

A Multi-University Examination of College Student-Athlete & Coach Fit

A Dissertation Presented for the
Doctorate of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Amanda Celeste Alexander
August 2014

Copyright © 2014 by Amanda Celeste Alexander
All rights reserved.

Dedication

The effort, integrity, and determination put into this dissertation are dedicated to Williard J. Alexander, MSG (aka Papaw). For your unwavering belief and unconditional love, I will always be grateful. Your dedication made this dedication possible.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this dissertation could not have happened without the support of my major advisor Dr. Jacob J. Levy, who told me early on that the ‘P’ in PhD stands for persistence. It sure does. I would also like to acknowledge my dissertation committee, Drs. John Lounsbury, Dawn Szymanski, and Joe Whitney, who graciously agreed be valuable members of my committee. A big thank you goes to the institutions and individuals who offered their assistance in my data collection and to the student-athletes themselves who put their time and effort into completing this study. This certainly wouldn’t have been possible without you. I am also so grateful to Coach JJ Clark, who has continued to support and mentor me long after my days as an athlete. To my fellow graduate friends, thank you for being a source of understanding, advice, and compassion. To my family, thank for you for your unwavering belief in my ability to make it through to the end. Ultimately, I would like to acknowledge my best friend and partner for his patience, encouragement, and love from start to finish.

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between student-athletes' personality traits and satisfaction with their collegiate coaching experience, as guided by vocational research and theory on job satisfaction and turnover. Specifically, this study was designed to examine both broad and narrow personality traits in relation to student-athletes' satisfaction across four dimensions of the student-athlete/coach relationship and to explore intent to transfer as a dependent of these variables. This study is an expansion of a previous study investigation of personality and satisfaction with coaching (Levy, Alexander, & Lounsbury, under review). A national sample of NCAA Division I, II, and III collegiate student-athletes was surveyed (N=239). Findings demonstrated that personality traits of emotional stability and optimism, in addition to the demographic variables academic classification and role on the team, significantly predicted satisfaction with coaching experience, accounting for over 13% of the variance. Additionally, satisfaction with coaching along with the personality traits emotional stability, extraversion and openness significantly predicted intent to transfer, accounting for close to 19% of the variance.

The results of this study offer valuable insight into variables that significantly influence the satisfaction of student-athletes and contribute to their retention. Theory of Work Adjustment and the Attraction-Selection-Attrition model support these findings (Juntunen & Even, 2012; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995). Practical implications and may include developmental programming, coaching education, and recruitment processes that incorporate measures of personality and satisfaction as a means for improving the experience and retention of this special population. Directions for future research and limitations of the current study are discussed.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	2
Collegiate-Athletes	2
Retention/Commitment to Sport	4
Student-Athlete Satisfaction	6
Person-Environment Fit Theory	7
Personality Theory in Sport	9
Coach-Athlete Fit.....	11
Current Study	16
Chapter 3 Methods.....	18
Participants.....	18
Measures	20
Procedure	23
Chapter 4 Results	24
Research Questions 1 and 2	24
Research Questions 3 and 4.....	25
Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusions.....	27
Implications.....	31
Directions for Future Research	34
Limitations	35
List of References	37
Appendix.....	49
Vita.....	54

List of Tables

Table 1. Frequencies of Participants by Sport	20
Table 2. Summary of the Bivariate Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Personality Variables and Satisfaction with Coaching	50
Table 3. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Satisfaction with Coaching Experience	51
Table 4. Summary of the Bivariate Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Personality Variables, Satisfaction with Coaching, and Intent to Transfer	52
Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Intent to Transfer	53

Chapter 1

Introduction

The purpose of the proposed study was to explore the relationship between student-athletes' personality traits and satisfaction with their collegiate coaching experience. Specifically, this study was designed to examine both broad and narrow personality traits in relation to student-athletes' satisfaction across four dimensions of the student-athlete/coach relationship. This study is an expansion of a previous study investigation of personality and satisfaction with coaching for one NCAA Division I Track and Field team (Levy, Alexander, & Lounsbury, under review). Results from this study indicated that four broad traits and two narrow traits related to satisfaction with coaching, with three personality traits (Extraversion, Optimism, and Self-Directed Learning) contributing significant independent variance explained. The current study will broadened its scope nationally to include student-athletes across a variety of collegiate sports to explore the generalizability of the previous findings and to examine possible relations between student-athlete's personal styles and satisfaction with their coaches. Additionally, questions inquiring about student athletes' intent to transfer to another institution (i.e. retention status) were added for the purpose of investigating the potential link between student-athlete satisfaction and potential for transfer. This is an area within which well-documented concern warrants further research.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Collegiate-Athletes

College student-athletes represent a unique sample of the collegiate student body. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) boasts that roughly 400,000 of the nation's 15 million annually enrolled college students are student-athletes. While student-athletes represent less than 3% of the overall college population, they are a highly visible part of most university's student body. However, although collegiate athletics have become an integral part of the campus life at many American universities, research about these athletic participants is infrequent in almost all areas.

While the NCAA is clear about the role of collegiate student-athletes as being just that, students and athletes, the athlete experience often reflects that of job. McCormick and McCormick (2006) go so far as to assert that student-athletes "meet the legal standard of employee," based on interviews with current and former college student-athletes that suggest that their athletic experiences meet the standard of labor, through "both common law test and statutory test" (p.71). Though this allegation is currently ripe with debate, there is no doubt that the demands and obligations assumed by student-athletes speak to the unique nature of their collegiate experience. The unique nature of these students' roles within their universities makes this population ripe for inquiry. Student-athletes are put in a position to balance a collegiate career full of exceptional performance and academic pressures, time demands, physical fatigue, emotional strain, and discrimination due to their athletic status. The "marriage" between athletics and

academics is often the source of many student-athletes' difficulties (Jolly, 2008). Much of the research about that exists about student-athletes is restricted to performance enhancement interventions. Less research has explored aspects of these student-athlete's lives outside of this area. Additionally, the majority of research within a mental health or psychological domain is limited to eating disorders, steroid use, or emotional states related to performance (Denny & Steiner, 2009).

For a student-athlete, the decision-making process to attend a particular university is likely to be quite different than that of a traditional student. In addition to academic factors, a student-athlete's choice of university is often influenced by the strength of the athletic program, expected playing time, and team cohesion (Crom, Warren, Clark, Marolla & Gerber, 2009). The decision-making process is likely to be even more complex for prospective scholarship athletes, those who for all intents and purposes are 'paid' for their sport participation. Studies by the NCAA suggests that across *all* Division I sports, student-athletes overwhelmingly report athletic reasons over academic reasons when considering their decision to attend their current college. For student-athletes athletics participation is the highest rated reason (roughly 80% responding agree or strongly agree) for attending their current institution over academic offerings/reputation, proximity to home, proximity to significant other, social scene/friends, and other peoples' expectations. It is obvious that student-athletes regard their presupposed athletic experience very highly.

Retention/Commitment to Sport

It has been noted that the head coach is among the most important factors in the student-athlete's initial decision-making process and invariably in their retention (Rivera, 2004; Crom et al., 2009). Results of the NCAA GOALS and SCORE studies (2010) suggest that student athletes decisions to attend a particular university are highly influenced by the particular coach with whom they will work. In the 2010 GOALS study conducted by the NCAA, between 40 and 60 percent of the nearly 20,000 student-athletes surveyed said it was unlikely that they would have chosen the same institution if a different coach had been in place; this implies that roughly half of student-athletes make decisions to attend their university largely based on the coach at that particular school. Interestingly, men's and women's basketball players were most likely to tie their decision to the coach. Additionally, student-athletes cite wanting to change their coach or some aspect of their relationship with the coach over any other part of their athletic experience, with female student-athletes (16%) acknowledging this sentiment more often than males (7%).

Once student-athletes matriculate into their universities, the major concerns become their development and retention within their sport. MacNamara and Collins (2010) assert that talent development and long-term athletic success are often at the mercy of a successful transition between stages of the athletic career, and a change in coach was identified by college athletes as being an outstanding feature in the transition to their university. According to the NCAA, student-athletes were also likely to report

that their perceptions of the athletics experience in college were less accurate than their pre-college expectations.

