



DESIGN AND VALIDATION OF A TOOL TO COLLECT STUDENT-ATHLETES' PERCEPTION OF THEIR SATISFACTION

José M. Palao^{A, C, D}

Department of Department of Health, Kinesiology and Sport Management, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, USA
ORCID: 0000-0002-4332-772X | e-mail: palaojm@gmail.com

Bridget Jost^{B, C, D}

Athletic Department, Madison College (Wisconsin), USA
ORCID: 0009-0008-1046-2096

Janel Katzer^{B, C, D}

Department of Department of Health, Kinesiology and Sport Management, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, USA
ORCID: 0009-0002-7704-4944

Megan Parietti^{A, D}

Department of Department of Health, Kinesiology and Sport Management, University of Wisconsin-Parkside, USA
ORCID: 0009-0004-7787-0239

^A Study Design; ^B Data Collection; ^C Statistical Analysis; ^D Manuscript Preparation

Abstract The purpose of this study was to design and validate a tool to collect the student-athletes' perception of their satisfaction. The instrument collects information regarding student-athlete characteristics, self-perception, perception of training, perception of team/teammates, perception of the program organization, and perception of the support received. The design and validation, of the questionnaire were done in two phases: a) design and development of the instrument, and b) content validation by experts. The results show that the tool is suitable for obtaining information about student-athletes' perception of their satisfaction. The implementation of the tool involves two phases: a) student-athletes completion of a survey, and b) student-athletes and moderator carry out a group discussion regarding the causes behind their answers, things to maintain, and things that could change or improve. The tool developed and validated could contribute to increase the information of student-athletes about their experience and generate communication channels.

Key words: college, sport, tool, student-athlete, perception

Introduction

Higher education plays a vital role in our society by developing individual's knowledge and critical thinking (Miller, 2003). The inclusion of athletics in this equation can enhance the student-athlete's higher education

experience, allowing them to become well-rounded citizens. The practice of sport enables students to develop their character, motivation, endurance, loyalty, and other skills (Duderstadt, 2000). Intercollegiate athletics is regulated by organizations that establishes the rules, policy of eligibility standards, administrative policy, etc. (Renick, 1974). The largest regulating organization in the United States is the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). In 1989, the NCAA instituted a Student-Athlete Advisory Committee (SAAC). The role of this committee is to provide student-athlete input regarding the issues that affect the student-athlete welfare (NCAA, 2015). Each NCAA member institution is required to implement this committee. This committee allows for athletic departments and the NCAA to obtain immediate feedback regarding the effects of the regulation. From a broad perspective, the NCAA has developed tools to assess the student-athletes' satisfaction and experiences. The goal of these assessments, done every five years, is to obtain the student-athletes' perspective to evaluate the effect of the regulation and procedures implemented. There are also research tools to assess the student-athletes' perception that try to generalize the findings and help establish the effect of the regulation on the student-athletes and on the athletic programs. To our knowledge, there is not a universal tool that focuses on obtaining the perceptions of the student-athletes from a qualitative and quantitative perspective to improve their experiences in a specific athletic program. Every history has different perspectives and missing the perspective of the student-athletes can affect the proper evaluation of how education and athletics interact in higher education institutions.

At the institutional level, the NCAA administers studies to gauge student-athlete satisfaction and their athletics, academic, and social experiences while in college, as well as their health and well-being. One assesses recent classes of athletes while the other focuses on former players. These studies are called Growth, Opportunities, Aspirations, and Learning of Students in College (GOALS) and the Study of College Outcomes and Recent Experiences (SCORE), respectively. The SCORE assessment has only been conducted once since its existence in 1994. The results were published in 2005–2006. The GOALS study is conducted approximately every five years, administered in 2006, 2010, 2015, and 2020. For the most recent iteration of the GOALS study there were over 22,000 student-athletes' responses (Durham, 2020) The goal of these assessments is to impart information about the general trends regarding college academic experience, college athletics experience, college social experience, recruitment, health and well-being, time commitments, on-campus support, and finances.

