

3-15-2013

Student-athlete perceptions of increased internationalization in college athletics

Erica Zonder

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/theses>



Part of the [Sports Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zonder, Erica, "Student-athlete perceptions of increased internationalization in college athletics" (2013). *Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations*. 473.

<http://commons.emich.edu/theses/473>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Student-Athlete Perceptions of Increased Internationalization in College Athletics

by

Erica Zonder

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Health Promotion and Human Performance

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Sport Management

Thesis Committee:

Brenda Riemer, Ph.D., Chair

Andrew Cornett, Ph.D.

Melody Reifel Werner, Ed.D.

March 15, 2013

Ypsilanti, Michigan

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Abstract

This study examined the effect of the increase in the number of international student-athletes in Division I college athletics on the experience of international and domestic student-athletes, specifically by investigating the perceptions of female athletes participating in sports that have high percentages of international student-athlete involvement. Scholarship opportunities, school choice, playing time, and recruiting are all areas that were explored through a questionnaire. This study potentially fills a gap in the research regarding the increased participation by international student-athletes on both the domestic and international student-athlete experience. Results indicated that international and domestic student-athletes had different perceptions of their recruiting experience than student-athletes of the opposite status, and further, different factors were important in terms of school choice. Both domestic and international student-athletes believed that there were similar scholarship opportunities in their sport, regardless of status, and further, that their sport had a high number of international participants.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Research Problem.....	1
Purpose Statement.....	2
Significance.....	2
Research Questions.....	2
Delimitations.....	2
Limitations.....	3
Assumptions.....	3
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	4
The Influx of International Student-Athletes.....	4
Recruiting of International Student-Athletes.....	5
Motivations of the International Student-Athlete.....	6
The Impact of Internationalization on Domestic Student-Athletes.....	7
Chapter III: Methodology.....	9
Participants.....	9
Data Collection/Instruments.....	10
Procedures.....	10
Design.....	11
Data Analysis.....	11
Chapter IV: Results and Discussion.....	12

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Part I: Demographic Questions	12
Part II: Your Experience as a Student-Athlete	13
Recruitment	14
School Choice	21
Scholarship Opportunities	25
Starting and Playing Time	25
Team	27
Sport	29
Chapter V: Conclusion	33
References	37
Appendix A: Informed Consent - Questionnaire	39
Appendix B: Questionnaire	41
Appendix C: Human Subjects Approval	47

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Participant Numbers by Sport, Conference, and Status	12
2	Whether a Coach Considers Status in Recruiting	19

Chapter I: Introduction

There has been an increase in the number of international student-athletes at the Division I level of collegiate sport in the United States, particularly in the last decade (Love & Kim, 2011; NCAA 2010). Research in this area has been mostly concerned with the possible causes and motivations of the international student-athlete regarding this labor migration, and less concerned with the impact on the domestic student-athlete. Scholarships have been shown to be a major motivation for the international student-athlete (Popp, Pierce, & Hums, 2011), as has the opportunity to obtain a degree from an American university and a chance to stay in the United States after graduation (Love & Kim, 2011; Popp, Hums, & Greenwell, 2009). Some of these studies examined the motivations of the international student-athlete in comparison to the domestic student-athlete, so there is some existing literature as to domestic student-athletes' motivation to participate in collegiate sport (Popp et al., 2009; Popp et al., 2011), but there is little in the way of examining the perceptions of the domestic student-athlete regarding the increase in internationalization, whether in terms of scholarship opportunities, an effect on school choice, playing time, position as a starter, or recruiting experience.

Research Problem

There has been an increase in the number of international-student athletes participating in collegiate sports, particularly in the last decade. How do today's student-athletes perceive the role of domestic or international status on their recruitment and collegiate athletic experience?

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study will be to examine female domestic and international student-athletes' perceptions of their experiences in sports that have a higher concentration of international student-athlete participation, such as golf, tennis, and soccer.