Interestingly, student-athletes have higher overall graduation rates than traditional students (Rishe, 2003). Therefore, of interest in this case is not of graduation statistics particularly but the potential for transferring schools (and hence sport teams) or leaving their sport all together. Student-athletes are likely to have a number of different factors that influence their commitment to an academic institution above and beyond those of traditional students. Though traditional college student retention is a widely researched area, it seems that there is limited research about the causes for attrition of college student athletes. If a student-athlete desires a transfer to another institution and also wishes to continue to play their sport at this new institution, the NCAA requires that a number of rules and regulations be respected to ensure their eligibility. Although it is known that a significant number of student-athletes choose to pursue a transfer, we can only speculate what motivated them to do so, as the NCAA does not record reasons for doing so. Still others choose to remain at their institution but leave their sport and forfeit their eligibility, in addition to potential scholarships, benefits, and resources provided as part of being student athlete.

One common model of student-athlete retention identifies an “environmental pull factor” as influencing the attitude that ultimately decides the fate of the student-athlete’s retention (Rivera, 2004, p. 34). More specifically, the coach-athlete relationship as an environmental factor has been deemed to be of vast importance in a student-athlete’s decision to stay in school. “Having a coach who helps me achieve my athletic goals”

received the highest mean score in this study of variables deemed important for a student-athlete's retention (Rivera, 2004, p. 193). Academic preparedness, social integration, and institutional commitment are also likely influences on student-athletes retention. (Ferris, Finster, & McDonald, 2004; Person & LeNoir, 1997; Harper, 2009). It is significant to note, however, that a match between a student's characteristics and those of the institution is vital in understanding student attrition (DesJardins, Ahlburg, & McCall, 1998). It stands to reason, therefore, that the match between a student-athlete and her environment is also likely to contribute to her decision to remain at a given university.

Student-Athlete Satisfaction

The NCAA has become increasingly interested with the satisfaction of student-athletes, and recent research from the GOALS and SCORE studies revealed that only 29% of student-athletes reports being completely satisfied with their athletics experience. Interestingly, these satisfaction rates were higher among student-athletes who had graduated from their university than those who had not.

A strong relationship between satisfaction and intent to remain in the relationship was found in college student roommate pairs (Bono, Boles, Judge, & Lauver, 2002). Wylleman (2000) suggested there is insufficient emphasis on the importance of interpersonal relationships in sport, and furthering the research in this area may have significant implications for athletic achievement and levels of enjoyment. Dissatisfaction with coaching behaviors has been associated with psychological need thwarting, the feelings that arise when individuals perceived their psychological needs to be actively undermined by others (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani,

2011). Need thwarting on the part of the athlete has in turn been associated with lower well-being as measured by decreased daily satisfaction, increased disordered eating, and increased burnout (Bartholomew et al., 2011). The strongest predictor of athletes' need thwarting was perceived coach control. Controlling behaviors by the coach, in individual in a position of authority, are likely to decrease feelings of personal autonomy in athletes and negatively predict need satisfaction. When considering personality-environment fit, it is likely that athletes whose personality styles predispose them to need increased feelings of autonomy (i.e. self-directed learners) would be especially at risk for dissatisfaction and all its associated detriments.

Person-Environment Fit Theory

Person-environment fit theory (P-E fit) maintains that individuals seek out, are satisfied with, and are more successful in work or other contextual environments where there is a good “fit” between their individual characteristics (i.e., abilities and personality) and environmental demands (Holland, 1996). The examination of person-environment fit is an integral component in increasing satisfaction and productivity in a variety of settings (Nauta, 2010). Referring back to Holland's model of person-environment fit, introducing a person within a vocation in which “interests, preferred activities, beliefs, abilities, values, and characteristics” are congruent with the nature of the work and those who work in the same environment may have positive implications for “job satisfaction, stability, and performance” (Nauta, 2010, p. 11). In the field of vocational research, use of the Big Five model to examine personnel selection, and job commitment, job satisfaction, and life satisfaction based on person-environment fit is

common (Heller, Warson, & Ilies, 2004; Juntunen & Even, 2012; Lounsbury, Park, Sundstrom, Williamson, & Pemberton, 2004; Schmit & Ryan, 1993), and within work domains, satisfaction has been linked to retention and productivity (Levy & Lounsbury, 2011). Theory of Work Adjustment in particular is concerned with satisfaction and its influence on tenure (i.e. commitment to the work environment) (Juntunen & Even, 2012). In this model the person's satisfaction with her ability to fulfill her work requirements moderates the relationship between ability and the satisfactoriness of the work environment with the individual's performance. Personality style is also believed to moderate the prediction of both satisfaction and satisfactoriness (Juntunen, & Even, 2012). Relational vocational theories stress that "the quality and nature of relationships are assumed to provide resources necessary for effective negotiation of work-related tasks" (Juntunen & Even, 2012). The Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model of vocational decision making suggests that "individuals will be attracted to organisations where the modal personality is most similar to their own...organizations tend to hire individuals that are most similar to the organisation's current members...[and] over time, individuals whose personalities do not 'fit' with other employees will be more likely to leave, voluntarily or involuntarily" (Slaughter, Stanton, Mohr, Schoel, 2005, p. 422).

Hence, vocational psychology can contribute immensely to our understanding of productivity, satisfaction, and decision-making within performance domains, such as the athletics.

Personality Theory in Sport

Early research and application of personality theory in athletic domains led to skepticism about the validity of the potential of personality assessment in this domain and has had an unfortunate and lasting effect on the dearth of research in this field (Jackson, Dimmock, Gucciardi, & Grove, 2011). A reductionist approach to personality research led the majority of researchers to look for personality predictors of performance, and no clear findings in this regard have been found (Beauchamp, Maclachlan, & Lothian, 2005). Additionally, purely descriptive data, such as that which identifies personality characteristics of basketball players for example, proved to be limited and generally not useful (Hardman, 1973). Personality research that focuses on prediction and intervention is likely to be more useful in the world of sport, and trends indicate that intervention based research has increased largely due to interest in applied sport psychology (Vealey, 1992). Personality research now has largely turned its focus toward what factors mediate or moderate the relationship between personality and performance. Personality theory research couched within the framework of the Big Five trait model personality has spurred a resurgence of research and presents an “empirically-derived...comprehensive...[and] psychometrically robust measurement tool” for examining human functioning and behavior across diverse settings (Jackson et al., 2011, pp. 222-223). The interpersonal nature of sport spotlights the necessity of continued research in the area of “trait-based research [to explore} relational outcomes in athletics endeavors” (Jackson et al., 2011, p. 223).

Much research suggests individual differences among athletes may greatly influence the overall fit between an athlete and her environment (Sheldon & Eccles, 2005; Denny & Steiner, 2008; Parham, 1993). Among student-athletes internal factors tend to be stronger predictors of happiness than do external factors; this is a finding consistent with personality research suggesting positive personality traits contribute to a person's happiness even during adverse circumstances (Denny & Steiner, 2009). Additionally, the personality trait optimism has been found to predict both coping and adjustment among college student-athletes (Gaudreau & Blondin, 2004).

Jackson, Dimmock, Guicciardi, and Grove (2011) found that the personality traits of conscientiousness agreeableness in one member of the coach-athlete dyad predicted higher relationship commitment not only for that individual but also for the other person in the partnership. Agreeableness was predictive of a similar effect on relatedness. Neuroticism in athletes was found to lower the level of commitment to the coach-athlete relationship. In this particularly study is easy to see how the fit between coach and athlete relies in part on the dynamics and interplay between the personalities involved. Since a compatible coach-athlete fit is important for the athletes' commitment and relatedness, interaction preferences that are perceived to be incompatible are likely to emerge as an environmental obstacle to success. According to Jackson et al. (2011):

One can readily envisage how relationship quality may be undermined when a highly open athlete who seeks to explore novel tactics and training methods, favors democratic instruction, values flexibility, and thrives on discussion, works

alongside an authoritarian, inflexible, autocratic coach who fails to recognize the athlete's perspective (i.e. low openness. (p. 227)

Coach-Athlete Fit

While survival of the fittest may seem an appropriate mantra for competitive athletic arenas, it seems important in the context of athlete development to truly examine what 'fittest' infers, since an athlete who doesn't have a good fit with her environment may not reach her true potential. One head basketball coach remarks on the importance of fit between the players' personalities and the coaching environment in the context of a 32 game losing streak, noting that group of optimistic new players combined with highly motivating coaching style finally combined to produce a winning season (Barker, 2003). In this case the losing record of the team was neither reflective of the coach's nor the athletes' potential but was illustrative of a mismatch within the athletic environment. A positive player-coach relationship was necessary in this particular situation for the motivational style of the coach to be effective.