At the research level, there are several valid and reliable tools. The Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ), developed by Riemer and Chelladurai (1998), provides a psychometric scale of the facets that affect student-athletes' satisfaction. This tool is based on the authors' theoretical framework and facets (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997). The following criteria classify a facet: whether it (a) is task- or social-related, (b) is an outcome or a process, and (c) affects the individual or team. This tool differentiates seven categories of facets: individual task outcomes, team task outcomes, individual social outcomes, team social outcomes, individual task processes, team task processes, team social processes, and individual social processes. Examples of other tools available are the "Satisfaction Scale for Athlete" (SSA) (Caliskan & Baydar, 2016), the Adaptation of the "Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire" (Smith, 2010), the "Student Athletes' Motivation toward Sports and Academics Questionnaire" (SAMSAQ) (Gatson-Gayles, 2005), and "Student-Athlete Experiences Inventory" (SAEI) and "Student-Athlete Gains Inventory" (SAGI) (Cox et al., 2004). All these research tools intend to collect valid and reliable information that generalizes the athletes' perceptions.

The approach of the available tools is focused on analyzing general trends or doing research. This paper describes the process of developing a tool that allows specific athletic departments to collect information regarding

their student-athletes' perceptions. The goal of the tool is to elicit their perception as critical starting points that prompt a positive analysis and discussion panel about student-athlete experiences. Student-athletes are key members of a college athletics program. Their perspective of the student-athlete experience is unique. It is crucial to collect data about their experience that provides athletic administrators with actionable data. Currently, within college athletics, the main metrics that are used to measure student-athlete progress are winning/losing percentages, graduation rates, team Grade Point Average (GPA), or Academic Progress Rate (APR) scores. These quantitative metrics do not provide insight into the day-to-day experience of the athletes. The tool intends to combine data from a survey and discussion panel as a starting point to gauge student-athletes' experience at their respective college or university. These combinations of quantitative and qualitative data have the intention to uncover a more in-depth understanding of the athletes' responses. The implication of athletes in the process will augment their involvement and provide perspectives and solutions closer to their realities. The use of this data would allow athletic programs to make necessary improvements to the athletic department's regulations to enhance the student-athlete experience. This study aimed to design and validate a tool to collect the student-athlete's perceptions and satisfaction.

Material and Methods

The design and validation of the questionnaire were done in two stages: a) design and development of the instrument, and b) content validation (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007). The design and development of the instrument involved the use of specific literature about student-athlete satisfaction. Reviews in the following databases were done: ISI Web of Knowledge, Medline, SPORTDiscus, Google Scholar, and EBSCO. The key word searches included: "student-athlete", "satisfaction", "perception", and "evaluation". A review of abstracts was done to select the papers related to the instrument topic. Questionnaires found in the literature (Caliskan & Baydar, 2016; Cox et al., 2004; Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997; Gatson-Gayles, 2005; Smith, 2010), specific literature (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997; Gatson-Gayles, 2005), and literature about creating an original instrument (Hague et al., 2004; Thomas, 2004) were used as guides. In the process of designing the first draft of the survey, the researchers, two student-athletes, and two college coaches participated in the process of selecting the questions, adapting or wording the questions, and clarifying them.

The structure of the tool followed the facets of athlete satisfaction established by Chelladurai & Riemer (1997). The facets differentiate between outcomes and process: self, coaches, team, administration and family/community. Questions were grouped into: student-athletes' characteristics (four questions), student-athlete's self-perception (eight questions), training-perception (fifteen questions), team/teammates-perception (fourteen questions), administration perception (seven questions), and support perception (three questions). For the questions related to socio-demographics of the athletes, open and closed-ended questions were used. For the questions related to student-athlete's self-perception about the facets, the Likert scale (0–10) was used.

In the second stage, the instrument was sent to four experts in fields related to coaching, sociology, and sport management; to 14 college students-athletes of individual and collective sports; and four college coaches of individual and collective sports. They were asked to evaluate qualitative (open questions) and quantitative questions (scale 1–10) from the survey regarding: clarity of the survey's questions; adequacy of the survey's questions; and the necessity to include/exclude questions. The cohorts' suggestions were considered, and appropriate alterations were made. A descriptive analysis of their responses (i.e. mean, median, and mode) was also recorded. Following the framework of Bulger and Housner (2007), questions with values lower than 7.0 were eliminated, questions with

values between 7.1 and 8.0 were modified, and questions with values greater than 8.1 were accepted or accepted with modifications. With the reported values from the quantitative evaluations done by the experts, the Aiken's (V) was calculated (Penfield & Giacobbi, 2004).