Significance

This study will potentially fill a gap in the research regarding the increased participation by international student-athletes on the domestic and international student-athlete experience. This knowledge could inform future policy decisions regarding scholarship opportunities and recruiting.

Research Questions

Is there a difference in the recruiting experience between international and domestic student-athletes?

Is there a difference in factors that affect school choice between international and domestic student-athletes?

Is there a difference in scholarship opportunities between international and domestic student-athletes?

Is there a difference in playing time or starter status between international and domestic student-athletes?

Delimitations

One delimitation of this study that could influence the results would be the sport itself from which the student-athletes are chosen. According to the research, tennis, swimming, track & field, and golf have much higher concentrations of international

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

student-athletes (Drape, 2006; Popp et al., 2009; Popp et al., 2011; Weston, 2006; Wilson & Wolverton, 2008). And further, soccer could be included in this group as its participation percentages are on par with track (NCAA, 2010, p. 59). Therefore, it seems possible that the examination of these sports will produce results that may not be generalizable to the larger population. Another delimitation is the exclusive use of female participants, as men's sports have also seen an increase in internationalization.

Limitations

A major limitation of this study could be a low-response rate. Several factors could cause this, such as the timing of request – perhaps that particular sport is “in-season” and there is not sufficient time for student-athletes to respond. Or perhaps a coach does not want players participating, or there is a general lack of interest in the subject or in the method of delivery. Further, it seems that a low response rate could lead to sampling problems, such as the majority of the responses coming from only one school or schools that are similar in terms of conference or budget. This would again threaten to impede the generalizability of the data.

Assumptions

Data were collected via survey research. As with all surveys, it must be assumed that the respondents answer the questions truthfully or to the best of their knowledge. Withholding information, or actually lying in their answers, could lead to skewed data and results.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Academic inquiry into the topic of labor migration in collegiate sport in the United States (U.S.) is in its “relative infancy” (Love & Kim, 2011, p. 91). Further, there seems to be even less research concerning the effect of such migration on domestic student-athletes. The following review will look at the literature concerning the increase in international student-athlete participation in United States collegiate athletics as well as the possible causes and motivations of that increase. And finally, what impact, if any, has thus far been observed on the scholarship and participation opportunities of the domestic student-athlete.

The Influx of International Student-Athletes

A trend toward increasing internationalization has been taking place in collegiate sport in the United States (Love & Kim, 2011). According to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)’s Student-Athlete Ethnicity Report, 5.5% of men and 6.9% of women were “nonresident aliens” in Division I athletics for the 2009-2010 academic year (NCAA, 2010). Overall, from 1999-00 to 2009-10, the number of male nonresident alien student-athletes has increased from 1.8% to 3.8% across all divisions, and the number of female nonresident alien student-athletes has increased from 1.5% to 4.3% (NCAA, 2010). Certain sports have a higher concentration of international student-athletes, including tennis, swimming, track, and golf (Drape, 2006; Popp et al., 2009; Popp et al., 2011; Weston, 2006; Wilson & Wolverton, 2008). For females in Division I tennis, international student-athlete participation has increased from 12.7% to 35.2% in the aforementioned ten-year time period (NCAA, 2010). Further, Weston noted that in

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

NCAA tennis, 63 of the top 100 men and 47 of the top 100 women were international student-athletes in 2005 (Thibault, 2009; Weston, 2006). In golf, international participation has increased from 5.9% to 16.5%, while in soccer, which has similar numbers to the aforementioned track, the increase is from 1.9% to 5.7% (NCAA 2010).

Recruiting of International Student-Athletes

According to Wilson and Wolverton (2008), international recruitment has become “ubiquitous” in college sports (p. 27). Weston (2006) calls it an “arms race”—the pressure on coaches to produce winning teams is “unmistakable” and therefore fueling efforts to recruit top talent internationally (p. 835). Some coaches contend that they are compelled to recruit internationally in order to field a competitive team, as the top American players only want to go to top-tiered, nationally recognizable schools (Weston, 2006). This is not necessarily a new phenomenon, as Bale (1991) noted in his “pioneering” piece of research on the subject—“prominent US high school athletes prefer to go to schools that are well known nationwide” (p. 82). According to the tennis coach at Baylor, “We’ve historically had a difficult time attracting the top American players to Waco” (Drape, 2006, para. 16). Further, coaches need to look to other nations because “there are not enough elite Americans to go around” (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008, p. A27).

