

**“GAME CHANGERS”: THE IMPACT OF THE TRANSFER PORTAL AND NIL DEALS ON
COLLEGE ATHLETES’ SOCIALIZATION AND MOTIVATION TO STAY WITH THEIR
ORGANIZATION**

by

Peyton Carey

Communication Studies, B.S., 2025, Texas Christian University

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of

Communication Studies

Texas Christian University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science



May

2025



BOB SCHIEFFER
COLLEGE of COMMUNICATION

“GAME CHANGERS”: THE IMPACT OF THE TRANSFER PORTAL AND NIL DEALS ON COLLEGE ATHLETES’ SOCIALIZATION AND MOTIVATION TO STAY WITH THEIR ORGANIZATION

by
Peyton Carey

Thesis Approved:

4/30/2025

Committee Chair

Date

4/30/2025

Committee Member

Date

4/30/2025

Committee Member

Date

5/1/2025

Associate Dean

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank everyone who supported me throughout this journey, and I apologize if I forget anybody.

Thank you to my family for planting the seed of education in me. Your love and belief in me enabled and encouraged me to pursue knowledge which I am forever grateful for because it is indeed powerful. Thank you to my friends for having my back, making me laugh, and giving my mind a break whenever I needed it. Thank you to all my professors at TCU who taught me what it means to be a good teacher and researcher. To the fellow graduate students in my cohort, thank you for the conversations as they were always interesting and helped my mind grow. I'd like to end with a quote from Colin Powell: "Success is the result of perfection, hard work, learning from failure, loyalty, and persistence. It also comes from people who support you when you need it the most."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	iv
Abstract.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Main Body	3
References.....	26
Appendices.....	34
<u>VITA.....</u>	<u>44</u>

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations of Variables.....	34
Table 2: MANOVA: Impact of Transfer Portal and NIL Deals on Socialization and Satisfaction.....	35
Table 3: MANOVA: Number of Teams Played for and Socialization.....	36
Table 4: Linear Regression Analysis: Factors Predicting Intent to Stay.....	37
Table 5: MANOVA: CAR Impact on Satisfaction and Socialization.....	38
Table 6: Regression Analysis: Socialization Components Predicting Satisfaction.....	39
Table 7: MANOVA: Gender Difference in Satisfaction, Socialization, and Intent.....	40

ABSTRACT

“GAME CHANGERS”: THE IMPACT OF THE TRANSFER PORTAL AND NIL DEALS ON COLLEGE ATHLETES’ SOCIALIZATION AND MOTIVATION TO STAY WITH THEIR ORGANIZATION

by

Peyton Carey

Master of Science, 2025, Texas Christian University

Johny Garner, Professor

This study explored the impact of the transfer portal and NIL deals on college athletes. I examined what factors influence college athletes’ decision to stay or leave their sports organization. Data was collected via an online Qualtrics survey with 46 participants, and was analyzed using bivariate correlations, MANOVA, and regressions on SPSS. Results showed that the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals did not significantly impact college athletes’ socialization process. However, NIL deals significantly predicted satisfaction, which significantly predicted athletes’ intent to stay with their organization. In addition, socialization significantly predicted both satisfaction and intent to stay. While the coach-athlete relationship (CAR) significantly predicted athletes’ satisfaction, it did not predict their intent to stay. Lastly, compared to men, women reported significantly lower socialization and satisfaction scores, but were no more likely to intend on leaving their organization. Overall, if sports organizations want to combat these rule changes and retain both genders of athletes, the answer is through improving socialization.

INTRODUCTION

The socialization process influences how individuals adapt to organizational norms, expectations, and values (Jablin, 1987). In other words, it is how newcomers learn to fit in and act within the organization. Socialization has typically been studied in the context of workplace organizations; however, more recent scholars have started applying this theory to sports organizations (Coakley, 2009; Benson et al., 2015). This study built off previous research and examined college athletes' socialization process. Jablin's stages of socialization (Anticipatory Socialization, Encounter, Metamorphosis, and Exit) are helpful for understanding this socialization process (Jablin, 1987). Members of sports organizations go through a socialization process that mirrors the experience of corporate workers. Similar to how new employees must learn and adapt to company norms and expectations, college athletes must adapt to their teams' culture and dynamics. However, the addition of the transfer portal and Name, Image, and Likeness (NIL) deals has altered this socialization process. Due to the rise of the transfer portal and NIL deals, college athletes' can now play for multiple organizations in their collegiate careers, creating more entry and exit experiences. Each time a player transfers, the process restarts both for the individual and the organization.

In addition to socialization, this study seeks to explore how the transfer portal and NIL deals have impacted what college athletes value most about their organizations. Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is a useful framework for breaking down the different organizational aspects individuals might value (Herzberg, 1966). Similar to how some corporate workers may value money more than hours worked, with NIL deals, now some college athletes may value money over the chance to win. Overall, this study aimed to examine the impact of the transfer portal and NIL deals on college athletes' socialization, satisfaction, and motivation. Practically,

this study offers sports organizations a better understanding of the influence the transfer portal and NIL deals has on athletes' decisions to stay or leave. Theoretically, this study expands socialization to a growing context that has yet to be fully studied and offers a deeper understanding of what makes people stay with or leave their organizations.

MAIN BODY

Literature Review

Transfer Portal and NIL Deals

In 2018, the transfer portal was launched to empower college athletes and grant them more flexibility, however, its influence has changed the dynamics of sports organizations (NCAA, 2018). One of the most prominent impacts of the transfer portal has been its influence on college athlete recruitment, socialization, and commitment. Coaches and players entering the transfer portal can significantly influence college athletes' decision to stay or leave an organization (Fontana et al., 2021). In 2022, there were nearly 1,300 undergraduates who transferred from one Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) school to another (NBC Sports, 2024). In 2023, 8,767 undergraduate athletes and 4,258 graduate athletes entered the transfer portal, equaling over 13,000 college athletes (NCAA, 2023). In other words, the number of college athletes entering the transfer portal has continued to increase over time. In 2021, the NCAA made another policy change to where college athletes can now profit from NIL deals, leading to a surge in sponsorships and endorsements (NCAA, 2021). Overall, policy changes surrounding the transfer portal and NIL deals have significantly influenced socialization among all sports organizations.

Socialization Process

Organizational socialization is “the process by which an individual acquires the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977, p. 3). More importantly, organizational socialization is how individuals identify with and become integrated organizational members. The social knowledge and skills mentioned by Van Maanen and Schein (1977) refer to how individuals must learn and adapt to organizational values, norms,

and behaviors. Many scholars have studied the socialization process and its impacts on both the individual and the organization. In general, these studies support the notion that smooth socialization is beneficial for newcomers. For instance, effective socialization leads to better group cohesion and success (Klein et al., 2015). On the other hand, ineffective socialization can result in lower job satisfaction, higher stress, and increased turnover (Bauer et al., 2007). In addition, previous research found task mastery, role clarity, and group integration all to be positively related to organizational commitment and negatively related to withdrawal (Mueller & Wanberg, 2003). Since organizations aim to retain their members, especially their most valuable ones, improving our understanding of this context can help improve employee satisfaction and reduce turnover rates.