Result

The draft of the survey had 56 questions after the first stage. The questions were divided into six groups about student-athletes characteristics and facets of satisfaction. The experts' and student-athletes' observations were related to the options of the questions, vocabulary used, the need to clarify the terminology or questions, etc.

Table 1. Evaluation by expert judges, student-athletes, and sport coaches (second stage).

VARIABLES	AIKEN'S V		VARIABLES	AIKEN'S V	
	definition	pertinence		definition	pertinence
Sociodemographic questions			Self-perception questions about team/teammates		
Sport	1.00	1.00	Team task achievement	0.96	1.00
Athletic year	1.00	1.00	Goals achieved	1.00	1.00
Scholarship	1.00	1.00	Team growth	0.89	0.95
Residence hall	1.00	1.00	Solidarity and integration	0.91	0.98
Self-perception questions about satisfaction			Principles of right and wrong	1.00	1.00
Performance	1.00	1.00	Effort teammates	1.00	1.00
Goals	1.00	0.98	Contribution team	1.00	1.00
Personal development	1.00	1.00	Friendships	1.00	1.00
Personal growth	0.89	0.95	Belonging	0.98	0.95
Effort	0.91	0.98	Support each other	0.99	1.00
Contribution	1.00	1.00	Recognition received	0.90	0.95
Structure	0.90	0.95	Support received	0.91	0.95
Self-perception questions about coaches & trainers			Level of loyalty	1.00	1.00
Use your abilities	1.00	1.00	Self-perception questions about administration		
Level of engagement	0.99	1.00	Facilities	0.89	0.95
Communication and information	0.90	0.95	Budget	0.89	0.95
Structure and process	0.98	0.95	Support received trainers	0.90	0.95
Recruiting and selection process	0.99	1.00	Housing facilities	0.91	0.95
Use of available athletic talent	0.90	0.95	Financial support/scholarship	1.00	0.98
Usefulness of practice	1.00	1.00	Level of loyalty	0.98	0.95
Tactic	1.00	0.95	Academic support	0.91	0.95
Equitable treatment	0.89	0.98	Self-perception questions about support & recognition		
Principles of right and wrong	0.83	0.92	Community support	1.00	1.00
Participation in decision-making	0.87	0.95	Family/friends (non-team)	1.00	1.00
Recognition	1.00	1.00	Media coverage	1.00	1.00
Support received	0.99	1.00			
Level of loyalty (individual)	1.00	1.00			
Level of loyalty (team)	1.00	1.00			

At this stage, all questions from the draft of the survey had an average score >7.0 . The Aiken's V was pertinent (>0.81 for the lowest value). Some of the questions' terminology and style were changed after reviewing the experts' evaluation of the draft of the survey. After the first review of the experts and student-athletes, the second draft was reviewed following the same procedures. All the questions from the reviewed draft of the survey had an average score >7.0 . The Aiken's V was pertinent (>0.81 for the lowest value) (Table 1). The survey had 49 questions after the revision process.

Discussion

This paper describes the process done to design and validate a tool to assess student-athlete satisfaction. The whole process of the design was influenced by the idea of developing a tool that allows bringing the voices of student-athletes to their programs. The first step of the process involved a review of the literature and a review of similar questionnaires (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007). The second step was content validation; and between these two steps a testable iteration of the survey was created. This tool could be used as first step in a group or panel discussion about the student-athlete's perception. The questionnaire could help student-athletes organize their thoughts as a starting point of the process.

Researches developed the pre-draft of the survey. The final draft was completed through internal reviews and meetings with athletes and coaches. Students in an exercise science program helped in the establishment of the process of application of the survey and group discussion (panel discussion). After this process, the experts' review contributed to increasing the clarity, understanding, and proper vocabulary and structure of the survey. In this phase, the experts' evaluation helped to establish the pertinence of the sections and questions of the survey (Bulger & Housner, 2007; Escurra, 1989; Padilla et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 1998). The levels of content validity found are higher than the proposed minimum (Penfield & Giacobbi, 2004).