The coaches themselves are integral to the recruiting process. Many international athletes are not as familiar with the schools as their American counterparts and so have to rely on their relationship with the coach. An engaging personality and the offer of a full ride could lead to success in attracting top foreign talent (Popp et al., 2011). Travel abroad, scouting foreign players at U.S.-based sport academies (such as IMG), and

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

sending email messages are all prevalent tactics used by coaches (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008). Popp et al. (2009) suggests recruiters (i.e. coaches) need to consider the interests and motivations of the international student-athletes, as the lure of winning a Big 10 or Big East title may not be the same as for a domestic student-athlete. Therefore they should perhaps “alter the pitches made” (p. 104). And further, according to Pierce, Popp, and Meadows (2011), there is a need for coaches to become more efficient in their recruiting, as many international student-athletes hear about playing opportunities from their personal support network and not from coaches or other university personnel.

Motivations of the International Student-Athlete

In 2011, Love and Kim studied the motivations of migrant collegiate athletes coming to the United States, using prior typologies in the field as a conceptual framework. Some common themes emerged: improved financial situation, desire to experience different cultures, and a desire to remain in the U.S. after their collegiate careers were over. In particular, athletes hoped to go to graduate school or find employment. Similarly, Popp et al. (2011) researched the factors that were considered the most important for international student-athletes in choosing an NCAA Division I university, and the results indicated that the value of the athletic scholarship was an important factor, as was “a degree from school leading to good job” (p. 181). Popp et al. (2009) suggested that international student-athletes prioritize their goals differently from their domestic teammates, and therefore there is perhaps a higher emphasis on academic achievement and less emphasis on athletic competition. (The importance of academics was a corresponding theme that emerged in Sato & Burge-Hall’s (2008) study of international student-athletes at a Historically Black College and University.) The

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

researchers further state that most international student-athletes intend to remain in the United States after they graduate and that their status as a student-athlete could be beneficial when seeking employment. All three studies suggest that the motivations of the international student-athlete to participate in collegiate sports go beyond the sport itself.

The Impact of Internationalization on Domestic Student-Athletes

The literature does not reflect a wealth of information regarding the experiences of the domestic student-athlete. In the three aforementioned studies on the motivations of international student-athletes, two of them, Popp et al. (2009) and Popp et al. (2011), compared their findings with those of the domestic student-athlete. Both studies found that domestic student-athletes were also motivated by career aspirations and, further, that school reputation was important. Additionally, there have been sport-specific studies, without regard for a distinction between international and domestic student-athletes, which have examined factors that influence college selection, with similar results. Pauline (2010) found that career opportunities was the top ranked factor for lacrosse players, followed by academic reputation and availability of an academic program or major. In Kankey & Quarterman (2007), Division I softball players considered availability of major or academic program and career opportunities after graduation to be two of the top three choice factors. Both lacrosse and softball have very low levels of international student-athlete participation, 1.1% (for women) and 1.5%, respectively (NCAA, 2010), so perhaps these results can also be considered in terms of domestic student-athlete experience.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

According to Abbey-Pinegar (2010), many domestic student-athletes view international student-athletes as competitors for scholarship opportunities. Further, there are concerns that athletic programs that are funded by state dollars but do not benefit the taxpayers are inconsistent with the purpose of the state institution. “American parents pay taxes to support these Universities and their sons and daughters can’t play tennis there” (Weston, 2006 p. 833). Coaches and scholars also claim that it is American athletes who lose out when universities recruit foreign players as for every scholarship that goes to an international student, there is one less available for an American (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008).