Jablin (1987) broke down the socialization process for newcomers into four phases: Anticipatory socialization, Encounter, Metamorphosis, and Exit. Anticipatory socialization is about experiences prior to joining the organization and provides individuals with expectations about their new organization, expectations which may or may not be accurate. In the workforce, this phase often consists of workers seeking information about the organization on the Internet or through their social circle. The relevance of this phase lies in the building of initial expectations, which sets individuals up for the next phase. The Encounter phase occurs after joining the organization and is where individuals' initial expectations meet reality. This stage is how newcomers make sense of their first interactions with organizations such as work interviews or athletic recruitment visits (Jablin, 1987; Jablin & Putnam, 2001). However, it is important to recognize how this phase of the socialization process can be influenced by various factors. For instance, previous research examined job transfers and revealed how positive communicative interactions, additional feedback, and closer communication relationships led to positive

adjustment and reduced individuals' uncertainty about being in and adjusting to a new environment (Kramer, 1993; Kramer, 1994). After individuals go through the Encounter phase, they arrive at the Metamorphosis phase. During Metamorphosis, individuals fully integrate into the organization, transitioning from an outsider to an insider who embodies what it means to be a member of that organization. This phase of the socialization process is where the organization can become a part of individuals' identities (Jablin, 1987). However, not all organizational members reach Metamorphosis. For instance, a past study demonstrated that when individuals do not receive enough support or fail to integrate into the organizational culture, they may not reach the Metamorphosis stage (Kramer, 1994). As a result, these individuals may feel dissatisfied and have a higher behavioral intent to quit or transfer (Bauer & Erdogan, 2011). The idea of quitting or transferring leads us to the Exit phase, the final stage of socialization where an individual leaves the organization. However, it is important to note that these phases of socialization are not linear; it is possible for members to leave organizations before ever reaching metamorphosis.

In recent years, the standard socialization process has been challenged by the rise in job mobility, which has increased the prevalence of temporary organizational positions and almost eliminated the concept of lifetime employment (Kramer, 1993; Kramer, 1994). The Transfer Portal and NIL deals are similar to job changes and may lead to athletes playing for more than one team in their collegiate career, creating many more entry experiences (Sullivan, 1999). Due to teams' frequent turnover and players' competition for profit, college athletes' socialization process has been altered. For example, if players fail to bond with their coaches or teammates and feel disconnected, they are more likely to feel dissatisfied with and question their commitment to the organization (Raabe et al., 2016). College athletes are essentially employees of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), so when they transfer teams they are

technically still in the same organization (NCAA), just a different branch. However, while they may just be transferring branches, each time a college athlete transfers, they must not only adapt to the team standards but also build new relationships with their teammates and coaches. This is so crucial to recognize because two of the most important factors for improving individuals' likelihood of reaching metamorphosis are the quality and frequency of their peer communication (Kramer, 1995). In other words, not only does a new member have to socialize and adapt to the new branch they join, but the branch and everyone already in it also must resocialize and adapt to the newcomer, disrupting the typical flow of the socialization process. Overall, college athletes' socialization process has dramatically been shaped by recent rule changes (Transfer portal and NIL Deals), which is what this study aims to explore. Therefore, the first research question I pose is as follows:

RQ1: How have NIL deals and the transfer portal affected the socialization process for college athletes in the last 6 years?

Motivating and Hygiene Factors

Herzberg (1966) established the motivation-hygiene theory which distinguishes between motivating factors that lead to job satisfaction, and hygiene factors that prevent dissatisfaction but do not necessarily motivate. In other words, satisfaction and dissatisfaction have different causes. Motivating factors are intrinsic to the job and make individuals strive for promotion in their careers, whereas hygiene factors are extrinsic to the job and keep people where they are (Herzberg, 1966; Nickerson, 2023, Udechukwu, 2009). Some motivating factors could include achievement, recognition, or opportunity for advancement, whereas some hygiene factors could include pay, stability, and relationships with peers. Past research found that teachers get their

satisfaction from intrinsic factors like the opportunity to educate and impact students, whereas their dissatisfaction was caused by external factors like poor leadership or administrative policies (Dinham & Scott, 1998). It is important to recognize that based on this theoretical framework, job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are separate concepts. "The opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but rather, no job satisfaction; and similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, but no job satisfaction" (Udechukwu, 2009, p. 5). For example, a starving artist may have a ton of motivating factors and love what they do, but limited hygiene factors and be unable to pay the bills. In other words, not being fully motivated or satisfied with one's work is different than being dissatisfied.

This theoretical framework has been frequently applied to workplace research examining satisfaction and employee turnover rates. For instance, a past study looked at certified nursing assistants (CNAs), who have an extremely high turnover rate, and found that both motivation and hygiene factors significantly influenced turnover intentions. CNAs who had higher scores in employee compensation, engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment were expected to have lower turnover intention scores (Bryant, 2018). Furthermore, past research on hospitality workers found the same factors (employee compensation, engagement, job satisfaction, and work environment) as well as employee motivation to be negatively related to employee turnover intention (Holston-Okae & Mushi, 2018). These studies raise the question of what motivation and hygiene factors employees value the most. Previous research applied this theory to the hotel industry and revealed job recognition and personal growth as the top motivating factors, whereas work-life balance and job stability were the top hygiene factors (Lundberg et al., 2009). It seems like employees value both motivation and hygiene factors, but whether employees leave due to a lack of motivation or dissatisfaction (lack of hygiene) has yet to be fully explored. The goal of

this study was to build off previous research and extend Herzberg's theory to a different context: college athletes and sports organizations.

In this study, satisfaction is a combination of motivating and hygiene factors. Some possible motivating factors for college athletes could be personal achievement, the chance to win, and increased playing time. On the other hand, hygiene factors might include relationships with coaches and teammates, stability, team culture, and financial security (NIL deals). Both motivating and hygiene factors are important in maintaining workers' and athletes' satisfaction and reducing the likelihood of turnover. For instance, previous research revealed that nurses become nurse practitioners to fulfill their potential, which falls under personal achievement and is a motivating factor (Kacel et al., 2005; Koelbel et al., 1991; Nickerson, 2023). Based on Herzberg's theory and past studies, even if college athletes have hygiene factors such as financial security/NIL deals if they perceive a lack of motivating factors, like no playing time, then they may be more likely to transfer (Herzberg, 1966; Kacel et al., 2005; Koelbel et al., 1991; Nickerson, 2023). However, this concept could also work in reverse, where college athletes may value finances and NIL deals over motivating factors such as the chance to win. For instance, Matthew Sluka, the football Quarterback at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), decided to walk away from his undefeated team due to a NIL deal disagreement estimated to be worth over 100,000 dollars, (Olson, 2024). Not too long after this news broke, Michael Allen, the fellow starting running back on the UNLV football team also decided to not play the rest of the season, claiming he also was dealing with an NIL deal disagreement and a lack of "on-field opportunities" (Fin, 2024). It is important to recognize that when these two critical players quit on their organization, the UNLV football team was ranked within the top 30 teams in the country and had a chance to make the college football playoffs for the first time in the program's history

(Olson & Bonagura, 2024). This situation at UNLV only further highlights the impact NIL deals or a lack thereof have had on college athletes and their decision-making processes. Overall, this study explores how college athletic organizations can retain their athletes and keep them satisfied. Thus, I ask the following research question:

RQ 2: How does college athletes' satisfaction with their motivating and hygiene factors impact their decisions to stay or leave their organization?

Coach-Athlete Relationship

One of the more significant hygiene factors for college athletes is the coach-athlete relationship. The coach-athlete relationship is crucial when it comes to shaping athletes' experiences and outcomes. Past studies have revealed communication styles (Cranmer et al., 2016; Kassing & Infante, 1999; Rey et al., 2021) and managing sudden changes/resistance (Browning & Kassing, 2011; Fontana et al., 2021; Zanin & Bisel, 2018) to be significant factors in the coach-athlete relationship. Coaches' communication styles can substantially affect athletes' satisfaction and performance. For instance, aggressive communication used by coaches has detrimental effects on athletes' confidence, satisfaction with coaches, and performance (Kassing & Infante, 1999). On the contrary, a past study found that wrestlers who perceived their coaches as high on positive feedback, high on instruction, and low on autocratic behavior were more likely to be satisfied with the organization's leadership (Dwyer & Fischer, 1990). Furthermore, another previous study highlighted how coaches who engaged in more frequent rewards and a democratic decision-making style produced more satisfied athletes (Weiss & Friedrichs, 1986). This relationship is important for this study because understanding how to increase college athletes' satisfaction would theoretically reduce their likelihood of transferring.