Most of the tools available that collect athlete's satisfaction are research tools or are focused on specific aspects of athlete satisfaction. The tool developed has the intention to help coaches and administrators to improve athlete's environment and satisfaction at a specific college or university. The goal was to create a tool that can be manipulated, altered, or adapted to the needs of an individual athletic program. The process of collecting data combines qualitative and quantitative data through the implementation of two phases: 1) The student's athletes fill-out the Likert-scale questions of one of the blocks (or the whole survey), and 2) A moderator generates a discussion between the athletes (e.g., panel group) regarding the causes behind their answers, things to maintain, and things that could change or improve related to one or several aspects of the facets. After finishing the second phase, the process is repeated with the rest of the tool's parts (if necessary). Each part involves a different number of questions. The approximate time of implementation of the tool will depend on the level of discussion generated by athletes. As a reference, each block could involve around 15–30 minutes. The tool can be adapted to include the questions and parts in which the program is interested in getting information. The tool can be implemented with a representative group of athletes or with the whole group.

The moderator's role is critical in creating the proper flow and tracking the observations provided for the athletes during the discussion. At the end of the discussion, the moderator summarizes the information shared with the group to make sure he/she collected the ideas/comments appropriately and if some clarification is needed. Our experience showed us how this approach could help student-athletes to share information about aspects that affect their life but might not be perceived as a problem. For example, regarding housing (administration facet),

the discussion allowed student-athletes to express their opinions about the meal plans and aspects related to this topic: the lack of variability of the food options after living on campus for several years, the problem of acquiring fresh fruit and vegetables for campus residents, information about how to eat appropriately for training or to prepare for competition and recovery with the options available on campus, manage residence problems, or balance academics and athletics. The implementation of this tool could be an alternative approach for athletic administrators to obtain the perspectives of their student-athletes. It has the purpose to retrieve a more in-depth scope of the athlete's opinions, intending to make them feel more included during the process. Student-athletes' experiences are influenced by multi-disciplinary factors, making them part of a large dynamics complex system. Gathering their insight could ascertain better information regarding the life of a student-athlete.

This tool could be useful to obtain information about student-athletes' satisfaction perception. The tool has a structure that allows for the flexibility of it being divided into questions, several parts, or as a whole survey, which lends to it being a practical tool that could be adapted depending on the goals and needs of an athletic department. The tool is intended to be the first step of the process of knowing the opinions about the student-athletes' experiences. The following steps of the process will be established after collecting the information. The combination of information from questionnaires and group discussions could help to establish student-athletes' experiences, their needs, and possible strategies to improve their experience. This combination will allow student-athletes to increase their involvement in the running of an athletic department and help them to feel heard. The implementation of the tools could be carried out for the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the athletic department, coaches, etc. Future studies are needed about reference values and normative profiles for different sports, genders, and divisions to interpret appropriately the quantitative data provided by the survey.

Conclusions

The tool created for this project is suitable for collecting athletes' perceptions regarding their satisfaction with their teammates, team, and athletic department. By involving student-athletes, coaches, and administrators to enhance the student-athlete experience. The adaptability of the tool and the combination of different approaches allow the users of the tool to manipulate it according to their context and needs. The tool has some limitations. The authors only assessed the content validity of the instrument (expert evaluation). The proper implementation of the group discussion depends on the experience of the moderator. The implementation of this tool requires a learning curve to the context, program, needs, etc. This tool could allow coaches and administrators to include in their source of information the voice and opinions of the student-athlete experience.

Questionnaire to collect student-athletes' perception of their satisfaction

This questionnaire is part of a process that aims to collect information about your experience as a student-athlete. This is the first of the process. After filling out the survey, you will participate in a group discussion. Since the questionnaire is anonymous, we ask that you respond as sincerely as possible. The survey intent that you think about your experience as a starting point of more in-depth discussion about your experience and how it could be improved. To complete the questionnaire, mark an X under the response that best corresponds to your answer, keeping in mind that there should only be one answer unless otherwise indicated. When necessary, print clearly on the lines provided.