The coach-athlete relationship is recognized as having the potential to foster athletes' technical and performance capabilities, character development, sport enjoyment, and prolonged participation (Jackson, Dimmock, Guicciardi, & Grove, 2011). The benefits of increasing the quality of the coach-athlete relationship have been cited extensively (Amorose & Horn, 2000; Rivera, 2004; Wylleman, 2000), and these findings may have practical implications within the athletic arena specifically in regards to recruitment, retention, and performance. Ghaye, Lee, Shaw, and Chesterfield (2009)

suggest that high quality connections at the coach-athlete level may actually be at the heart of improving performance.

Personality traits have been shown to act as a type of filter for a number of interpersonal outcomes. Jowett and Nezlek (2011) found that coach-athlete interdependence, conceptualized as the standard for which partners' evaluations of their relationship are based on comparing alternatives for the basis of deciding to remain in or leave the relationship, was positively associated with sport satisfaction. They assert that "to be satisfied coaches and athletes may have to establish interdependence to act as a buffer against actual or potential stress, particularly in high-level competition" (Jowett & Nezlek, 2011, p.296).

Other research suggests that factors related to student-athletes' states of intrinsic motivation, perceived competence, autonomy, and relatedness are also associated with preferred coaching behaviors and styles (Amorose & Horn, 2000; Hollembeak & Amorose, 2005). It has also been noted, however, that student-athletes tend to have differing preferences when considering their coach's behavioral and leadership styles (Beam, Serwatka, & Wilson, 2004). For example, high performance coaching is associated with more stable coach-athlete relationships, among other factors, suggesting a link between performance and interpersonal coach-athlete dynamics (Mallett & Côté, 2006). Additionally, within the context of the coach-athlete dyad, a positive association between relationship interdependence and sport-related satisfaction was found to be stronger for higher level competitors (Jowett & Nezlek, 2011). This misfit between the coach and athlete may lead to a myriad of problems within the athletic working

environment, which may include, but are not limited to, dissatisfaction, attrition, mental health disturbance, and poor performance (Weathington, Alexander, & Rodebaugh 2010; Rivera, 2004; Smith, Ntoumanis, & Duda, 2010; Nauta, 2010). Based on these findings, one can assume that even if an athlete is quite talented, she may still have difficulty maximizing her potential if incompatibility exists between the coaching style and the athletes' personality.

Since both external and internal variables have been identified as significant in maximizing the student-athlete experience, it is important to now consider the fit between both the athlete and her or his environment. It is obvious that the quality of the student-athlete's perceived experience is vital in maximizing their potential and ensuring their retention at the university and within the team, and since the perceived coach-athlete relationship has been noted as crucial to a variety of processes as part of the athletic experience, it has been proposed that the fit between student-athlete and coach is a much needed area of investigation. Bowes and Jones (2006) propose a theory of coaching that is flexible and dynamic and in which both coach and athlete take on adaptable roles of teacher and learner in an attempt to work more capably with each other within ever changing, often chaotic environments.

When considering talent development in young athletes, personality research has had mixed results in predicting performance, and Morris (2000) suggests instead that psychological skills training is a more appropriate and effective way to address psychological variability in athletes. In youth populations, training coaches to increase certain behaviors and to decrease others has been shown to influence the quality of the

coach-athlete relationship as well as the overall structure of the sport setting/environment (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2006). Other research on coach education proposes more focus on actions of the individual in an effort to understand the interpersonal workings within the social collective culture that is athletics (Bowes & Jones, 2006). It has been suggested that while countless studies have been done in the area of coaching, most have fallen short of being able to capture the complex nature of this role; this has left room in the research to explore more effective ways to guide coaches' actions (Bowes & Jones, 2006). Coaches and researchers alike, however, recognize the importance of exploring coach-athlete fit. As head high school basketball coach Cliff Barker (2003) asserts:

A positive bond between players and coaches will produce a psychologically sound approach to a successful program. The final two pieces of the coaching puzzle involve the individual differences in personality and the interpretations of the teaching environment. Every successful leader and teacher must recognize the individual differences in thought, feeling, and behavior associated with social interaction. It will help him develop a positive interaction within the group, motivate the individual, and ensure a full contribution to the team effort. (p. 71)

Team sports add an additional layer to the complexity of person-environment fit. When considering group dynamics in sport, Beauchamp, Maclachlan, and Lothian (2005) recommended that a knowledge of "self as well as the patterns of preference that characterize those with whom one interacts" is necessary for improved interaction (p. 203). Recognizing personality based differences may provide coaches and other support staff with valuable information that can assist in maximizing whatever potential they

have for intervention and accommodation of student-athletes' needs, bridging the gap between coaching style and athletes' preferred behaviors (Beauchamp et al., 2005). This mutuality within the coach-athlete dyad has the potential for producing reciprocal effects of one personality on the other in this working relationship, such that a coach's perception of an athlete and thus treatment of this athlete is bolstered by the athlete's desirable traits and vice versa (Jackson, Dimmock, Gucciardi, & Grove, 2011). Thus, while personality similarity may not be an absolute necessity in fostering a healthy working relationship, personality compatibility is likely to increase commitment of both partners and to elicit mutually satisfactory experiences (Jackson et al., 2011).

In regards to coaching as leadership role, research suggests that people's personal traits and preferences influence the ways in which they respond to leadership behaviors, stressing the importance of the “match between leaders' behaviors and followers' values” (Van Kleef, Homan, Beersma, & van Knippenberg, 2010, p. 2). Since preferences are “theorized to result from both dispositional and situational factors” (Beauchamp Maclachlan, & Lothian 2005, p. 210), the person-environment fit is likely to have a major impact on the preferences that both an athlete and a coach are likely to have in regards to the dynamics of their working relationship. Just as coaching behaviors are influenced by individual differences in coaches, athlete behaviors and perceptions are also influenced by individual differences in athletes (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2006).

However, it is important to consider that within the arena of athletics, especially elite/professional or collegiate level, personality compatibility between a coach and her athletes is never guaranteed and may actually be the exception rather than the rule.

Awareness of these potential differences and their implications for the working relationship is an area that psychological consultation is likely to be helpful in fostering a mutually satisfying and productive environment for both coach and athlete. As noted by Carl Jung, early pioneer of personality theory, “the meeting of two personalities is like the contact of two chemical substances: if there is any reaction, both are transformed.”

Current Study

Based on previous findings and a thorough review of the literature, I sought to address the following research questions:

Research Question 1 (R1): Do gender, race/ethnicity, academic classification (i.e., Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior), and role on the team (i.e., active participant in 100% of matches; participant in less than 100% of matches, but more than 50% of matches; and participant in less than 50% of matches) of student-athletes relate to satisfaction with their collegiate coaching experience (hereafter referred to as satisfaction with coaching)?

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Gender and race/ethnicity will not significantly relate to satisfaction with coaching.

H2: Academic classification and role on the team will be positively related to satisfaction with coaching.

R2. Do student-athletes' broad personality traits (as defined by the Big Five Personality Traits: Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Openness) and narrow traits of Optimism, Self-Directed Learning, and Work Drive relate

to student-athletes' satisfaction with their collegiate coaching experience, above that which is already explained by demographic variables?

H3: Four of the Big Five traits (Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Openness) and all of the narrow traits will be positively related to satisfaction with coaching. Agreeableness will not be significantly related to satisfaction with coaching. This hypothesis is based on the findings of Levy et al. (under review).

H4: The linear combination of the Big Five traits will predict a significant amount of variance explained in satisfaction with coaching.

H5: The narrow traits will add a significant amount of variance explained in satisfaction with coaching, above that of the Big Five traits (Lounsbury, Smith, et al., 2009; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001).

R3: Does student-athletes' satisfaction with coaching relate to their intent to transfer from their current institution?

H6: Satisfaction with coach will be significantly related to intention to transfer.

R4: Do student-athletes' broad and narrow personality traits contribute additional variance in predicting intent to transfer, above that already explained by satisfaction with coaching?

H7: The Big Five will add a significant amount of variance explained in intent to transfer.