According to previous research, supportive and memorable messages from coaches may be one route to improving coach-athlete relationships and satisfaction (Cranmer et al., 2016).

Additionally, when coaches demonstrate their mastery of the sport and communicate praise verbally or through playing time, it boosts athletes' learning and performance (Rey et al., 2021).

Overall, communication styles are a key part of building a positive coach-athlete relationship, and studies have shown positive reinforcement and pure knowledge to enhance athletes' perceptions of their coaches, improving their overall satisfaction and engagement.

Managing sudden changes and resistance is another critical factor in forming and sustaining healthy coach-athlete relationships. Shifts in leadership, new star recruits, and/or teammates transferring programs are legitimate and substantial challenges faced more frequently now within the coach-athlete relationship. In addition, coaches transferring organizations can lead to their former players doing the same. For instance, in 2023, coach Jerry Kill transferred from New Mexico State University to Vanderbilt University. Shortly after this decision, Diego Pavia, coach Jerry Kill's former quarterback at New Mexico State University also transferred to Vanderbilt University (Schlabach, 2024). Furthermore, in 2022, Deion Sanders, the head coach of Jackson State's football team, and his son Shedeur Sanders, the quarterback of Jackson State's football team, transferred to the University of Colorado Boulder. As a result, Travis Hunter, the top wide receiver and defender on Jackson State's football team, followed them and transferred to the University of Colorado Boulder. Additionally, 86 new players joined the University of Colorado Boulder's football team, 53 of them coming via the transfer portal (Bonagura et al., 2023). Overall, both these examples (Jerry Kill & Deion Sanders) underscore the significant impact coaches can have on college athletes not only entering the transfer portal but also the new organization they choose to join.

Previous research investigated the effects of interim leadership in college athletics, illustrating how changes in coaching leadership can disrupt team cohesion and affect athletes' trust (Browning & Kassing, 2011). These results showcase the importance of effectively managing transitions to minimize the negative impacts on athletes and maintain stability within the team. Resistance often accompanies sudden changes, particularly when athletes feel disconnected or uncertain of the direction they are headed. Teammate exits are an example of emotional events that create uncertainty (Fontana et al., 2021). The ways in which coaches manage these exits can impact the team's resilience and bond with their coach (Fontana et al., 2021). A past study highlighted how coaches and managers can foster collective resistance through discursive positioning (Zanin & Bisel, 2018). Discursive positioning is the concept that language and communication can shape the dynamics of relationships and how we position our identities (Davies et al., 1990). For instance, if a manager asks their assistant to get them lunch or come to their office, this communication is likely a request, not a question, which implies that the dynamics of their relationship grant them that power. In the context of sports, coaches position themselves as managers and have the same power over their athletes, which they can use to foster team cohesion and resistance. In a previous study, a football coach used physical punishment to unite the team (Zanin & Bisel, 2018). In other words, resistance is not merely an individual reaction but can become a collective response. Therefore, coaches must address change and resistance effectively, which involves understanding the athletes and tailoring communication accordingly (Zanin & Bisel, 2018). Sudden changes, frustrations, and uncertainties are common difficulties faced by coaches and athletes but managing them is doable and needed to strengthen the coach-athlete relationship and improve organizational cohesion.

Overall, the coach-athlete relationship is a pivotal factor impacting, athletes' satisfaction and commitment. Based on the previous research discussed, I pose the following hypothesis:

H1: The coach-athlete relationship (CAR) will be a significant predictor of college athletes' intent to stay with their sports organization.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

After IRB approval, I recruited participants through snowball sampling, emails, flyers, social media, and third-party assistance. To be included in this study, I required participants to be either former or current college athletes. College athletes interested in participating in this study viewed an online consent form that explained confidentiality, the study's goal, and how to withdraw if desired. All participation in this study remained completely voluntary and did not affect athletes' standing with their teams or universities. After signing the consent form and agreeing to participate in the study, the participants completed an online survey. This survey contained questions regarding socialization, satisfaction, coach-athlete relationship, intent to stay vs. intent to leave, and demographics. I collected all data anonymously through Qualtrics.

A descriptive analysis of demographic variables revealed that out of the 46 participants, 32 identified as male (70%) and 14 identified as female (30%). The average age was 26.81 years old (SD = 14.63, ranging from 18-59 years old). Ethnicity-wise, the majority of the sample was white (34 participants, 74%). Additionally, four participants identified as black or African American (8.7%), three as Hispanic (6.5%), three as native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (6.5%), one as American Indian (2.2%), and one as other (2.2%). The average years spent as an athlete was 2.76 (SD = 1.52). Most athletes reported only playing for one organization (40 participants,

87%), some reported playing for 2 (2 participants, 4.3%), while others reported playing for over 4 organizations (4 participants, 8.6%). Lastly, 31 athletes (67%) reported never receiving NIL money, whereas 15 athletes (33%) reported having accepted an NIL deal.

Measurements

To start, I measured two demographic categorical variables: the number of teams participants played for in their college athletic career, and whether participants had received any NIL money or deal before. I then used a 7-point Likert-type scale to measure the rest of the items, with anchors ranging from 1 for "Strongly Disagree" to 7 for "Strongly Agree." For socialization, participants rated their agreement or disagreement with statements targeting certain aspects of the socialization process such as role competency and acculturation. In other words, this scale measured how socialized college athletes were with their organizations. For satisfaction, participants rated their agreement or disagreement with statements focusing on factors influencing their satisfaction such as pay and playing time. I tested the coach-athlete relationship by having participants rate their agreement or disagreement with statements regarding their connection to and trust in their coaches. I measured intent to stay by having participants rate their agreement or disagreement with statements targeting their organizational commitment.

Number of Teams Played For

I used a 1 item open-ended measure to determine the number of teams participants played for in their college athletic career. Participants were asked to report how many total teams they played for in their college athletic career. This variable was designed to examine athletes experience and the impact of the transfer portal.

NIL Deals

I used a 1 item closed-ended measure to determine whether participants had received an NIL deal before. Participants indicated whether they had ever received an NIL deal by answering yes or no. This variable was designed to examine NIL deals influence on the college athlete experience.

Socialization

I adopted and adapted the 25-item scale used to measure socialization based on previous research (Myers & Oetzel, 2003). This scale contained five sections of five items, each targeting different aspects of college athletes' socialization process (Familiarity with Others, Acculturation, Recognition, Role Competency, and Adaptation). An item example for Familiarity with Others was "I consider my teammates friends." An item example for Role Competency was "My role on this team is very clear." I used a 7-point Likert Scale to measure all items, with higher scores demonstrating more efficient socialization.

Satisfaction

I used two scales to measure college athletes' satisfaction. The first scale consisted of 21 items adopted and adapted based on previous research (Weiss et al., 1967). A few item examples from this scale were "Playing Time" and "Chance to Win." The second scale consisted of 20 items adopted and adapted based on previous research (Stanton et al., 2002). This scale consisted of five sections of four items, each targeting different influential aspects of college athletes' satisfaction (Work, Pay, Promotion, Coaches, and Teammates). An item example for Pay was "Underpaid." An example for Coaches was "Bad." I used a 7-point Likert Scale to measure all items, with higher scores demonstrating a higher level of satisfaction.

