel proud of belonging to (name of school).
OB8	Goodenow 1993 PSSM	Other students-athletes here like me the way I am	Other students here like me the way I am

#### Outcome 2: Satisfaction (service)

OS1	Keaveney, S. and Madhavan P. (2001)	Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.	On the whole, I am satisfied with my experience with this/that service.
OS2	Keaveney, S. and Madhavan P. (2001)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh my positive experiences as a student-athlete. (reverse)	Overall, my negative experiences outweigh/outweighed my positive experiences with this/that service. (r)
OS3	Keaveney, S. and Madhavan P. (2001)	In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.	In general, I am/was happy with the service experience.

#### Demographics

D1	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Age	Older student-athletes might deal with adaptation differently
D2	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Gender	Males vs Females might deal with adaptation differently
D3	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Ethnicity	Each ethnicity might deal with adaptation differently
D4	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Sport	Group sports vs individual sports might deal differently with adaptation

D5	NCAA GOALS (2019)	Where are you from?	Where do they consider themselves from and is that region different from where the school is located?
D6	NCAA GOALS (2019)	City (In what city is your school located)?	Where do they consider themselves from and is that region different from where the school is located?

---

**APPENDIX B**  
**EXPERTS' RATINGS OF EACH ITEM**

<u>Pre-Questionnaire Cultural Difference</u>						
Item	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CD1	5	0	3	3	2	2.6
CD2	5	0	4	5	1	3
CD3	2	0	5	5	5	3.4
CD4	4	0	4	5	0	2.6
CD5	5	0	5	5	0	3
<u>Construct 1 Coach's Cultural Competence</u>						
CC1	5	2	4	5	5	4.2
CC2	5	4	4	5	3	4.2
CC3	5	2	4	5	3	3.8
CC4	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CC5	5	3	5	5	5	4.6
CC6	3	3	5	5	1	3.4
<u>Construct 2 Mentorship</u>						
CM1	1	5	0	5	3	2.8
CM2	4	5	4	5	5	4.6
CM3	4	5	0	5	5	3.8
CM4	0	5	4	4	4	3.4
CM5	1	3	4	5	4	3.4
CM6	3	2	4	4	3	3.2
CM7	4	1	4	5	1	3
CM8	4	1	4	5	1	3
<u>Construct 3 Introduction to Team Norms and Roles</u>						
CN1	4	3	5	5	3	4
CN2	5	5	3	4	4	4.2
CN3	5	3	4	4	4	4
CN4	1	3	4	4	4	3.2
CN5	4	5	4	5	0	3.6

CN6	5	5	5	5	5	5
CN7	3	1	3	5	5	3.4
CN8	4	4	3	5	5	4.2
CN9	2	3	3	5	3	3.2

Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior

Items	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	Expert 4	Expert 5	Average
CP 1	5	5	3	5	3	4.2
CP 2	5	5	2	5	3	4
CP 3	5	5	3	5	3	4.2
CP 4	4	5	3	5	1	3.6
CP 5	3	5	2	5	3	3.6
CP 6	2	4	3	5	0	2.8

Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services

CS1	5	4	5	5	5	4.8
CS2	5	3	4	5	3	4
CS3	4	2	4	5	3	3.6
CS4	3	4	2	5	1	3
CS5	4	4	4	5	5	4.4
CS6	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CS7	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
CS8	2	4	2	5	4	3.4

Outcome 1 Sense of Belonging

OB1	4	4	5	5	5	4.6
OB2	4	3	2	5	5	3.8
OB 3	4	3	2	5	2	3.2
OB 4	5	3	5	5	5	4.6
OB 5	4	4	2	5	2	3.4
OB 6	4	4	2	5	1	3.2
OB 7	4	5	2	5	1	3.4
OB 8	5	4	5	5	2	4.2

Outcome 2 Satisfaction

OS1	5	4	5	5	4	4.6
OS2	4	4	2	5	4	3.8
OS3	5	4	2	3	5	3.8

*Note: Rating from 1-5 how well the item represents each construct*

**APPENDIX C**

**SOCIALIZATION FROM THE**

**STUDENT-ATHLETE'S PERSPECTIVE - SSA SCALE**

**Instructions**

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this important survey measuring the perception of student-athletes about the socialization tactics used by their coaching staff in order to facilitate their adaptation process to the team. This information will aim to inform the student-athletes, coaches, and teams on how to improve the socialization process for student-athletes.

The survey should take 15 minutes to complete. Be assured that all answers you provide will be kept anonymous and confidential. Your responses should be based on your own personal experience and perceptions.