Some parents and coaches have “grumbled that some of these semi-professional [international student-athletes] are unfairly competing against U.S. players” (Abbey-Pinegar, 2010 p. 347). And these players who have competed as “professionals” or “failed professionals” and are older or more experienced than college players from the United States have an unfair advantage over a U.S. teenager who has been playing junior tennis, for instance (Drape, 2006). The NCAA has until recently largely ignored the contradictions between sport development systems in the U.S. and abroad; the international student is recruited by watching him play with his club team (Mulhauser, 2001). High school sport teams do not exist in Europe, and club team rosters often include a mix of paid professionals and unpaid teenagers. As such, currently there is no longer a competitive equity between domestic and international college athletes (Abbey-Pinegar, 2010; Weston, 2006).

Chapter III: Methodology

A questionnaire was used in order to examine both international and domestic student-athletes' experiences and perceptions regarding the increase in the number of Division I international student-athletes. The survey examined the differences in scholarship opportunities, factors that influence school choice, recruiting experience, starter status and playing time, and the student-athletes' thoughts and feelings on these and other related topics.

Participants

A purposive sampling strategy was employed for this study. Research has determined that tennis, swimming, golf, and track and field have some of the highest percentages of international student-athlete participation (Drape, 2006; Popp, Hums, et al., 2009; Popp, Pierce et al., 2011; Weston, 2006; Wilson & Wolverton, 2008), as does soccer (NCAA, 2010). Therefore, the participants were selected from three of these sports: golf, tennis, and soccer. Student-athletes, both international and domestic, from women's teams, were targeted. Typically, women's soccer has 20-24 team members, while women's golf and tennis have around 8-10 players each, so approximately 40 female student-athletes were approached at each school. Initially, three schools from three different conferences in the Southeast Michigan area were contacted. Two additional schools were subsequently contacted. The represented conferences were diverse in terms of size/reputation, in that the participants came from one school in a "major" conference (Conference 1), one school in a higher tier "mid-major" (Conference

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

2), and three schools from a lower tier mid-major (Conference 3). All student-athletes were age 18 and older. Only NCAA Division I schools were used.

Data Collection/Instruments

A two-part questionnaire (see Appendix B) was used in order to survey female student-athletes from a golf team, tennis team, and soccer team from each of the three conferences, nine teams in total. Part I consisted of nine questions that asked participants demographic questions such as age, place of birth, class, international or domestic status, sport, and scholarship information. Participants answered whether they were on an athletic scholarship (and percentage) and if they were on an academic scholarship. Part II consisted of 13 open-ended questions designed to elicit qualitative responses regarding the individual's experiences as an international or domestic student-athlete, in terms of recruiting, decision-making regarding school choice, scholarship opportunities, playing time, and their opinion on team dynamics and sport participation.

Procedures

After receiving approval by the University Human Subjects Review Committee, student-athletes were contacted, by email or through their coach, in order to solicit their participation in the questionnaire. Conference 2 respondents, from the higher-tier mid-major, were given the questionnaire in person and asked to sign an informed consent document upon their arrival that detailed what was expected of them and then how the information would be used. While it would have been preferable to meet with all respondents in person to explain the purpose of the study and questionnaire, in the end, the Conference 1 and Conference 3 participants, in lieu of in-person availability, were sent the link to the survey, either by email or through their coaches.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Design

This cross-sectional, descriptive study incorporated both qualitative and quantitative components. The survey contained both open-ended questions as well as measurable responses.

Data Analysis

After the survey was completed, the data were collected, transcribed, coded and sorted, and then put into categories or themes. Ultimately a conclusion and recommendations were developed.

Chapter IV: Results and Discussion

A total of 64 student-athletes participated in the survey, 58 of whom completed both Part I: Demographic Questions and Part II: Your Experience as a Student-Athlete. Those 58 responses are used as the data for this study.