Coach-Athlete Relationship

I used two scales to measure the Coach-Athlete Relationship. The first scale consisted of eight items adopted and adapted from previous research (Scandura & Graen, 1984). An item example from this scale was “You usually know where you stand with your coaches.” Another item example was “I have a strong and positive relationship with my coaches.” The second scale used consisted of four items adopted and adapted based on previous research (Van der Wal et al., 2016). In this scale, each item targeted a different aspect of the Coach-Athlete Relationship (Specific Instructions, Global Instructions, Two-Way Communication, and Mutual Decision-Making). The item for Specific Instructions was “My coaches tell me exactly how, where, and when to perform tasks.” The item example for Mutual Decision-Making was “The coaches respect the players and make mutual decisions with them.” I used a 7-point Likert Scale to measure all items, with higher scores demonstrating stronger and more positive Coach-Athlete Relationships.

Intent to Stay

College Athletes’ Intent to Stay with their organization was measured on a 10-item scale adapted based on previous research (Hinshaw & Atwood, 1985). An item example from this scale was “I intend to stay with my current team.” Another item example was “I have major doubts about whether or not I will stay in this organization.” I used a 7-point Likert Scale to measure all items, with higher scores demonstrating a higher intent to leave.

Results

The results of this study seek to answer two research questions and test one hypothesis. Bivariate correlations, analyses of variance, and regressions were run on SPSS to examine the

relationships between several variables, including age, gender, number of teams/the transfer portal, NIL deals, satisfaction, socialization, coach-athlete relationships, and intent to stay (See Table 1).

Influence of Transfer Portal and NIL Deals

RQ1 aimed to understand how NIL deals and the transfer portal have influenced the socialization process of college athletes. To answer this research question, I first split participants into two age groups (over 29 and under 29). I specifically chose 29 years of age as the cut off because the Transfer portal was introduced in 2018 (7 years ago) and the oldest athletes at that time were likely about 22 years old. Therefore, one of these groups were athletes prior to the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals (over 29), whereas the other group (under 29) were athletes who played after the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals. In addition, I had participants answer whether they had ever received NIL money before. I then separated participants into two groups (yes and no) and ran a MANOVA test to see if there was any relationship between these variables and college athletes' socialization. Based on the data analysis, the results revealed that Age had no significant effect on any of the socialization components ($Wilks' Lambda = 0.79, F(7, 20) = 0.78, p = .61$). Furthermore, NIL deals had no significant effect on any of the socialization components ($Wilks' Lambda = 0.80, F(7, 20) = .73, p = .65$), but they did significantly predict Weiss Satisfaction (See Table 2). I also tested RQ1 by looking at the relationship between the number of teams participants reported playing for, and their socialization. MANOVA results revealed a statistically significant result between number of teams and familiarity socialization ($Wilks' Lambda = 0.69, F(10, 74) = 1.53, p = .15$) (See Table 3).

Factors Impacting Athletes' Intent to Stay

RQ2 aimed to better understand how satisfaction with various motivating and hygiene factors influenced athletes' decisions to stay or leave their organization. NIL deals can be considered as a hygiene factor. An analysis of variance revealed that receiving NIL deals did not have a statistically significant effect on intent to stay (See Table 4).

Socialization can be seen as both a motivating and hygiene factor. I used regression tests to examine the relationship between athletes' socialization and their intent to stay with their organization. The results were statistically significant, and collectively, the five socialization components explained 45% of the variation in athletes' intent to stay or transfer (See Table 4).

College athletes' overall satisfaction was also a key predictor of their intent to stay with their organization. Recall that I measured satisfaction in two different ways. A correlation analysis test showed both satisfaction scales as highly correlated ($r = .88, p < .001$) and collectively they demonstrated a significant positive relationship with athletes' intent to stay with their organization (See Table 4). According to the linear regression test, satisfaction accounted for 27% of the variance in athletes' intent to stay (See Table 4).

Another regression test revealed a significant relationship between the number of organizations an athlete had played for and their intent to stay (See Table 4). In other words, the more teams a college athlete played for, the higher their intent to transfer/leave their current sports organization ($\beta = -0.45, p = .02$) (See Table 4).

H1 focused on the coach-athlete relationship (CAR). Neither CAR scale significantly predicted intent to stay (See Table 4). A regression test revealed that the CAR was not an indicator of intent to stay ($F(2, 26) = 1.22, p = .31, R^2 = .09$). Therefore, H1 was not supported. However, it is worth noting that both CAR scales significantly predicted college athletes'

satisfaction (See Table 5). The LMX-MDM CAR scale significantly predicted Weiss Satisfaction, whereas the Van der Wal CAR scale significantly predicted JDI Satisfaction (See Table 5).

Additional Findings

In addition to my research questions or hypotheses, I explored the relationship between socialization and satisfaction. College athletes' socialization (all 5 components) was highlighted as a significant predictor of satisfaction (See Table 6). According to the regression test, the corrected model with all five socialization components explained 79% of the variance in Weiss Satisfaction and 65% of the variance in JDI Satisfaction (See Table 6). More specifically, acculturation and recognition significantly predicted satisfaction on both scales, adaptation predicted satisfaction on one scale (Weiss), while familiarity and role clarity did not predict satisfaction on either scale (See Table 6).

Another additional finding was a significant difference in socialization for women versus men. The multivariate MANOVA test did not show a significant relationship between gender and socialization ($Wilks' \Lambda = .56, F(8,20) = 1.98, p = .10, partial \eta^2 = .44$), but a univariate ANOVA test revealed that compared to men, women reported significantly lower levels of recognition, role clarity, and adaptation (See Table 7). These results indicate that women have a harder time clarifying their roles, adapting, and getting recognition within their sports organizations. Women also reported significantly lower satisfaction scores on both scales than men but were not significantly more likely to transfer (See Table 7).

Discussion

The Impact of the Transfer Portal, NIL Deals, and Gender on College Athletes'

Socialization

One of the goals of this study was to examine how the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals impacts college athletes' socialization. Contrary to expectations, the results underscored no significant change in college athletes' socialization process in the past six years since the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals. Whether an athlete had received NIL money before did not significantly impact their socialization process. This result could be explained by how NIL deals don't have a team impact because they are typically not collective. However, the number of teams a college athlete played for had a significant negative relationship with the familiarity component of socialization. In other words, the more teams an athlete played for, the harder it was for them to be familiar with their current organization. This finding is important because socialization was a significant predictor of athletes' satisfaction, backing previous research where lower socialization scores resulted in decreased satisfaction (Anderson et al., 2009; Kowsikka & James, 2019; Song et al., 2015). Gender was also a significant factor in the socialization process. Women demonstrated lower socialization scores than men (recognition, role clarity, and adaptation). Furthermore, women were significantly less satisfied with their sports organizations compared to men. Since socialization was a significant predictor of athletes' satisfaction, it is possible that women's lower satisfaction scores could be caused by a lack of socialization. Additionally, since NIL deals were a significant predictor of satisfaction, it is also possible that female athletes are less satisfied due to the lack of NIL deals and opportunities available to them.

The Relationship between the CAR and College Athletes' Satisfaction

Although the results of this study indicated that collectively the CAR scales significantly predicted both Weiss and JDI satisfaction, when examined individually, the results differed. More specifically, the LMX-MDM CAR scale significantly predicted Weiss Satisfaction, whereas the Van der Wal CAR scale did not. On the other hand, the Van der Wal CAR scale significantly predicted JDI Satisfaction, whereas the LMX-MDM CAR scale did not. These results can be explained by the difference in scale items. The LMX-MDM CAR scale items focused more on interpersonal connection, whereas the Van der Wal CAR scale focused more on task completion. For instance, one of the scale items for the LMX-MDM CAR scale was “You usually know where you stand with your coaches,” whereas a scale item for the Van der Wal CAR scale was “My coaches tell me exactly how, where, and when to perform tasks.” Similarly, the items on the satisfaction scales differed in focus. The Weiss satisfaction scale focused on relationships and team culture, whereas the JDI satisfaction scale focused on work conditions and performance. For instance, a scale item from the Weiss satisfaction scale was “The way my coaches and teammates handle adversity,” whereas a scale item from the JDI satisfaction scale was “Good chance for promotion.” Based on the items in each of these scales, the LMX-MDM CAR scale aligns more with Weiss Satisfaction, and the Van der Wal CAR scale aligns more with JDI satisfaction. Therefore, it makes sense why each CAR scale predicts satisfaction differently.