H8: The narrow traits will add a significant amount of variance explained in intent to transfer.

Chapter 3

Methods

Participants

Participants were solicited from four-year universities with NCAA Division I, II, or III athletic programs. The study was open to all varsity intercollegiate student-athletes, who were at least 18 years of age. No other demographic variables limited one's eligibility to participate, including, but not limited to, sex/gender, race/ethnicity, national origin, sexual orientation, or academic class status (e.g., Freshman, Sophomore, etc.). A total of 239 student-athletes volunteered to complete the study. The mean age for the sample was 20.13 years (range 18-27). Two outlying cases were removed due their data entries being over the NCAA eligibility limit for athletic participants. Appropriately 68% of participants were female (n=162) and 32% of participants were male (n=77). Regarding academic classification, 20.1% were Freshmen (n=48); 25.5% were Sophomores (n=61); 21.8% were Juniors (n=52); 29.7% were Seniors (n=71); and 2.1% were graduate students (n=5). When asked to describe their role on their current team, 72.4% of participants (n= 168) endorsed being active participant(s) in 100% of matches (i.e. starter or 2nd string), 17.2 % (n=40) endorsed participating in less than 100% but more than 50% of matches (i.e. major contributor, 3rd string), 7.3% (n=17) endorsed participating in less than 50% of matches (i.e. contributor), and 3.0% (n=7) endorsed their role as 'other'. With respect to race/ethnicity, 74.5% identified as White/Non-Hispanic (n=178), 7.5% identified as Black/African American (n=18); 7.5% identified as Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander (n=18); 5.0% identified as Hispanic/Latina(o)

(n=12); 2.5% identified as Multiracial/Biracial (n=6), and 2.1% identified with Other (n=5). The majority of participants were student-athletes at Division I universities (81.2%; n=194) followed by Division III (15.9%; n=38) and Division II (.8%; n=2) respectively. Mean GPA of participants was 3.35. Frequencies for participants by sport endorsed are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Frequencies of Participants by Sport

Sport	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage of total</i>
Archery	0	0.0%
Badminton	0	0.0%
Baseball	7	2.9%
Basketball	7	2.9%
Bowling	0	0.0%
Cross Country	33	13.8%
Equestrian	0	0.0%
Fencing	6	2.5%
Field Hockey	0	0.0%
Football	12	5.0%
Golf	12	5.0%
Gymnastics	0	0.0%
Ice Hockey	7	2.9%
Lacrosse	2	0.8%
Rifle	0	0.0%
Rowing	14	5.9%
Sailing	0	0.0%
Synchronized Swimming	0	0.0%
Swimming/Diving	14	27.2%
Team Handball	0	0.0%
Tennis	12	5.0%
Indoor Track	65	27.2%
Outdoor Track	71	29.7%
Volleyball	12	5.0%
Water Polo	6	2.5%
Wrestling	2	0.8%

Note. N= 234; 83.7% of participants ($n=200$) endorsed being single-sport athletes; 14.2% of participants ($n=34$) endorsed being multi-sport athletes.

Measures

Personality: The Personal Style Inventory for College Students (PSI; Lounsbury & Gibson, 2008) was used to measure the Big Five personality traits and several narrow

personality traits found to be predictive of college-student development and success.

Scale development, norms, reliability, criterion-related validity, and construct validity information for the PSI can be found in Lounsbury, Tatum, et al. (2003) and Lounsbury and Gibson (2008). The following are brief descriptions of the personality traits measured by the PSI, along with the internal consistency reliability coefficients:

Big Five Personality Traits: *Agreeableness* is defined as being pleasant, equable, participative, cooperative, and inclined to interact with other harmoniously (Cronbach's $\alpha = .74$). *Conscientiousness* is defined as being reliable, trustworthy, orderly, dependable, organized, and rule-following (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$). *Emotional stability* is defined as the overall level of adjustment and emotional resilience in the face of stress and pressure. This is conceptualized as the inverse of neuroticism (Cronbach's $\alpha = .71$). *Extraversion* is defined as having a tendency to be sociable, outgoing, gregarious, warmhearted, expressive, and talkative (Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$). *Openness* is defined as receptivity to learning, new experiences, novelty, and change (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$).

Narrow Personality Traits: *Optimism* is defined as having an upbeat, hopeful outlook, especially concerning plans, prospects, people, and the future, even in the face of difficulty and adversity; a tendency to minimize problems and persist in the face of setbacks (Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$). *Sense of Identity* is defined as having strong sense of one's purpose, goals, and directions in life; having a clear sense of self (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$). *Self-Directed Learning* is defined as taking responsibility for conducting learning activities in an autonomous, self-reliant manner without direction or guidance from teachers, parents, or others (Cronbach's $\alpha = .82$). *Work Drive* is defined as being

hard-working, industrious, and inclined to put in long hours and time and effort to achieve at a high level in school and other pursuits (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$)

Satisfaction with Coaching: The Athletic Satisfaction Questionnaire (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1998) is a multidimensional scale designed to measure an athlete's satisfaction with their athletic experience. For the purposes of this study, the sub-scales directly related to experience with coaching were utilized: *Ability Utilization* measures satisfaction with how the coach uses and/or maximizes the individual athlete's talents and/or abilities (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$). *Strategy* measures strategic and tactical decisions made by the coach (Cronbach's $\alpha = .96$). *Personal Treatment* measures satisfaction with those coaching behaviors which directly affect the individual, yet indirectly affect team development, including social support and positive feedback (Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$). *Training and Instruction* measures satisfaction with training and instruction provided by the coach (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$). *Coaching Satisfaction Total* includes the previous four dimensions together (Cronbach's $\alpha = .97$)

Intent to Transfer. To assess participants' commitment to their current university and sport, participants were asked to respond to following questions on a six-point Likert-type scale (1—strongly disagree to 6—strongly agree): “I am currently considering transferring from my current academic institution to another academic institution.” For responses of “agree” or “strongly agree,” participants were given the follow-up question: “I plan to continue to play my current sport if I transfer to a new institution.” For responses of “disagree” or “strongly disagree,” participants were given the follow-up question: “In the past I have considered transferring to another academic institution.” The

next question asked of all participants was: “I plan to remain at my current university and pursue professional athletics upon completion of my collegiate athletic career.”

Procedure

After receiving human subjects’ approval from the author’s university Institutional Review Board, an internet survey was be launched using a secure survey distribution website managed by UT Office of Information Technology. Solicitations for volunteer participation were distributed using university athletic department email listings for athletic directors and academic coordinators. Additional solicitations were made by email to community professionals known to work with college student-athletes. Universities who agreed to allow their student-athletes to participate were then asked to distribute a standard email with a description of the study and a link by email (see appendix).

Data were collected for approximately nine months and analyzed at the conclusion of the data collection period. Participants were made aware of the general purpose of the study and asked to indicate their willingness to participate voluntarily by agreeing to the terms of the approved IRB form, which appeared at the beginning of the survey. Any participant who did not affirm the informed consent statement was not allowed to participate in the study. Participants were made aware that survey data will remain anonymous and participation will not in any way affect athletic eligibility. As compensation for participation, all participants were given the chance to enter a random drawing for one of 24 \$25 amazon.com gift cards. The NCAA confirmed that the random chance to win one of these gift cards did not violate any NCAA restrictions on receiving

benefits and would not negatively impact participants' athletic eligibility in any way. Upon completion of the online survey, participants who wished to enter the random drawing were rerouted to a secure server that stored only an email address of their choice. Upon completion of data collection, all participants who entered their email address in the drawing were entered into the drawing (SPSS was used to generate a random number to correspond with each email entry, and the first 24 random email entries were selected as winners). All winners have since been contacted by email and sent their electronic amazon.com gift card. Dissertation support grant funding in the amount of \$600 was granted by the University of Tennessee Psychology Department for the purpose of providing this compensation.

Chapter 4

Results

Research Questions 1 and 2

Descriptive statistics for the study variables (e.g., means and standard deviations) along with bivariate correlations between the variables are presented in Table 2 (see appendix). A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the contribution of the study variables on satisfaction with coaching. The independent variables were entered in three steps, with the demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, academic classification, and role on team) entered simultaneously on step 1; the Big Five Personality variables were entered simultaneously on step 2; and the narrow personality traits were entered in a stepwise fashion on step 3. Before the hierarchical multiple regression was performed, the independent variables were examined

for collinearity. Results of the variance inflation factor (all less than 2.0), and collinearity tolerance (all greater than .76) suggest the estimated β s are well established in the following regression model.