Part I: Demographic Questions

Part I consisted of nine questions that asked participants about their age, birthplace, class, international or domestic status, sport, and scholarship information. Participants answered whether they were on an athletic scholarship (and percentage) and if they were on an academic scholarship. As can be seen in Table 1, of the 58 total respondents, 36 considered themselves domestic student-athletes, while 22 were international.

Table 1

Participants Numbers by Sport, Conference, and Status

Sport	<i>Domestic Student-Athletes (DSA)</i>			<i>International Student-Athletes (ISA)</i>		
	Conf. 1	Conf. 2	Conf. 3	Conf. 1	Conf. 2	Conf. 3
Golf	7	1	3	0	7	0
Tennis	5	0	0	0	5	1
Soccer	4	14	2	2	7	0

For golf, there were 11 domestic student-athletes (DSAs) and 7 international student-athletes (ISAs). For tennis, there were 5 DSAs and 6 ISAs. The Conference 1 participants were 100% domestic, and the Conference 2 participants were 100% international. In soccer, there were 20 DSAs and 9 ISAs.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Fifty-four student-athletes were on an athletic scholarship, 22 of which were considered 100%. Of the 22, 12 were international and 10 domestic. It is worth noting, however, that tennis is a “counter” or “head count” sport, which means that all of the athletes are on 100% scholarship. To that end, there was a tennis ISA from Conference 2 who gave no response to the question of percentage of scholarship, as did a tennis DSA from Conference 1; therefore, a total of 24 participants with 100% scholarships is more accurate: 11 from tennis, seven from golf, and six from soccer. Twenty-two student-athletes claimed some percentage of academic scholarship, of which 14 were DSAs and eight were ISAs. Of the 22, 20 were from Conference 2, as were all eight ISAs. Two respondents from Conference 2 stated they were on 100% athletic scholarship but also that they received some amount of academic scholarship. While the participants who received both athletic and academic support were not explicitly asked what their overall percentage of both equaled, some of the student-athletes at the Conference 2 school get a “full ride” made up of both types of funds, so perhaps that led to the confusion in those two answers.

Part II: Your Experience as a Student-Athlete

Part II consisted of 13 open-ended questions. Questions 1-3 referred to recruitment; for example, Question 3 asked, “Do you believe that coaches in your sport consider status in their recruiting strategy? Please explain.” Questions 4-5 examined school choice, Questions 6-7 explored scholarship opportunities, Questions 8-9 looked at starting and playing time, and Questions 10-11 asked about team dynamics in terms of international or domestic status. Question 12 looked at perception of overall international or domestic participation in each sport, asking, “Do you perceive your sport as having a

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

high number of international participants at the NCAA level? What would you say is the percentage of international student-athletes participating in your sport?" Question 13 asked if the respondents had any other thoughts to share or questions they wished they were asked; there was very little response to this question.

Recruitment. Question 1 asked the participants to consider their recruiting process/experience. Participants described how they were first contacted, or the steps they went through. They often described emails that led to visits or playing at showcases that led to emails. From their responses a common theme emerged: The answers included a comment as to the type of contact with the coach during the process. The 25 domestic student-athletes who mentioned their contact with the coach during the recruiting process, without exception, had some sort of face-to-face meeting prior to choosing or attending their school, whereas of the 19 international student-athletes who responded, 8 of them had never met the coach in person prior to attending the university. According to Participant T(ennis)33, she "contacted the coach, sent my result by email and he liked and he offer(ed) me [a] full scholarship." T34 said there was "numerous exchange of emails. My ranking was taken into consideration. I sent videos which featured me playing tennis." In comparison, T36, a domestic student-athlete, stated "[we] went back and forth with emails...had phone calls to develop a relationship...did a couple of home visits and took official visits." All three tennis players began the relationship in some way other than face-to-face, and not surprisingly, only the domestic student-athlete's relationship evolved to the point of an in-person meeting. According to Wilson and Wolverton (2008), many coaches have seen a sharp rise in calls or emails by international student-athletes in the last decade.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Participant G(olf)1, an ISA, stated, “I sent the resume to coach and we had the recruiting process since then via phones and emails.” In comparison, G6, a domestic student-athlete from the same school, said “Coach watch(ed) me play, then talked with me and I signed.” The idea of pre-contact being the coach watching the athlete perform is another common theme that emerged, in particular with the soccer players. Of the 25 domestic student-athletes that met the coach prior to signing, 13 specifically stated that the coach had watched them play prior to any contact between them, and of that 13, 10 were soccer players – eight of whom used the words “college showcase.” Five international soccer student-athletes also stated that the coach watched them play, four of whom mentioned a college showcase, and three of those four said the showcase was in the “states” or the “US.” For example, S(occer)9 stated:

Team attended a lot of showcase tournaments in the US where many university coaches attended. Team also traveled to several universities and played the women’s varsity team at those locations. When a certain date hit, coaches who were interested in me sent me emails and I scheduled visits with them. (S9, ISA)

S18, a domestic student-athlete, also was recruited at a college showcase:

I went to multiple college showcases with my club team and was recruited at Crossroads of America showcase in Indiana. [Coach] told my club coach he was interested and then I proceeded to call and email them.

Additionally, there were a few hybrid-type examples, in that the coach watched the student-athlete play before expressing interest, but there was not initial face-to-face contact. G8, an ISA, sent “videos of my swing to schools.” G54, a DSA, sent “videos of my swing” to “several schools and then participated in some unofficial visits.” And T34,

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

an ISA, “sent videos which featured me playing tennis.” Both G8 and T24 come from Conference 2. In sports programs that cannot afford plane tickets to other countries, coaches often rely on DVDs and the Internet (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008).

A follow-up to the participants relating their recruiting experience was whether or not they thought their status, whether international or domestic, was a factor. In Question 2, they were asked whether they believed their recruitment was the same or different from someone of the other status, and then further whether one status had any sort of recruiting advantage over the other. Two main themes emerged: 66% of international student-athletes, many of whom stated that they never met the coach in person, seemed to think the process was the same for everybody, whereas 61% of domestic student-athletes, including 100% of the all-domestic tennis team, thought the process was different; and secondly, domestic student-athletes had an advantage because of that aforementioned face-to-face contact—a coach can see them play or more easily bring them in on a visit. T31, an international student-athlete who did not have any face-to-face contact with her coach prior to attending her school, is the epitome of both:

I believe that the way of recruitment is very similar for both International Student-Athlete[s] and Domestic Student-Athlete[s]. But for coaches [it] is easier to go and watch their recruits if they are from the U.S.

Overall, of the 45 participants who answered the first part of the question about whether their recruitment was the same or different, there was little consensus. Twenty-two thought it was different and 23 thought it was the same or similar. As mentioned above, international student-athletes often felt that their experience was the same as domestic student-athletes. G1, who as we saw earlier was recruited solely by phone and

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

email, still felt her recruitment was “the same as someone of the opposite status” while S9 said, “The recruitment was the same!” and T32 “think[s] it was the same.” All of these participants were international student-athletes from Conference 2. And further, every one of the international soccer student-athletes, regardless of conference, agreed that it was the same. Conversely, both G2 and G3 noted that “Not the same. Coach never saw me play” and “if you are too far away for the coach to see you play then different,” respectively. This was even more interesting as G3 is an international student-athlete who actually had the coach come watch her play during the recruiting process.

Many domestic student-athletes felt their experience was different than that of the international student-athlete. According to T36, who was part of the all-domestic team from Conference 1:

I think it would be different because I think it’s easier to get an international student to a school that might not be as good because they are not as educated about the school.

According to Popp et al. (2011), international student-athletes are “likely not as familiar with the differences among U.S. colleges” (p. 184). Another member of that team, T38, agreed that the international student-athlete does not know as much about the school, but had the opposite view as to how that affects recruiting:

I think for an international kid it is much more important to them than a domestic kid. I think for an international kid the coaches do a more thorough job in describing the university to them because the international recruit is more naïve to the school normally.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

G57, a DSA, felt the process was “a lot different,” and S26, a DSA, believed “it’s harder for international people to have unofficial visits.” On the other hand, domestic student-athletes such as S50 “believe everyone gets the same type of recruitment regardless of the type of student you are.” S25 agreed it’s the same, but adds “we have to do the same things but in different ways.”