Predictors of College Athletes’ Intent to Stay with their Organization

Another goal of this study was to explore college athletes’ satisfaction with motivating and hygiene factors and how that influenced their intent to stay with their organization. Satisfaction showed to be a significant predictor of athletes’ intent to stay with their organization. In other words, the more satisfied athletes were with the motivating and hygiene

factors provided by their organization, the more likely they intended on staying. In addition, there was a significant positive relationship between socialization and athletes' intent to stay with their organization, where higher socialization scores equated to higher intent on staying. More specifically, recognition, acculturation, and adaptation were all significant predictors of athletes' intent to stay with their teams. Although NIL deals could be classified under recognition, they were not a significant predictor of athletes' intent to stay with their organizations. However, the transfer portal did impact athletes' intent to stay, as once an athlete transferred once they were more likely to do it again. While not what I hypothesized, the CAR was not a significant predictor of athletes' intent to stay with their organization, but it did significantly predict athletes' satisfaction with their organization. Perhaps when considering leaving a sports organization, there are more important motivating and hygiene factors than the CAR and NIL deals.

Theoretical Implications: Re-Evaluating the CAR and Socialization for Women

Although this study's results did not reveal a significant change in college athletes' socialization process in the past six years since the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals, they do provide some valuable theoretical and practical implications. Starting with the theoretical implications, the results suggest we re-evaluate the significance of the CAR. This study challenges the notion that the CAR is the driving factor in college athlete retention. That being said, the CAR may still be important since it was significantly correlated with satisfaction, which supports previous research (Dwyer & Fischer, 1990; Kassing & Infante, 1999). In addition, college athletes' satisfaction was a predictor of intent to stay, which also supports previous research (Bryant, 2018; Dinham & Scott, 1998; Hinshaw & Atwood, 1985; Kacel et al., 2005; Koelbel et al., 1991). However, since the CAR did not significantly predict athletes' intent to

stay with their organization, future models should examine other motivating factors, such as teammates and culture. Overall, the focus of retention should be shifted from the individual experience to the collective team experience.

Regarding collective experience, the results underscored women's struggle to socialize and be satisfied with their sports organization. This data is pivotal because it opens the door for critical scholars to build on existing research and further explore the role gender plays in how athletes integrate into sports organizations (Bauer & Erdogan, 2011). Additionally, this concept can be extended to the workforce or other organizations, where women may also have a harder time than men in socializing (Tabassum & Nayak, 2021; Rudman & Phelan, 2008). Scholars can examine factors as to why women may not be as satisfied with their organizations as men. For example, as past studies suggest, maybe societal norms, unfair promotions, or issues with peers are keeping women from socializing and being satisfied (Avery & McKay, 2006; Ely, 1994; Kanter, 1993; Ridgeway, 2002). However, even with lower socialization and satisfaction scores, women were no more likely to leave their organization than men. There is limited research on the effect of gender on organizational commitment, but some research has shown women to have higher commitment scores than men (Wahn, 1998), while other research has shown men to have higher organizational commitment scores than women (Marsden et al., 1993). Overall, future research should further investigate the relationship between gender and relational commitment. Perhaps women lack alternative options and the sense of agency to leave organizations, or maybe the struggle has become a norm and increased their threshold for organizational adversity.

Practical Implications: Improving Athlete Retention and Support for Female Athletes

The main practical implication of this study is how we can use socialization to retain college athletes and support female athletes. While we have seen players follow their coaches to

new teams via the transfer portal (Bonagura et al., 2023) compared to socialization, the CAR was a non-factor in retaining college athletes. Socialization was a key component in athletes' satisfaction with their organization. If sports organizations want to combat the transfer portal, retain their athletes, and improve athletes' satisfaction (specifically females), then they need to improve the socialization process. Ironically, one way to do this is by increasing the relational quality among organizational members, including both teammates and coaches. Interpersonal relationships have been shown to increase employees' job satisfaction and decrease their turnover intentions (Morrison, 2004). Mentorships such as the "Big Buddy" system where each newcomer gets paired up with a more experienced member, or team activities like dinners and movie nights are common practices among a variety of organizations. These practices allow organizational members to build relationships inside and outside the organization, increasing the quality of interpersonal relationships. Theoretically, by improving the quality of interpersonal relationships, organizations can increase their members satisfaction, thereby also increasing members organizational commitment.

Another way to increase the socialization process and athletes' satisfaction, specifically females, is through recognition. While participation trophies may not be the answer, both genders of athletes need to feel valued. NIL deals are one form of recognition, but there are a variety of ways to make athletes feel appreciated and respected. One way is by having monthly check-ins with athletes and providing them with resources such as mental health counseling and academic tutors. Another common practice is regularly handing out awards such as a "Game Ball" at the end of each game or having a "Player of the Week." While the CAR didn't predict athletes' intent to stay, it did predict their satisfaction, and coaches play an important role in team-building, socialization, and recognition. Therefore, it is critical that women have visible

female role models within the organization to look up to, relate to, and talk to. In other words, sports organizations need to make sure they are recognizing their female athletes and female leaders. Overall, many sports organizations express that they want to be like a family, but that kind of bond only happens through social interaction, fairness, and recognition.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

Although this research provided some valuable implications, there are a few limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. This study had a rather small sample size which makes the findings of this study less generalizable. While there was diversity in gender, age, and sports played, a larger sample size could have examined some smaller effects and produced more significant results. This study also only looked at divisional college athletes, which excluded any club sport athletes. Future studies should include more athletes from different competition levels to gain a more holistic understanding of athletes' socialization, satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Another limitation of this study is that the data was collected through a self-reported survey, which allows for potential response bias. It is possible that participants struggled to accurately recall past experiences, especially the older participants who were athletes prior to the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals. Future research could use interviews to eliminate bias and better understand how these new rules and have impacted college athletes. For instance, scholars can explore how losing a teammate to the transfer portal effects college athletes' socialization, satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Furthermore, future research should use longitudinal studies to examine the causal relationships between the transfer portal, NIL deals, gender, socialization, satisfaction, and intent to stay. Overall, this research would provide valuable insights as to how rule changes can alter athletes' socialization, satisfaction, and loyalty to their organization.