The results of step 1 indicated that the variance accounted for (R^2) with the first four independent variables (gender, race/ethnicity, academic classification, and role on the team) equaled .03 (adjusted $R^2 = .01$), which was not significant different from zero ($F_{(4, 199)} = 1.44, p = .221$). Academic classification was the only statistically significant independent variable, $\beta = -.16, p = .03$. In step 2, the Big Five personality variables were entered into the regression equation. The change in variance accounted for (ΔR^2) was equal to .08, which was significantly different from zero ($F_{(9, 194)} = 2.73, p = .005$). In step 3, the narrow traits (Optimism, Self-Directed Learning, and Work Drive) were entered into the regression equation in a stepwise fashion. Self-Directed Learning and Work Drive were excluded from the analysis. The change in variance accounted for by Optimism (ΔR^2) was equal to .02, which was significantly different from zero ($F_{(10, 193)} = 2.99, p = .002$). The standardized regression coefficients (β), for the full model are reported in Table 3 (see appendix). Four variables contributed significantly to the explanation of satisfaction with coaching: academic classification, role on the team, Emotional Stability, and Optimism.

Research Questions 3 and 4

Descriptive statistics for the study variables (e.g., means and standard deviations) along with bivariate correlations between the variables are presented in Table 4 (see appendix). A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the

contribution of the satisfaction with coaching and the personality variables in relation to intention to transfer to another institution. The independent variables were entered in three steps, with satisfaction with coaching being entered on step 1; the Big Five Personality variables were entered simultaneously on step 2; and the narrow personality traits were entered in a stepwise fashion on step 3. Before the hierarchical multiple regression was performed, the independent variables were examined for collinearity. Results of the variance inflation factor (all less than 2.0), and collinearity tolerance (all greater than .85) suggest the estimated β s are well established in the following regression model.

The results of step 1 indicated that the variance accounted for (R^2) with satisfaction with coaching equaled .11 (adjusted $R^2 = .11$), which was significantly different from zero ($F_{(1, 190)} = 23.56, p < .001$). In step 2, the Big Five personality variables were entered into the regression equation. The change in variance accounted for (ΔR^2) was equal to .08, which was significantly different from zero ($F_{(6, 185)} = 7.15, p < .001$). In step 3, all the narrow traits were excluded from the regression equation. The standardized regression coefficients (β), for the full model are reported in Table 5. Four variables contributed significantly to the explanation of intention to transfer: satisfaction with coaching, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Openness.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

In support of research hypothesis 1, demographic variables of race/ethnicity and sex showed no significant relationship with coaching satisfaction. Though previous research suggests differences in the Big Five personality traits by sex (Feingold, 1994; Vecchione, Alessandri, Barbaranelli, & Caprara, 2012), the results of this study did not yield any significant differences in the prediction of coaching satisfaction by sex. Consistent with our results, there are generally no significant personality score differences between racial or ethnic groups (Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996).

Research hypothesis 2 was also supported. The demographic variables of academic classification and role on team helped to significantly explain satisfaction with coaching. Upperclass athletes and athletes with a more substantial role on the team reported higher levels of satisfaction with their coaching. The theory of work adjustment supports the finding that student-athletes who have remained committed to their sport for longer periods of time (i.e. upperclass student-athletes) are more likely to be satisfied with their coaching experience, as they are more likely to have adjusted to the expectations of their particular environment (Juntunen & Even, 2012). Additionally, the ASA model proposes that organizations are likely to become more homogenous over time as individuals are likely to be attracted to and to select settings within which they believe themselves to be a good fit (Slaughter, Stanton, Mohr, & Schoel, 2005).

The finding that student-athletes who have a more active role on their team and receive more playing/competitive time are more satisfied with their coaching experience

in not surprising, as coaches typically have direct control over this aspect of a student-athlete's athletic experience. Since student-athletes tend to value their athletic experience very highly, generally rating it as the most important factor in their decision to attend their university (NCAA GOALS study, 2011), having a larger role as an athlete is likely a desirable position. It may be more helpful to note that student-athletes who have a lesser role on their team may be at risk for lower levels of satisfaction and its associated detriments.

In regards to the influence of personality on satisfaction with coaching, research hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were partially supported by the findings. The results of this study suggest that normal personality traits, defined by the Big Five as well as narrow traits, are significantly related to satisfaction with coaching and explain roughly 8% of the variance in satisfaction with coaching above and beyond academic classification. Specifically, however, only emotional stability and optimism were found to uniquely predict student-athletes satisfaction with their coaching experience. Based on these findings, it appears that certain personality traits as well as certain situational factors (i.e. academic classification and role on team) play a large role in satisfaction of college student-athletes. Future research may explore this if there is a person x situation interaction, which conceptually emphasizes attributes and context as they relate to behavior and attitudes (Graziano, Meara, Habashi, Sheese, & Tobin, 2007). Lounsbury, Saudargas, and Gibson (2004) also cite the importance of examining this trait-by-environment interaction in regards to the withdrawal process.

In regards to stated research questions 3 and 4, the predicted hypotheses were

partially supported. Student-athletes who endorsed lower levels of satisfaction with their coaching experience were more likely to consider transferring from their current institution, supporting research hypothesis 6. In this case, satisfaction with coaching explained roughly 11% of the variance in intent to transfer. It is reasonable to posit, therefore, that coaches in this case may act as an environmental factor that strongly influences the commitment of their athletes. This adds breadth to previous research suggesting that the coach is the most important factor in a student-athletes decision making process to attend a particular university (NCAA, etc.). Additionally, this finding is consistent with vocational research suggesting that poor employee satisfaction is negatively associated with measures of job loyalty (Lam & Ozorio, 2012). In regards to research hypothesis 7, the Big Five traits added significant additional prediction of satisfaction with coaching. Specifically, lower levels of emotional stability and openness predicted higher intent to transfer. Additionally, student-athletes with higher extraversion were found to be more likely to express intent to transfer. This is consistent with findings in which higher extraversion and lower emotional stability were significant for the use of the Attraction-Selection-Attrition model for traditional college students (Slaughter, Stanton, Mohr, & Schoel, 2005). Lounsbury, Park, Sundstrom, Williamson, and Pemberton (2004), also found that extraversion and emotional stability, as part of a model including optimism and assertiveness, predict career satisfaction. Additionally, extraversion is related to ambition and job search efficacy (Zimmerman, Boswell, Shipp, Dunford, & Boudreau, 2012). Higher levels of openness and neuroticism have also been found to relate to increased relationship conflict (Bono, Boles, Judge, & Lauver, 2002),

which is significant in light of the finding that dissatisfaction with coach is strongly related to intent to leave. Openness, however, has generally shown to be an inconsistent predictor of career success (Wille, Fruyt, & Feys, 2013), as both commitment to an organization and intent to transfer to a new organization are likely to both inherently require higher levels of openness. Since satisfaction with the coaching relationship is a strong predictor of intent to leave. Research hypothesis 8 was unsupported as no narrow traits added significant prediction of intent to transfer. Since specific personality traits help explain intent to transfer significantly above and beyond satisfaction with coaching, it seems that a personality-environment interaction may be a major influence on student-athletes retention. Essentially, both internal and external variables have been identified that point to increased likelihood of transfer.

Though intent to transfer was measured in this study, a number of studies in vocational settings suggest that intent to quit an organization is actually the direct antecedent to turnover and that there is a consistent relationship between intention to leave and actual leaving (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979; see also Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson, 2004). Additionally, this finding may help to explain the role of academic classification as it relates to satisfaction with coaching. Since athletes who are dissatisfied with their coaching experience are more likely to consider transferring and hence more likely to actually leave, it is possible that the upperclass athletes who stayed were generally more satisfied in the first place and that athletes who were unsatisfied have already transferred. In this study alone 3.1% of student-athletes (n=6) endorsed that they were currently considering transferring. Therefore, it reasonable to assume in this

case that 3.1% of student-athletes in this study alone are very likely to actually transfer. This phenomenon may place considerable strain on both the individual athlete, their team, the university athletic program and should not be taken lightly. After all, retention within the athletic department also directly affects overall retention rates of the university itself.