In terms of a recruiting advantage for one status over another, of the 14 international student-athletes, only five felt that there was a recruiting advantage for one status over another, and four of the five said that the domestic student-athlete had the advantage. Of the 19 domestic student-athletes who answered the question, 16 said there was an advantage, and 14 of those 16 picked a side—11 DSAs specifically said that the advantage was theirs. Why was it an advantage to be a domestic student-athlete? One advantage was that the coach could see them play. S53, a DSA, “believe[s] domestic has better recruiting chances because coaches can come watch those recruits more easily.” T34, an international student-athlete, “think there is an advantage for [the] domestic student-athlete. The coach can always go and see the player playing live.”

G2, an international student-athlete, was on the fence about who had the advantage, as it “could be dis- and advantage” that the coach never saw her play. Another advantage for the domestic student-athlete is ease of visits. G63, a DSA, says she “has more of an advantage because I can visit schools easily,” while another DSA, G58, “was able to travel a short distance and have more contact with the coach.” While it might seem obvious that those in closer proximity to a coach would have an easier time having face-to-face contact with them, it was interesting that nine of 14 ISAs did not state that they believed domestic student-athletes had any advantage at all, including G1—the ISA who

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

never met the coach in person and believed her recruitment was the same—who said, “I don’t believe there is a recruiting advantage for [one] over another.”

The last question in the recruitment series asked participants whether they believed that coaches in their sport consider status in recruiting. Overall, 36 of 53, 68%, said yes. Twelve of 20 ISAs said yes (60%), as did 24 of 33 DSAs (73%). Please see Table 2 below:

Table 2

Whether a Coach Considers Status in Recruiting

Sport	<i>Domestic Student-Athletes</i>		<i>International Student-Athletes</i>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Golf	10	0	4	2
Tennis	3	2	1	5
Soccer	11	7	7	1

Many athletes, regardless of status, believed that cost was a factor. According to G8, who is an ISA:

Absolutely. To recruit internationals, you must have the budget to offer scholarship money, or else the likelihood goes down that they will come. Also, it save[s] a lot of money by recruiting domestic students.

Similarly, another ISA, S9 stated:

I think they have to, honestly. International students have to pay a lot more to go to school in the states. Therefore coaches have to allocate their money appropriately.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

S16, a DSA, furthered the point, “Yes I do think they do, because people from out of the country usually have full rides to come out of state.” Because tennis is a counter sport (as explained earlier) where everyone gets a full ride, there was only one response that mentioned money, and that was T31, an ISA, who explained, “I do not because coaches of tennis teams provide the same to players from the US and out of the US.”

Other respondents mentioned the fact that international student-athletes may be more motivated and better players than their American counterparts. For example, G2, an ISA, believed “Yes, international are usually more motivated.” S19, a DSA, said that “Yes. Some international players have different style of play and better attitude.” T33, an ISA, does not believe that a coach considers status, and yet she still commented, “But in tennis I think international athlete[s] are having better results than Americans.” T35, another ISA, echoed that sentiment, “I guess so, since there is a belief that European girls are stronger than Northamericans [*sic*].” G58, a DSA, “believe(s) that international student-athletes are becoming more and more popular in women’s golf.”