Conclusion

This study found that socialization was a significant predictor of college athletes' satisfaction and intent to stay with their organization. Although the addition of the transfer portal and NIL deals did not significantly alter college athletes' socialization process, there were notable differences between the socialization process for women and men. Compared to male athletes, female athletes reported lower socialization scores amongst all socialization components, which may explain their significantly lower satisfaction scores. However, this research highlighted socialization as a key factor for keeping athletes satisfied and retaining them. Additionally, the findings from this study underscore the importance of forming interpersonal relationships within organizations. College athletics are progressive, meaning they are constantly evolving, and there is still a gap in understanding how these evolutions can change the college athlete experience. Sports organizations as well as other organizations, like business corporations, typically strive to not only retain their athletes/employees, but also keep them satisfied. Overall, to accomplish these satisfaction and retention goals, organizations must form a supportive culture that encourages social interaction and enhances the socialization process for both men and women.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., & Riddle, B. L. (2001). Attitudes, style, and socialization: Predictors of commitment and satisfaction in workgroups. *Communication Research Reports, 18*(3), 241–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090109384804>
- Avery, D. R., & McKay, P. F. (2006). Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology, 59*(1), 157–187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2006.00807.x>
- Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 707–721. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.707>
- Bauer, T. N., & Erdogan, B. (2011). Organizational socialization: The effective onboarding of new employees. *American Psychological Association, 3*(2) 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-002>
- Benson, A. J., Evans, M. B., & Eys, M. A. (2016). Organizational socialization in team sport environments. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 26*(4), 463–473. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.12460>
- Bonagura, K., Rittenberg, A., & Adelson, A. (2023). Inside Deion Sanders' roster remake at Colorado football. ESPN. https://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/38279763/inside-deion-sanders-roster-remake-colorado-football

- Browning, B., & Kassing, J. (2011). "We aren't looking at this as an audition": Exploring interim leadership in college athletics. In SAGE Business Cases. SAGE Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.4.4.514>
- Bryant, O. A. (2018). Employee turnover in the long-term care industry using Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i4/3997>
- Coakley, J. (2009). *Sport in society: Issues & controversies* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Cranmer, G., Anzur, C., & Sollitto, M. (2016). Memorable messages of social support that former high school athletes received from their head coaches. *Communication & Sport*, 5, 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479516641934>
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1990.tb00174.x>
- Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1998). A three-domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 362-378.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810211545>
- Dwyer, J. J. M., & Fischer, D. G. (1990). Wrestlers' perceptions of coaches' leadership as predictors of satisfaction with leadership. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 71(2), 511-517.
<https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1990.71.2.511>
- Ely, R. J. (1994). The effects of organizational demographics and social identity on relationships among professional women. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39(2), 203–238.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2393234>

- Fin, C. (2024). UNLV running back leaving program over on-field opportunities. *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. <https://www.reviewjournal.com/sports/unlv/unlv-football/unlv-running-back-leaving-program-over-on-field-opportunities-3176937/>
- Fontana, J. L., Cranmer, G. A., & Sollitto, M. (2021). “Next person up”: Understanding collegiate student-athletes’ socialization experiences with teammate exit. *Communication & Sport*, 9(2), 308-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479519859864>
- Hinshaw, A. S., & Atwood, J. R. (1985). Testing a theoretical model for job satisfaction and anticipated turnover of nursing staff. *Nursing Research*, 34(6). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-40453-9_6
- Holston-Okae, B., & Mushi, R. (2018). Employee turnover in the hospitality industry using Herzberg’s two-factor motivation-hygiene theory. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v8-i1/3805>
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing Company.
- Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective*, 679–740. SAGE Publications.
- Jablin, F. M., & Putnam, L. L. (2001). *The new handbook of organizational communication*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412986243>
- Kacel, B., Miller, M., & Norris, D. (2005). Measurement of nurse practitioner job satisfaction in a midwestern state. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, 17(1), 27-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1041-2972.2005.00007.x>

- 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*(5), 779–794. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.779>
- Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation: New edition*. Basic Books.
- Kassing, J. W., & Infante, D. A. (1999). Aggressive communication in the coach–athlete relationship. *Communication Research Reports, 16*(2), 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099909388708>
- Klein, H. J., Polin, B., & Sutton, K. L. (2015). Specific onboarding practices for the socialization of new employees. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 23*(3), 263–283. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12113>
- Koelbel, P. W., Fuller, S. G., & Misener, T. R. (1991). Job satisfaction of nurse practitioners: An analysis using Herzberg's theory. *The Nurse Practitioner, 16*(4), 43–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7599.1991.tb01054.x>
- Kramer, M. W. (1993). Communication and uncertainty reduction during job transfers: Leaving and joining processes. *Communication Monographs, 60*(2), 178–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759309376307>
- Kramer, M. W. (1994). Uncertainty reduction during job transitions: An exploratory study of the communication experiences of newcomers and transferees. *Management Communication Quarterly, 7*(4), 384–412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318994007004002>
- Kramer, M. W. (1995). A longitudinal study of superior-subordinate communication during job transfers. *Human Communication Research, 22*(1), 39–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1995.tb00361.x>

- Kowsikka, F. M. J. J., & James, R. (2019). Newcomers' socialization: The proactive behaviors, satisfaction, and social integration. *Journal of Business Studies*, 6(1), 89-107.
<https://doi.org/10.4038/jbs.v6i1.44>
- Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2009). Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 890-899. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.003>
- Maanen, J. V., & Schein, E. H. (1977). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 209-264. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/1934>
- Marsden, P., Kalleberg, A., & Cook, C. (1993). Gender differences in organizational commitment: Influences of work positions and family roles. *Work and Occupations*, 20(3), 368-390.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888493020003005>
- Morrison, R. (2004). Informal relationships in the workplace: Associations with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(3), 114–128. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2005-00385-003>
- Myers, K., & Oetzel, J. (2003). Exploring the dimensions of organizational assimilation: Creating and validating a measure. *Communication Quarterly*, 51(3), 438-457.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370309370166>
- NBC Sports. (2024). College football transfer portal tracker. NBC Sports.
<https://www.nbcsports.com/college-football/news/college-football-transfer-portal-tracker>

- NCAA. (2023). Transfer portal data: Division I student-athlete transfer trends. NCAA.
<https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2022/4/25/transfer-portal-data-division-i-student-athlete-transfer-trends.aspx>
- Nickerson, C. (2023). Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation-hygiene. *Simply Psychology*.
- Olson, E. (2024). UNLV's Sluka reflects on what happened and what's next. AP News.
<https://apnews.com/article/unlv-sluka-what-happened-5237f0dba1c523d2d0e74523c7f64a4e>
- Olson, M., & Bonagura, K. (2024, October 17). How UNLV became the unlikely center of the college football universe. ESPN. https://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/41532905/unlv-pac-12-mountain-west-nil-dispute-matthew-sluka
- Raabe, J., Zakrajsek, R. A., & Readdy, T. (2016). Teammate influence on collegiate swimmers' basic psychological need satisfaction: A qualitative perspective. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 9, 27-49. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2015-0016>
- Rey, R., Cranmer, G., Browning, B., & Sanderson, J. (2021). Sport knowledge: The effects of Division I coach communication on student-athlete learning indicators. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 15(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.2021-0062>
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, status, and leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 637-655.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00233>
- Rudman, L. A., & Phelan, J. E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 61-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.04.003>

- Scandura, T. A., & Graen, G. B. (1984). Moderating effects of initial leader-member exchange status on the effects of a leadership intervention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 428-436.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.428>
- Schlabach, M. (2024). How Vanderbilt turned to New Mexico State for the coaches and QB who helped beat Alabama. ESPN. https://www.espn.com/college-football/story/_/id/41671222/vanderbilt-alabama-upset-diego-pavia-clark-lea
- Song, Z., Chon, K., Ding, G., & Gu, C. (2015). Impact of organizational socialization tactics on newcomer job satisfaction and engagement: Core self-evaluations as moderators. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 49, 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.02.006>
- Snyder, E. E. (1970). Aspects of socialization in sports and physical education. *Quest*, 14(1), 1–7.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1970.10519683>
- Stanton, J. M., Sinar, E. F., Balzer, W. K., Julian, A. L., Thoresen, P. L., Aziz, S., Fisher, G. W., & Smith, P. C. (2002). Development of a compact measure of job satisfaction: The Abridged Job Descriptive Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 62(1), 173-191.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316440206200112>
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 457–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639902500308>
- Tabassum, N., & Nayak, B. S. (2021). Gender stereotypes and their impact on women’s career progressions from a managerial perspective. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review*, 10(2), 192-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2277975220975513>