Implications

From a practical standpoint, there are a number of conditions for which the results of this research can be usefully applied. First, assessing and identifying student-athletes who are likely to have a more difficult time transitioning into their role within a collegiate setting allows for the opportunity to intervene in ways that may facilitate their ability to adapt to their new environment, increasing the likelihood of their satisfaction and success (McNamara & Collins, 2010; see also Schlossberg, 1981). McNamara and Collins (2010) make the case that the development of psychological coping skills be included as a part of talent development initiatives for student-athletes in an effort to "[smooth] the pathway to success and [reduce] the incidence of dropout" (p. 353). Developmental programming through athletic academic services, career services, or counseling services aimed at increasing optimism and emotional stability through stress tolerance and coping skills is likely to be most helpful based on our results. Female student-athletes in particular have been shown to benefit from the use of positive coping skills in resilience to negative life events and resistance to illness (Yi, Smith, & Vitaliano, 2005). Though personality traits are considered to be generally stable, relatively brief training designed to enhance emotional competence in college students was found to

bring about significant positive long-term increases in extraversion and agreeableness as well as significant long-term decreases in neuroticism (Nelis et al., 2011). The development of increased emotional competence also significantly increased psychological well-being, subjective health, quality of social relationships, and employability (Nelis et al., 2011). This type of approach aims at modifying personality variables, which are shown in fact to have considerable change during one's college years (Siegler et al., 1990). At this particular developmental transition college student-athletes may be at a particularly vulnerable and beneficial time for the implementation of strategies and skills that may increase the likelihood of retention based on personality-environment fit. While this is not an entirely new concept, as programming is already in place within both athletic and traditional college student environments (i.e. residence hall programming), knowledge of personality traits that make student-athletes particularly vulnerable to a difficult transition may prove useful in tailoring these programs for maximum efficacy. Additionally, when considering the role of an athlete on her team and its impact on satisfaction, it may be particularly important to work to improve the satisfaction of new athletes who do not yet have a large role within the team (i.e. underclassmen) or athletes who are injured and thus removed from their role temporarily.

Predicting intention to withdraw is also a vital implication of the current research. Though student-athletes actually have higher graduation levels than traditional college students (Rishe, 2003), this study suggests that the intent for collegiate student-athlete attrition is likely to be largely related to satisfaction with their coaching experience, a factor that is not applicable for traditional students. It stands to reason, therefore, that

interventions that aim to increase the quality of this relationship and enhance the fit between coach and athlete will be likely to increase the commitment to retention as well. Since satisfaction has been identified as a key factor in job turnover, assessing satisfaction of student-athletes based on personality traits can identify athletes who are sensitive to intent to transfer or dropout of sport and/or school and can guide interventions for increasing satisfaction levels of these individuals, as is consistent with the Attraction-Selection-Attrition model of vocational selection and turnover.

Another possible application would be the use of personality measurement for the purpose of screening during the recruitment process. While research warns against the use of personality research simply for the assumption of performance potential (Morris, 2010), a process that includes personality measures to supplement what is already known about the skills and interests of the student-athletes could prove useful. This is likely to be beneficial from the standpoint of both the student-athlete and the coach. For example, if a student-athlete is aware that they are likely to fit best in a setting within which they will get personalized, directive coaching style, they can ask questions of prospective athletic programs and coaches that help them to make them the best recruiting decision for their individual style. This is again consistent with the Attraction-Selection-Attrition framework recommending personality-environment fit as a major predictor organizational employment decisions (Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995; Slaughter, Stanton, Mohr, & Schoel, 2005).

Similarly, while a coach may not turn away an athlete who displays superior athletic talent because of a personality-environment mismatch, an awareness of the needs

of a particularly talented athlete may help the coach to adjust his or her coaching style facilitate the satisfaction and performance of this athlete. Specifically, if an athlete is low in openness, she may have a particularly difficult time adapting to a new coaching style, especially if this coaching style involves novel practices unknown to the athlete previously. Knowing this may guide a coach to adjusting their coaching style accordingly as the athlete adjusts to this new system. Personality inventories are already within work settings and within the professional athletic realm to screen candidates for fit and performance potential (Gardner, 2001; Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Gibson, 2004; Schmit & Ryan, 1993). In fact, this is a more equitable way of assessing individual differences that are not demographically marginalizing, as cognitive aptitude and intelligence tests have been found to be (Lounsbury Saudargas, & Gibson, 2004).

Developmental coaching for coaches themselves may help facilitate the creation of an environment within which their student-athletes are more likely to thrive. Often done with business managers and executives, developmental leadership training for coaches could help to identify skills deficits, remove psychological and organizational barriers to performance, and improve interpersonal effectiveness (Berman & Bradt, 2006), thus improving the chances for creating a more satisfactory environment for student-athletes. One of the major roles of a coach is maximize the potential of their athletes, and an awareness and nurturance of fit between a coach and athletes styles is likely to produce the best chances in reaching this goal.

Directions for Future Research

There are a number of areas for future research that could clarify and expand upon

the results of the current study. Directions for future research could aim to examine sport specific questions and team based differences. This will be important in continuing to build on the personality-environment fit framework and in tailoring specific interventions for best practice with certain populations (i.e. by team, individual, or sport). Future research could also attempt to acquire data from coaches as a means for examining specific coach-by-coach environmental factors that factor into the coach-athlete fit for a particular team and/or athlete. Personality and satisfaction data from coaches would round out the model for person-environment fit within the athletic setting, much in the same way that knowledge of specific job environments helps create a model for a better fit with employee personality.

Limitations

Several limitations of the current study should be acknowledged. In this study no measures of coach personality traits were administered. Satisfaction of student-athletes with their coaching experience was unidirectional, based only on the self-report of the athletes themselves. Since I was unable to collect data from specific coaches and subsequently match it with their respective athletes, it was not possible to examine the reciprocal relationship of personality traits within the coach-athlete relationship that may be in place. Due to their already hefty time demands and often high-profile status, collecting data from collegiate student-athletes is quite difficult; similarly, collecting data from collegiate coaches is rarely done due to its difficulty. Future research should attempt to address this deficit in data collected from coach themselves, as it is likely to provide increased explanation of the dynamics of this relationship, as the importance of

reciprocity in relationship dynamics has been cited extensively (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2006; Jowett & Nezlek, 2011; Wylleman, 2000). Additionally, protecting the confidentiality of participants would need to be carefully considered in when collecting data from a coach and her respective athletes. A case study approach may be an appropriate first step in addressing this concern.

Additionally, when this study was proposed, I planned to do sport-by-sport comparisons of satisfaction. However, while the total number of participants was sufficient for total sample analyses, there were not enough participants representing each sport to allow for sport-by-sport comparisons (see participants section for number of participants by sport). Since the majority of the data collected in this study represented track & field and cross country athletes, it would be interesting to see if these findings hold up in a sample that represents a larger variety of sport representation. This would allow for the possibility of sport-by-sport comparisons as well as the examination of specific sport findings.

Nevertheless, it is clear from the current study that the study of personality traits within athletics is a fruitful area of investigation that can provide insight into factors that may be crucial in improving the experience and retention of this special population of performers.