Socio-demographic questions

1. What sport(s) do you currently compete in? _____
2. What is your athletic year? () Freshman () Sophomore () Junior () Senior () 5th year-Senior / Graduate
3. Scholarship () Full () Partial () Non-scholarship () Walk-on
4. Do you live in the residence hall? () Yes () No

Self-perception questions about satisfaction

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with your performance as a student-athlete?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the goals that you have achieved regarding your sport, your education, and your personal development?											
– Sport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Education	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Personal development	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with your personal involvement being a student-athlete in the athletic program of your university?	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with your personal growth as an athlete regarding technical and tactical skills, strategies and tactics of the sport, physical capacities, psychological skills, social skills and personal mental growth?											
– Technical and tactical skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Strategies and tactics of the sport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Physical capacities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Psychological skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Social skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Personal mental growth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the effort you give during practice sessions and in competition?											
– Physical (in-season practices)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Physical (in-season games)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Physical (out of- season)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Mental (in-season practices)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Mental (in-season games)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Mental (out of-season)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with your contribution to your program and team?											
– Program	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Team	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the structure of the athletic program?											
– Structure of athletic program	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Self-perception questions about coaches and trainers

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with how your coaches use your abilities as an athlete and the abilities of the rest of their athletes in the program/team?											
– Yourself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Teammates	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you about the level of engagement by your coach involving training and practice?											
– Physical training	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Practice	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you about the communication and information provided by your coach(es)?											
– Communication & information	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the structure and process within the team regarding technical and tactical training, physical training, and health aspect/athletic training (physical therapy)?											
– Technical and tactical training	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Physical training	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Health aspects / athletic training	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the recruiting and/or selecting the players for the team?											
– Recruiting/Selection	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the use of the available athletic talent of the team in a coordinated manner to achieve success in athletic competition?											
– Use of athletic talent	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the usefulness of practice to achieve success in athletic competition?											
– Usefulness	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the tactics adopted by the coaches and processes within the team regarding technical and tactical training, and competition?											
– Technical and tactical training	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Competition	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with equitable treatment received for yourself/team members by the coaching staff, athletic trainers, and athletic department?											
– Coaching staff	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Athletic trainers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Athletic department	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Being in accordance with the accepted principles of right and wrong that govern the conduct of a profession (coach)											
– Ethical conduct coach	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the level of athlete participation in decision-making in situation contingencies that the coach allows?											
– Participation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the recognition received by coaches, teammates, and others?											
– Coaches											
– Teammates											
– Others	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the support received by the athletic department regarding training and competition?											
– Support by athletic department	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with the level of loyalty that the coach(s) demonstrates towards yourself as an individual?											
– Level of loyalty towards yourself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the level of loyalty that the coach demonstrates towards the team?											
– Level of loyalty towards team	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Self-perception questions about team/teammates

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with your team performance (team task achievement)?											
– Team performance	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the goals achieved by your team regarding sport, education, and personal development?											
– Sport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Education	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Personal development	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the team growth in terms of sport aspects regarding technical and tactical skills, strategies and tactics of the sport, physical capacities, psychological skills, social skills and personal mental growth?											
– Technical and tactical skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Strategies and tactics of the sport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Physical capacities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Psychological skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Social skills	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Personal mental growth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with solidarity and integration of the team members in the program?											
– Solidarity and integration	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Being in accordance with the accepted principles of right and wrong that govern the conduct of a profession (student-athlete)											
– Ethical conduct	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the effort put forth by your teammates during practices and competitions?											
– Practices	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Competitions	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the contribution of your team helping towards you as a teammate?											
– Team <u>help</u>	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are with your friendships with the rest of the members of the team and program (athletes and coaches)?											
– Teammates	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Coaches	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with your level of belonging in the team and program?											
– Teammates	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Program	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with how the team members get along as a group as well as providing support to each other?											
– Team cohesion	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Support to each other	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with the recognition received from your teammates, coach(es), administration and media?											
- Teammates	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Coach(es)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Media	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the support received by your teammates?											
- Support by teammates	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the level of loyalty that your teammates demonstrate towards you?											
- Level of loyalty	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Self-perception questions about administration