- Udechukwu, I. I. (2009). Correctional officer turnover: Of Maslow's needs hierarchy and Herzberg's motivation theory. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2), 69–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600903800205>
- van der Wal, R. A., Bucx, M. J., Hendriks, J. C., Scheffer, G. J., & Prins, J. B. (2016). Psychological distress, burnout, and personality traits in Dutch anaesthesiologists: A survey. *European Journal of Anaesthesiology*, 33(3), 179–186. <https://doi.org/10.1097/EJA.0000000000000375>
- Wahn, J. C. (1998). Sex differences in the continuance component of organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Management*, 23(3), 256–266.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601198233004>
- Weiss, M. R., & Friedrichs, W. D. (1986). The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams. *The Journal of Sport Psychology*, 8(4), 332-346.
- Zanin, A. C., & Bisel, R. S. (2018). Discursive positioning and collective resistance: How managers can unwittingly co-create team resistance. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 32(1), 31-59.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917717640>

APPENDICES

Tables

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations of Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Intent	5.35	1.10	.84	–									
2. JDI Satisfaction	4.91	0.73	.85	.52**	–								
3. Weiss Satisfaction	5.70	1.12	.96	.49**	.88**	–							
4. Adaptation	4.91	0.96	.67	.58**	.67**	.73**	–						
5. Role Clarity	5.26	0.97	.54	.02	.17	.35*	.12	–					
6. Recognition	5.45	0.96	.69	.41*	.63**	.75**	.52**	.43*	–				
7. Acculturation	6.38	0.67	.85	.37*	.62**	.63**	.55**	.25	.38*	–			
8. Familiarity	6.19	0.89	.84	.52**	.37**	.37**	.28	.13	.36*	.23	–		
9. LMX-MDM CAR	5.07	1.24	.91	.23	.70**	.78**	.66**	.49**	.60**	.40*	.13	–	
10. Van der Wal CAR	5.20	1.19	.79	.29	.71**	.73**	.57**	.43**	.69**	.41*	.11	.75**	–

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2: MANOVA: Impact of Transfer Portal and NIL Deals on Socialization and Satisfaction

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Acculturation	Age Group	29	6.39	0.51	(1, 26)	0.003	.955	.000
	NIL	29	6.39	0.51	(1, 26)	1.244	.275	.046
Familiarity	Age Group	29	6.17	0.90	(1, 26)	0.091	.766	.003
	NIL	29	6.17	0.90	(1, 26)	0.011	.917	.000
Recognition	Age Group	29	5.54	1.01	(1, 26)	2.454	.129	.086
	NIL	29	5.54	1.01	(1, 26)	3.128	.089	.107
Role	Age Group	29	5.34	0.85	(1, 26)	1.205	.282	.044
	NIL	29	5.34	0.85	(1, 26)	1.539	.226	.056
Adaptation	Age Group	29	4.88	1.03	(1, 26)	1.831	.188	.066
	NIL	29	4.88	1.03	(1, 26)	1.591	.218	.058
Weiss Satisfaction	Age Group	29	5.66	1.18	(1, 26)	0.474	.497	.018
	NIL	29	5.66	1.18	(1, 26)	4.266	.049*	.141
JDI Satisfaction	Age Group	29	4.85	0.75	(1, 26)	0.000	.995	.000
	NIL	29	4.85	0.75	(1, 26)	1.737	.199	.063

Note. * $p < .05$

Table 3: MANOVA: Number of Teams Played for and Socialization

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	N	M	SD	Df	F	p	Partial η^2
Acculturation	Number of Teams							
	1	30	6.42	0.51				
	2	2	5.88	0.88				
	4 or more	1	6.50	—				
	Total	33	6.39	0.53	(2, 41)	0.83	.443	.04
Familiarity	1	30	6.33	0.59				
	2	2	4.30	2.40				
	4 or more	1	4.60	—				
	Total	33	6.15	0.90	(2, 41)	7.08	.002*	.26
	Recognition	1	30	5.63	0.98			
2		2	5.10	1.27				
4 or more		1	4.80	—				
Total		33	5.58	0.98	(2, 41)	0.62	.546	.03
Role		1	30	5.27	0.91			
	2	2	5.25	0.71				
	4 or more	1	5.25	—				
	Total	33	5.27	0.88	(2, 41)	0.00	1.00	.00
	Adaptation	1	30	4.97	1.02			
2		2	4.10	0.14				
4 or more		1	4.20	—				
Total		33	4.90	1.00	(2, 41)	0.76	.475	.04

Note. * $p < .05$. Missing SD (—) reflects $n = 1$.

Table 4: Linear Regression Analysis: Factors Predicting Intent to Stay

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Model B	SE B	β	t	p
Intent	(Constant)	1.852	1.286	—	1.440	.162
	Weiss Satisfaction	0.116	0.408	0.121	0.283	.779
	JDI Satisfaction	0.580	0.614	0.405	0.944	.354
	R²	.269				
	F	F(2, 26) = 4.79				.017*
Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Model B	SE B	β	t	p
Intent	(Constant)	0.257	2.233	—	0.115	.909
	Acculturation	0.085	0.367	0.042	0.230	.820
	Familiarity	0.401	0.210	0.341	1.906	.069
	Recognition	0.033	0.266	0.030	0.126	.901
	Role Clarity	-0.054	0.224	-0.045	-0.242	.811
	Adaptation	0.445	0.228	0.419	1.951	.063
	R²	.450				
F	F(5, 23) = 3.76				.012*	
Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Model B	SE B	β	t	p
Intent	(Constant)	3.944	0.945	—	4.172	<.001*
	CAR_1	0.015	0.246	0.017	0.060	.952
	CAR_2	0.256	0.257	0.280	0.996	.329
	R²	.086				
	F	F(2, 26) = 1.22				.312
Intent	(Constant)	9.819	1.900	—	5.169	<.001*
	Number of Colleges	-1.117	0.438	-0.447	-2.550	.017*
	NIL	0.118	0.443	0.046	0.265	.793
	R²	.202				
F	F(2, 26) = 3.28				.054*	

Note. * $p < .05$

Table 5: MANOVA: CAR Impact on Satisfaction and Socialization

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	N	M	SD	Df	F	p	Partial η^2
LMX-MDM CAR	Weiss Satisfaction	30	5.63	1.14	(1, 27)	9.57	.005*	.262
	JDI Satisfaction	30	4.93	.76	(1, 27)	4.04	.055	.130
	Acculturation	30	6.38	.54	(1, 27)	.69	.414	.025
	Familiarity	30	6.15	.93	(1, 27)	.17	.681	.006
	Recognition	30	5.51	.98	(1, 27)	.96	.336	.034
	Role	30	5.21	.90	(1, 27)	2.19	.151	.075
	Adaptation	30	4.92	1.04	(1, 27)	6.05	.021*	.183
Van der Wal CAR	Weiss Satisfaction	30	5.63	1.14	(1, 27)	3.73	.064	.121
	JDI Satisfaction	30	4.93	.76	(1, 27)	5.21	.031*	.162
	Acculturation	30	6.38	.54	(1, 27)	.89	.355	.032
	Familiarity	30	6.15	.93	(1, 27)	.004	.953	.000
	Recognition	30	5.51	.98	(1, 27)	6.85	.014*	.202
	Role	30	5.21	.90	(1, 27)	.38	.545	.014
	Adaptation	30	4.92	1.04	(1, 27)	.62	.437	.023

Note: * $p < .05$.