List of References

- Abbott, A., & Collins, D. (2007). Eliminating the dichotomy between theory and practice in talent identification and development: considering the role of psychology. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 22(5), 395-408. doi: 10.1080/02640410410001675324
- Allen, M. S., Frings, D., Hunter, S. (2012). Personality, coping, and challenge and threat states in athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10(4), 264-275. doi: 10.1080/1612197X.2012.682375
- Amorose, A. J and Horn, T. S. (2000). Intrinsic motivation: relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status, and perceptions of their coaches' behavior. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 22, 63-84. Retrieved from http://groups.jyu.fi/sporticus/lahteet/LAHDE_1.pdf
- Anderson, A. G., Miles, A., Mahoney, C., & Robinson, P. (2002). Evaluating the effectiveness of applied sport psychology practice: making the case for a case study approach. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16, 432-453. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/AcuCustom/SiteName/Documents/DocumentItem/2795.pdf>
- Barker, C. (2003). Personality theory in coaching: Positive reinforcement. *Coach & Athletic Director*, 73(2), 68-74. Retrieved from <http://proxy.nss.udel.edu:2104/itx/start.do?prodId=AONE>
- Bartholomew, K., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., Bosch, J. A., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2011). Self-determinism theory and diminished functioning: The role of

interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(11), 1459-1473. doi: 10.1177/0146167211413125

Beam, J. W., Serwatka, T. S., & Wilson, W. J. (2004) Preferred leadership of NCAA division I and II intercollegiate student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 27(1). Retrieved from

<http://areas.fmh.utl.pt/~arosado/Repositorio/ficheiros/LONGTERM/Ref3.pdf>

Beauchamp, M. R., Maclachlan, A., & Lothian, A. M. (2005). Communication with sport teams: Jungian preferences and group dynamics. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 203-220. Retrieved from

<http://journals.humankinetics.com/AcuCustom/SiteName/Documents/DocumentItem/4843.pdf>

Berman, W. H., & Bradt, G. (2006). Executive coaching and consulting: "Different strokes for different folks". *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37(3), 244-253. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.37.3.244

Bono, J. E., Boles, T. L., Judge, T. A., & Lauver, K. J. (2002). The role of personality in task and relationship conflict. *Journal of Personality*, 70(3), 311-344. doi: 10.1111/1467-6494.05007

Bowes, I., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 245-245. Retrieved from

<http://journals.humankinetics.com/AcuCustom/SiteName/Documents/DocumentItem/5780.pdf>

- Carodine, K., Almond, K., & Gratto, K. (2001). College student athletes' success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 19-33. doi: 10.1002/ss.2
- Conroy, D. E., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2006). Coach training as a strategy for promoting youth social development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 128-144. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/AcuCustom/SiteName/Documents/DocumentItem/5772.pdf>
- Cotterill, S. T., Sanders, R. & Collins, D. (2010). Developing effective pre-performance routines in golf: why don't we ask the golfer? *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22(1), 51-64. doi: 10.1080/10413200903403216
- Crom, C. L. L., Warren, B. J., Clark, H. T., Marolla, J., & Gerber, P. (2009). Factors contributing to student- athlete retention. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 14-24. Retrieved from http://csri-jiaa.org/documents/puclications/research_articles/2009/JIAA_2009_2_Crom_Publish%20Copy_1.0.pdf
- DesJardins, S. L., Ahlburg, D. A., & McCall, B. P. (1998). An event history model of student departure. *Economics of Education Review*, 18, 375-390. doi: 10.1016/S0272-7757(98)00049-1
- Denny, K. G., & Steiner, H. (2009). External and internal factors influencing happiness in elite collegiate athletes. *Child Psychiatry Human Development*, 40, 55-72. doi: 10.1007/s10578-008-0111-z

- Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(3), 429-456. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.116.3.429
- Ferris, E., Finster, M., & McDonald, D. (2004). Academic fit of student-athletes: an analysis of NCAA Division I-A graduation rates. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 555-575. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000040263.39209.84
- Gardner, F. L. (2001). Applied sport psychology in professional sports: the team psychologist. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 32(1), 34-39. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.32.1.34
- Gaudreau, P. and Blondin, J. P. (2004). Differential associations of dispositional optimism and pessimism with coping, goal attainment, and emotional adjustment during sport competition. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 11(3), 245-269. doi: 10.1037/1072-5245.11.3.245
- Ghaye, T., Lee, S., Shaw, D. J., & Chesterfield, G. (2009). When winning is not enough: learning through reflections on the 'best-self'. *Reflective Practice*, 10(3), 385-401. doi: 10.1080/14623940903034747
- Graziano, W. G., Habashi, M., M. Sheese, B. E., & Tobin, R. M. (2007) Agreeableness, empathy, and helping: A person x situation perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(4), 583-599. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.4.583
- Hardman, K. (1979). A dual approach to the study of personality and performance in sport. In Whiting, H. T. A. (Ed.), *Personality & Performance in Physical Education & Sport* (77-122). London: Henry Kimpton Publishers.

- Harper, S. R. (2009). Race, interest convergence, and transfer outcomes for black male student athletes. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 147, 29-37. doi: 10.1002/cc.375
- Heller, D., Watson, D., & Ilies, R. (2004). The role of person versus situation in life satisfaction: A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(4), 574-600. doi: 10.1037/0033-29.1304.4.574
- Hogan, R. Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American Psychologist*, 51(5), 468-477. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.51.5.469
- Hollembeak, J. and Amorose, A. J.(2005). Perceived coaching behaviors and college athletes' intrinsic motivation: a test of self-determination theory. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(1), 20-36. doi: 10.1080/10413200590907540
- Jackson, B., Dimmock, J.A., Guicciardi, D. F., & Grove, J. R. (2011). Personality traits and relationship perceptions in coach-athlete dyads: Do opposites really attract? *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12, 222-230. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.11.005
- Jowett, S. & Nezlek, J. (2011). Relationship interdependence and satisfaction with important outcomes in coach-athlete dyads. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 29(3), 287-301. doi: 10.1177/0265407511420980
- Juntunen, C. L., & Even, C. E. (2012). Theories of vocational psychology. In Fouad, N. A. (Ed.), *APA Handbook of Counseling Psychology* (237-267). Washington DC: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/13754-009

- Lam, Desmond, & Ozorio, B. (2012). Linking employees' personalities to job loyalty. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 2203-2206. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2012.07.010
- Levy, J. J., Alexander, A.C., & Lounsbury, J. W. (2011). Athlete-coach fit: an investigation of a division I track and field team. (Submitted for publication).
- Levy, J. J., & Lounsbury, J. W. (2011). Big five personality traits and performance anxiety in relation to marching arts satisfaction. *Work: Journal of Prevention, Assessment, and Intervention*, 40(3), 297-302. doi: 10.3233/WOR-2011-1233
- Lounsbury, J.W., & Gibson, L.W. (2008). *Manual for the Personal Style Inventory*. Resource Associates, Knoxville, TN.
- Lounsbury, J. W., Park, S., Sundstrom, E., Williamson, J. M., & Pemberton, A. E. (2004). Personality, career satisfaction, and life satisfaction: Test of a directional model. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12(4), 395-406. doi: 10.1177/1069072704266658
- Lounsbury, J. W. Saudargas, R. A., & Gibson, L. W. (2004). An investigation of personality traits in relation to intention to withdraw from college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(5), 517-534. doi: 10.1353/csd.2004.0059
- MacMamara, Á., & Collins, D. (2010). The role of psychological characteristics in managing the transition to university. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 11, 353-362. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.04.003
- Mallett, C. & Côté, J. (2006). Beyond winning and losing: guidelines for evaluating high performance coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 213-221. Retrieved from

- http://www.coach.ca/files/Mallett__Cote,_Guidelines_for_evaluating_HP_coaches.pdf
- McCormick, R. A., & McCormick, A. C. (2006). The myth of the student-athlete: The college athlete as employee. *Washington Law Review*, 81(71), 71-157. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.msu.edu/facpubs/280/>
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493-522. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.86.3.493
- Morris, T. (2000). Psychological characteristics and talent identification in soccer. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 18, 715-726. doi: 10.1080/02640410050120096
- Nauta, M. M. (2010). The development, evolution, and status of Holland's theory of vocational personalities: Reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 57(1), 11-22. doi: 10.1037/a0018213
- NCAA.org. "Examining the student-athlete experience through the NCAA GOALS and SCORE studies." Presented at the NCAA Convention, 2011, San Antonio, TX.
- Nelis, D., Quoidback, J., Hansenne, M., Kotsou, I., Weytens, F., Dupuis, P., & Mikolajczak, M., (2011). Increasing emotional competence improves psychological and physical well-being, social relationships, and employability. *Emotion*, 11(2), 354-366. doi: 10.1037/a0021554
- Parcover, J. A., Mettrick, J., Parcover, C. A. D., & Griffin-Smith, P. (2009). University and college counselors as athletic team consultants: Using a structural family

- therapy model. *Journal of College Counseling*, 12, 149-161. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1882.2009.tb00112.x
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big five factors and facets and the prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(3), 524-539. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.3.524
- Person, D.R. & LeNoir, K.M. (1997). Retention issues and models for african american male athletes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 80, 79-91. doi: 10.1002/ss.8007
- Riche, P.T. (2003). A reexamination of how athletic success impacts graduation rates: Comparing student-athletes to all other undergraduates. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 62(2), 407-427. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3487919>
- Riemer, H.A. & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the athlete satisfaction questionnaire. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 127-156. Retrieved from <http://journals.humankinetics.com/AcuCustom/SiteName/Documents/DocumentItem/1170.pdf>
- Rivera, C. A. (2004) *The identification of key factors student-athletes perceived to be important to the college student-athlete retention process*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from OhioLINK ETD Center (osu1091805526)