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with the facilities and equipment provided to the team?											
- Practice facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Game facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Equipment	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Locker rooms	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the total budget allotted to your team regarding the budget for travel (meals, hotels, transportation), equipment, practice/game apparel, strength & conditioning/weight room facilities, film/video?											
- Travel-meals	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Travel-hotels	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Travel-transportation	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Equipment	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Practice apparel	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Game apparel	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Strength & conditioning/weight room facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Film/video	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the support received by your athletic trainers, medical staff, and personal trainers?											
- Athletic trainers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Medical staff	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Strength and conditioning coaches	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Others (_____)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the housing facilities provided to you as an athlete and your team (housing, study areas, and meal plans)?											
- Housing	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Study areas	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Meal plans	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Others (_____)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the financial support/scholarship opportunities provided by the athletic department/university to the athlete?											
- Financial support/scholarships	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the level of loyalty that the athletic department and university demonstrates toward your team?											
- Level of loyalty-athletic department	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
- Level of loyalty-university	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with the academic support received by your professors, academic advisers, tutoring help, study tables, and grade reports?											
– Professors	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Academic advisers	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Tutoring help	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Study tables	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Grade reports	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Self-perception questions about support and recognition

	Less satisfied					More satisfied					
How satisfied are you with the community support received for your team and yourself for the involvement in your athletic endeavors?											
– Team	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Yourself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with your family/friends (non-teammates) support for the involvement in your athletic endeavor?											
– Family	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Friends	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How satisfied are you with the media coverage or the support yourself, your team, and your program receives?											
– Yourself	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Team	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
– Program	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

References

Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2007) Modified Delphi investigation of exercise science in physical education teacher education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 26, 57–80.

Caliskan, G., & Baydar, H. O. (2016). Satisfaction scale for athlete (SSA): A study of validity and reliability. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(14).

Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1997). A classification of facets of athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, 11(2), 133–159.

Cox, R. H., Sandstedt, S. D., Martens, M. P., & Ward, D. G. (2004). Development of the student-athlete experiences inventory. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 27(3), 243.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Durham, M. (2020, January 23). 2020 GOALS study results shared at NCAA Convention. *NCAA.org*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/2020-goals-study-results-shared-ncaa-convention>

Escurra, L. (1989). Cuantificación de la validez de contenido por criterio de jueces [Quantification of content validity through judge criteria]. *Revista de Psicología*, 6, 103–111.

Gaston-Gayles, J. L. (2005). The factor structure and reliability of the student athletes' motivation toward sports and academics questionnaire (SAMSAQ). *Journal of College Student Development*, 46(3), 317–327.

Hague, P., Hague, N., & Morgan, C. (2004). *Market research in practice: A guide to the basics*. London: Kogan Page.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33(1), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310>

Miller, R. (2003). The role of athletics in higher education. *Major Themes in Economics*, 5(1), 31–47.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (2015, January 13). History of the NCAA student athlete advisory committee. Retrieved September 15, 2020, from <http://www.ncaa.org/student-athletes/history-ncaa-student-athlete-advisory-committee>

- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2017, June). GOALS and SCORE studies. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/ncaa-goals-study>
- Padilla, J. L., Gómez, J., Hidalgo, M. D., & Muñiz, J. (2007). Esquema conceptual y procedimientos para analizar la validez de las consecuencias del uso de los test [Conceptual diagram and procedures to analyze the validity of the consequences of test use]. *Psicothema*, 19(19), 173–178.
- Penfield, R. D., & Giacobbi, P. R. (2004) Applying a score confidence interval to Aiken's item content-relevance index. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 8(4), 213–225.
- Renick, J. (1974). The use and misuse of college athletics. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 45(7), 545–552.
- Riemer, H. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Development of the athlete satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20(2), 127–156.
- Smith, W. (2010). Athlete satisfaction and the peak event: adapting the athlete satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ) to a New Zealand setting. *Massey University, School of Business*.
- Thomas, S. J. (2004). *Using web and paper questionnaires for data-based decision making: From design to interpretation of the results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Trochim, W. & Donnelly, J. P. (2007). *The research methods knowledge base* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: Cengage Learning-Atomic Dog.
- Zhu, W., Ennis, C. D., & Chen, A. (1998) Many-faceted Rasch modelling expert judgment in test development. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 2(1), 21–39.

Cite this article as: Palao, J. M., Jost, B., Katzer, J., Parietti, M. (2023). Design and Validation of a Tool to Collect Student-Athletes' Perception of Their Satisfaction. *Central European Journal of Sport Sciences and Medicine*, 3(43), 25–36, <https://doi.org/10.18276/cej.2023.3-03>