Table 6: Regression Analysis: Socialization Components Predicting Satisfaction

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	Model B	SE B	β	t	p
Weiss Satisfaction	(Constant)	-3.72	1.30	—	-2.86	.008*
	Acculturation	0.74	0.22	.35	3.46	.002*
	Familiarity	-0.07	0.13	-.06	-0.59	.562
	Recognition	0.47	0.16	.41	3.00	.006*
	Role Clarity	0.12	0.14	.09	0.85	.402
	Adaptation	0.39	0.13	.35	2.95	.006*
	R²					
	F	F(5, 27) = 20.77				<.001*
JDI Satisfaction	(Constant)	-0.60	1.11	---	-0.54	.592
	Acculturation	0.52	0.18	.38	2.84	.008*
	Familiarity	-0.02	0.11	-.03	-0.23	.821
	Recognition	0.28	0.13	.38	2.12	.043*
	Role Clarity	-0.06	0.12	-.07	-0.48	.632
	Adaptation	0.22	0.11	.30	1.95	.062
	R²					
	F	F(5,27) = 10.01				<.001*

Note: * $p < .05$.

Table 7: MANOVA: Gender Difference in Satisfaction, Socialization, and Intent

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Gender	N	M	SD	Df	F	p	Partial η^2
Gender	Weiss Satisfaction	Male	22	5.98	0.89	(1, 27)	13.707	<.001*	.337
		Female	7	4.44	1.16				
		Total	29	5.61	1.16				
	JDI Satisfaction	Male	22	5.12	0.63	(1, 27)	9.028	.006*	.251
		Female	7	4.24	0.84				
		Total	29	4.91	0.77				
	Acculturation	Male	22	6.49	0.56	(1, 27)	3.373	.077	.111
		Female	7	6.07	0.35				
		Total	29	6.39	0.55				
	Familiarity	Male	22	6.31	0.98	(1, 27)	1.999	.169	.069
		Female	7	5.74	0.69				
		Total	29	6.17	0.94				
	Recognition	Male	22	5.76	0.72	(1, 27)	10.524	.003*	.280
		Female	7	4.57	1.20				
		Total	29	5.48	0.98				
	Role	Male	22	5.39	0.79	(1, 27)	4.337	.047*	.138
		Female	7	4.61	1.07				
		Total	29	5.20	0.91				
	Adaptation	Male	22	5.11	0.97	(1, 27)	4.953	.035*	.155
		Female	7	4.17	0.96				
		Total	29	4.88	1.04				
	Intent	Male	22	5.40	1.10	(1, 27)	0.261	.614	.010
		Female	7	5.16	1.17				
		Total	29	5.34	1.10				

Note. * $p < .05$.

Scales

All following Items were measured using a 7-Point Likert Scale

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Somewhat Agree
4. Neither Agree nor Disagree
5. Somewhat Disagree
6. Disagree
7. Strongly Disagree

Socialization Items

Familiarity with Others

- I consider my teammates friends
- I feel comfortable talking with my teammates and coaches
- I spend time with my teammates outside of games and practice
- I avoid conversations with teammates and coaches whenever possible
- I feel like I know my coaches and teammates well

Acculturation

- I know what is expected to succeed in this organization.
- I understand the standards and values of this team.
- I feel a part of and identify with this organization
- I feel very comfortable in my team environment.
- I am tense in my team environment.

Recognition

- My good work is appreciated by my coaches and teammates
- I feel heard by my coaches and teammates
- My coaches and teammates do not recognize the good work I do.
- I do not think I can perform as well as others.
- I think the work I do would be missed if I quit.

Role Competency

- I sometimes feel overwhelmed trying to figure out my role on the team
- My role on this team is very clear.
- I often feel as though I need someone to tell me how to do my job
- I think I could train someone to take on my team role
- I think I'm an expert at what I do

Adaptation

- I think I have adapted to my organization's expectations.
- I question why we do things the way we do at this organization.
- I would like to change some of the organization's standards.
- I feel that my personal goals align with the team's overall goals.

- It has been difficult for me to fit into this organization.

Weiss Satisfaction Items

- The chance to work as a team
- The chance to do different things from time to time
- The chance to be “somebody” on the team
- The way my coaches and teammates handle adversity
- The competence of my supervisor in making decisions
- Being able to do things that don't go against my beliefs
- Stability of your role on team
- Playing time
- Team Culture
- The chance to build relationships with other people
- The chance to be a leader
- The chance to do something that showcases my abilities
- The way team policies are put into practice
- The pay and the amount of work that I do
- The chance for advancement on this team
- The chance to win
- Autonomy/The freedom to use my own judgment
- The working conditions
- The way my coaches and teammates get along with each other
- The praise I get for doing a good job
- The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job

JDI Satisfaction Items

- Work 1. Gives sense of accomplishment
- Work 2. Satisfying
- Work 3. Uninteresting
- Work 4. Challenging
- Pay 1. Fair
- Pay 2. Underpaid
- Pay 3. Income adequate for normal expenses
- Pay 4. Well paid
- Promotion 1. Good chance for promotion
- Promotion 2. Dead-end job
- Promotion 3. Promotion on ability
- Promotion 4. Unfair promotion policy
- Coaches 1. Praises good work
- Coaches 2. Annoying
- Coaches 3. Tactful
- Coaches 4. Bad
- Teammates 1. Helpful

- Teammates 2. Intelligent
- Teammates 3. Lazy
- Teammates 4. Responsible

Coach Athlete Relationship/LMX-MDM

- You usually know where you stand with your coaches
- You typically know how satisfied your coaches are with what you do
- How well do you feel that your coaches understand your problems and needs
- How well do you feel that your coaches recognize your potential
- Regardless of how much formal authority your coaches have built into their position, you count on them to help you out when you really need it
- I have enough confidence in my immediate supervisor that I would defend and justify his or her decisions if he or she were not present to do so
- I have a strong and positive relationship with my coaches
- My relationship with my coaches impacts my satisfaction with the team

Coach Athlete Satisfaction (Van der Wal et al., 2016)

- “My coaches tell me exactly how, where, and when to perform tasks” (specific instructions)
- “My coaches give general directions to succeed” (global instructions).
- “There is a two-way communication with my coaches and I” (two-way communication)
- “The coaches respect the players and make mutual decisions with them” (mutual decision-making)

Intent to Quit (Hinshaw and Atwood, 1983)

- Item 1—I intend to stay with my current team
- Item 2—I am unsatisfied and almost certain that I will leave this team in the near future.
- Item 3—Deciding whether to stay or leave my team is not an essential issue for me at this time.
- Item 4— I am committed to working with my teammates and coaches to achieve our collective goals.
- Item 5—If I were to receive an offer from another team tomorrow, I would seriously consider it.
- Item 6—I have no intention of leaving my current team.
- Item 7—I have been a part of this organization for as long as I want to be.
- Item 8—The relationships I’ve built within my organization make me want to stay with this team.
- Item 9—I have major doubts about whether or not I will stay in this organization.
- Item 10—My needs are not being met as an athlete. I plan to transfer teams.

VITA

Peyton Carey graduated from Servite High School in 2019 before earning a Bachelor of Arts in both Political Science and Communication Studies from Texas Christian University in 2023. He also completed a minor in the John V. Roach Honors College. During his undergraduate and graduate studies, Peyton worked a variety of jobs including door-to-door sales, valet parking, Uber driving, and food delivery, which ultimately bettered his understanding of communication and persuasion. In 2025, Peyton earned a Master of Science in Communication Studies from Texas Christian University, specializing in social influence and organizational communication. Throughout his graduate studies, he served as a Teaching Assistant, instructing and mentoring over 170 undergraduate students. Peyton's research interests span from sports communication to health communication to persuasion. He has co-authored a publication with his mentor, Dr. Jie (Jackie) Zhuang, titled "*Compliance with social norms in the face of risks: Delineating the roles of uncertainty about risk perceptions versus risk perceptions,*" and has several other studies currently under peer review.