- Schmit, M. J., & Ryan, A. M. (1993). The big five in personnel selection: Factor structure in applicant and nonapplicant populations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 966-974. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.78.6.966
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1981). A model for analyzing human adaptation to transition. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9(2), 1-18. doi: 10.1177/001100008100900202
- Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B., (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 474-773. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01780.x
- Siegler, I. C., Zonderman, A. B., Barefoot, J. C., Williams Jr., R. B., Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R. (1990). Predicting personality in adulthood from college MMPI scores: implications for follow-up studies in psychosomatic medicine. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 52(6), 644-652. Retrieved from <http://www.psychosomaticmedicine.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/content/52/6/644.full.pdf+html>
- Sheldon, J. P. & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Physical and psychological predictors of perceived ability in adult male and female tennis players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(1), 48-63. doi: 10.1080/10413200590907568
- Slaughter, J. E., Stanton, J. M., Mohr, D. C., & Schoel III, W. A. (2005) The interaction of attraction and selection: Implications for college recruitment and Schneider's ASA model. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(4), 419-441. Doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00218.x

- Smith, A., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. (2010). An investigation of coach behaviors, goal motives, and implementation intentions as predictors of well-being in sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22(1), 17-33. doi: 10.1080/10413200903403190
- Strong, E. K., Jr., Donnay, D. A. C., Morris, M. L., Schaubhut, N. A., & Thompson, R. C (2004). *Strong Interest Inventory®*, Revised Edition. Mountain View, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. (cited in Case, J. C. and Blackwell, T. L. (2008). Test review. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 51(2).
- Van Kleef, G. A., Homan, A. C., Beersma, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2010). On angry leaders and agreeable followers: how leaders' emotions and followers' personalities shape motivation and team performance. *Psychological Science*, 20(10), 1-8. doi: 10.1177/0956797610387438
- Vealey, R. S. (1992). Individual differences and sport behavior. In Horn, T. S. (Ed.), *Advances in Sport Psychology* (23-59). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Vecchione, M., Alessandri, G., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G., (2012). Gender difference in the Big Five personality development longitudinal investigation from late adolescence to emerging adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(6), 740-746. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/science/article/pii/S0191886912002826>

- Weathington, B. L., Alexander, A. C., & Rodebaugh, L. L. (2010). Coaching Influences on student-athlete motivation, stress, and skill. *Athletic Insight*, 2(2), 89-106.
- Wille, B., De Fruyt, F., & Feys, M. (2013). Big five traits and intrinsic success in the new career era: A 15-year longitudinal study on employability and work-family conflict. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 62(1), 124-156. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00516.x
- Wylleman, P. (2000). Interpersonal relationships in sport: Uncharted territory in sport psychology research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 555-572.
- Yi, J. P., Smith, R. E., Vitaliano, P. P. (2005). Stress-resilience, illness, and coping: A person-focused investigation of young women athletes. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 28(3), 257-265. doi: 10.01007/s10865-005-4662-1

Appendix

Table 2

Summary of the Bivariate Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Personality Variables (1-5 point scale) and Satisfaction with Coaching (1-7 point scale)

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Satisfaction with Coaching	--	.14*	-.02*	.21**	.01	.05	.01	.16*	.01	4.65	1.64
2. Agreeable		--	.26**	.24**	.07	.13	.15*	.09	.29**	4.02	0.56
3. Conscientious			--	.07	.01	.01	.17*	.16*	.36**	3.77	0.84
4. Emotional Stability				--	.26**	-.05	.018**	.32**	.09	3.29	0.75
5. Extraversion					--	.30**	.23**	.33**	.05	3.60	0.79
6. Openness						--	.38**	.24**	.26**	3.83	0.59
7. Self-Directed Learning							--	.34**	.53**	3.66	0.78
8. Optimism								--	.24**	4.14	0.65
9. Work Drive									--	3.36	0.82

Note. N = 204; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; All frequencies for demographic variables (sex, race, academic classification, and role in sport) are listed under 'Participants' in the Method section.

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Satisfaction with Coaching Experience

Predictor	Satisfaction with Coach	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.028	
Sex		-.051
Race		.028
Academic Classification		-.160*
Role on Team		-.101
Step 2	.084	
Sex		-.045
Race		.077
Academic Classification		-.212*
Role on Team		-.128
Agreeableness		.132
Conscientiousness		-.061
Emotional Stability		.246*
Extraversion		-.089
Openness		.110
Step 3	.022	
Sex		-.046
Race		.100
Academic Classification		-.217*
Role on Team		-.144*
Agreeableness		.143
Conscientiousness		-.085
Emotional Stability		-.206*
Extraversion		-.136
Openness		.067
Optimism		.174*
Work Drive		---
Self-Directed Learning		---
Total R^2	.134	
N	204	

Note: Satisfaction with coach refers to satisfaction with coaching experience and is the combination of measures of Ability Utilization, Strategy, Personal Treatment, and Training and Instruction

^aRole on team refers to active participants in 100% of matches (i.e. starter or 2nd string), participants in less than 100% but more than 50% of matches (i.e. major contributor, 3rd string), participants in less than 50% of matches (i.e. contributor), and participants who endorse their role as 'other'

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 4

Summary of the Bivariate Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Personality Variables (1-5 point scale), Satisfaction with Coaching (1-7 point scale), and Intent to Transfer (1-6 point scale)

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Intent to Transfer	--	-.33**	-.04	.08	-.24**	.06	-.10	-.02	-.11	-.01	1.48	0.81
2. Satisfaction with Coaching		--	.14	-.01	.21**	-.01	.03	.00	.12	.03	4.66	1.62
3. Agreeable			--	.27	.24**	.02	.09	.13	.08	.29	4.01	0.56
4. Conscientious				--	.07	-.02	-.01	.14	.14	.35	3.78	0.84
5. Emotional Stability					--	.26**	-.05	.18**	.32**	.09	3.28	0.75
6. Extraversion						--	.26	.20	.37	.05	3.57	0.80
7. Openness							--	.37	.27	.29	3.82	0.58
8. Self-Directed Learning								--	.39	.55	3.66	0.76
9. Optimism									--	.21	4.16	0.60
10. Work Drive										--	3.37	0.83

Note. N = 192; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Intent to Transfer

Predictor	Intention to Transfer	
	ΔR^2	β
Step 1	.011	
Satisfaction with Coaching		-.332**
Step 2	.078	
Satisfaction with Coaching		-.285**
Agreeableness		.047
Conscientiousness		.077
Emotional Stability		-.263**
Extraversion		.165*
Openness		-.168*
Step 3	---	
Satisfaction with Coaching		---
Agreeableness		---
Conscientiousness		---
Emotional Stability		---
Extraversion		---
Openness		---
Optimism		---
Work Drive		---
Self-Directed Learning		---
Total R^2	.188	
N	192	

Note: In Step 3 all narrow personality traits were excluded from the analysis, since they did not additional explained variance to the model.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Amanda Alexander was born in Fort Smith, Arkansas, the daughter of Janine Alexander and James Bradley. She is the oldest of two brothers and two sisters. She attended grade school primarily in Nashville, Tennessee, graduating from Hillwood High School in 2004. Upon graduating she attended The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. She was a student in the University Honors Program and participated on the NCAA Division I Track & Field team. She also studied abroad in Italy for a summer term to explore her ethnicity as an Italian American and to learn the Italian language. After deciding to major in psychology, she completed Departmental Honors in Psychology. Amanda graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Science degree and a minor in Business Administration in 2008. She accepted an assistantship and invitation to the Counseling Psychology Doctoral Program at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville. She competed on the UT Track & Field team during her first year of graduate school, completing her eligibility and earning NCAA Academic All-American (second team) honors. She is interested in providing clinical and performance enhancement services to athletes and performers and is currently pursuing certification as a consultant with the Association of Applied Sport Psychology. She is continuing her training at a clinical internship at The University of Florida Counseling & Wellness Center and plans to graduate Summer 2014.