**DEFINITIONS:**

Coach-mentor: A person from the coaching staff that provides individual support and guidance continuously in various contexts (athletics, personal, academic, others).

(A 5-point Likert scale will be given for the responses)

- 1= strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = agree
- 5 = strongly agree

Pre-questionnaire

- PQ1 1. The culture on this team is so different from where I am from.
- PQ2 2. Teammates, coaches, and members of this team here think and act differently from where I am from.
- PQ3 3. I feel very different from teammates, coaches, and members of this team
- PQ4 4. In conversations with teammates, coaches, and members of this team, I do not always know what the appropriate response is.

### Construct 1 Cultural Competence

- CC1 5. I feel the coaching staff knows my strengths as a person.  
CC2 6. I feel the coaching staff is interested in knowing more about me.  
CC3 7. I feel the coaching staff knows my weaknesses as a person.  
CC4 8. I feel the coaching staff understands me as a person.  
CC5 9. I feel the coaching staff respects my cultural beliefs.

### Construct 2 Mentorship

- CM1 10. I feel one of the coaches from the staff acts as my mentor  
CM2 11. I feel that I receive emotional support from my coach-mentor at any time  
CM3 12. My coach-mentor is guiding me on how to be successful within the team  
CM4 13. Having a coach-mentor has helped me to get adjusted to the new environment on the team.

### Construct 3 Introduction to Roles

- CR5 14. The coaching staff explained to me what my responsibilities are on this team.  
CR6 15. I feel the coaching staff took into consideration my personal characteristics when they assigned those responsibilities to me.  
CR7 16. I feel the coaching staff assigned me a specific role on the team that I am happy with

### Construct 4 Prosocial Behavior

- CP2 17. I feel the coaching staff likes the fact that other members of the team look out for me.  
CP3 18. I can see other members of the team going out of their way to help whoever needs help.  
CP4 19. I feel like the coaching staff promotes helping, sharing, volunteering within the team.  
CP5 20. I feel valued because of other members of the team have helped me.  
CP6 21. I feel the coaching staff appreciate it that other members of the team have to help me.

### Construct 5 Introduction to Support Services

- CS1 22. The coaching staff made sure that I was aware of the support services offered to student-athletes.  
CS6 23. My coaching staff encourages me to use the support services.  
CS7 24. My coaching staff encourages everyone to use the support services.  
CS8 25. I feel the coaching staff likes it when I use the support services.

### Outcomes



- OB2R 26. It is hard for people like me to be accepted on this team  
 OB3R 27. Sometimes I feel as if I do not belong on this team  
 OB5 28. I can really be myself on this team.  
 OB7 29. I feel proud of belonging to this team  
 OB8 30. Other students-athletes here like me the way I am
- OS1 31. Overall, I am satisfied with my student-athlete experience.  
 OS2 32. Overall, my positive experiences far outweigh my negative experiences as a student-athlete  
 OS3 33. In general, I am happy with the student-athlete experience.

### Demographics

- D1 Are you playing on men's or women's teams? Men's Women's  
 D2 NCAA sport(s) you are playing: select all that apply  
 D3 How do you describe yourself? (select all that apply American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian, White, Other  
 D4 Birth year: 1994 or earlier to 2002 or later  
 D5 Birth month: Jan to December  
 D6 Where did you live during your senior year in high school?  
 D7 Where did you grow up? City Country

# APPENDIX D

## IRB APPROVAL



OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

### INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH APPROVAL LETTER for EXEMPT REVIEW

Evelyn Jara-Pazmino  
Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management  
Hospitality Management  
902 Sumter Street  
Columbia, SC 29208

Re: Pro00085470

Dear Mrs. Evelyn Jara-Pazmino:

This is to certify that the research study *Student-Athletes with a Different Cultural Background and their Perception of Socialization Tactics Used by their Coaches: Scale Development*

was reviewed in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), the study received an exemption from Human Research Subject Regulations on 1/18/2019. No further action or Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is required, as long as the study remains the same. However, the Principal Investigator must inform the Office of Research Compliance of any changes in procedures involving human subjects. Changes to the current research study could result in a reclassification of the study and further review by the IRB.

Because this study was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, consent document(s), if applicable, are not stamped with an expiration date.

All research related records are to be retained for at least three (3) years after termination of the study.

The Office of Research Compliance is an administrative office that supports the University of South Carolina Institutional Review Board (USC IRB). If you have questions, contact Lisa Johnson at [lisaj@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:lisaj@mailbox.sc.edu) or (803) 777-6670.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Johnson  
ORC Assistant Director and IRB Manager