Another common statement by participants was that coaches are just looking for the best players. According to S11, an ISA, “Yes I’m sure they do, however the ultimate decision is who is the best player/fit for them,” and S21 and S28, two DSAs, said, “Yes, they look for what will make our team better” and “Yes, they want the best athletes.” Two other DSAs, T36 and S52, said, “No I think they just want the best players” and “No, they want to recruit the best players.” All of these aforementioned responses cited the same reason, looking for the best players, and yet the respondents differed in the yes/no part of the question. Perhaps there are two different ways of looking at this: yes, coaches are willing to look beyond the borders of their country to find the best players, or

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

no, coaches want the best players, regardless of their country of origin. According to Wilson and Wolverton (2008), coaches argue that they need to look to other nations because there are not enough top Americans for all the schools. S60, a DSA, had an interesting take on the question:

I think by having more international students, it could be either more appealing to other international students or a turn off to students from the United States.

Depending on how coaches look at it, I believe that most coaches don't consider status.

And yet, according to one college coach who recruits internationally, "You bring one player, and they have a friend, then you bring that friend, and that one ends up bringing another" (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008, p. A29), in other words, a talent pipeline (Pierce et al., 2011), so maybe S60 is on to something.

School Choice. Participants were asked what the deciding factor was for them to attend their school. Five factors emerged: coach, scholarship money, location, academics, and the team itself. Participants were allowed to give more than one response. Each will be looked at in turn.

Of the 58 participants, all of whom answered this question, 18 mentioned the coach as a factor in their school choice decision, eight ISAs and 10 DSAs. Of the ISAs only one was from tennis. T34 said, "The coach looked really helpful and showed that he wanted me on his team." Three golf ISAs also mentioned the coach, including G2. She "click(ed) with the coach," while a soccer ISA, S11, said, "The coaches and team really sold me." In many cases, the coach might be the only contact an international student-athlete has with a school (Popp et al., 2011), so it easy to imagine why this factor would

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

rate highly for ISAs. Amongst the DSAs, T37 said, “The team and coaches were the deciding factor and I loved them,” while S61’s deciding factor was “that the coaches seemed very nice and that they were still working to improve the team.” And finally, from S10, “The coaches were the reason I chose to attend. They are genuine people and they care about us as people.”

Ten student-athletes mentioned scholarship money as a deciding factor, four ISAs and six DSAs, and interestingly, none of the responses were from tennis players. Perhaps the 100% scholarship factor played a role here, as everyone expects and gets a full-ride, taking this factor out of the equation. For ISAs G1 and G7, a 100% scholarship was important: “I am able to get a full scholarship so that was the reason” and “My deciding factor was the percentage of the scholarship. I need 100%.” Two soccer players from Conference 2 agreed. S22, an ISA, stated that her reason was “I got a full scholarship,” while S29, a DSA, picked her school “because I received a full scholarship” (although it seems that both G1 and S29 received a half-athletic, half-academic “full ride”). For another DSA, S28, the “percent of the scholarship was the deciding factor.” She did not, however, provide that percentage in the demographic part of the survey, preferring to leave that question blank. S22 also left that question blank. Of the 13 non-tennis players who indicated that they that received a 100% athletic scholarship in the demographic section of the survey, only one mentioned scholarship money as her deciding factor.

Thirteen participants mentioned location as a deciding factor, and as one might expect, only three of these were ISAs, two of whom were from Canada. Seven soccer-playing DSAs also mentioned location. S15 said, “It was close to home and I was really lazy,” while S16 said, “It was close to home and I liked that.” S50 said, “This university

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

was close to home.” Fifteen participants mentioned academics. Of those 15, nine were from the Conference 1 school, which has a strong academic reputation. Also of those 15, 11 were DSAs, with eight from that Conference 1 school. S51 “chose based on academics,” G54 “really liked....the academics,” G56 said her school was “Very strong academically,” and G57 said her school was “nationally recognized for being prestigious in academics.” All of these responses are from the Conference 1 school. Other schools had players who said, “I liked the tradition of both academics and athletics the university has” (G58, a DSA), while T34, an ISA, “got my major in this school” and S9, another ISA, said, “The most important factors were probably the academic programs available.” Eighteen student-athletes mentioned the team, 13 of whom were DSAs: S19 “saw how close the team was at the banquet and made me want to be a part of this team”. According to Popp et al. (2011), “getting to know team members” was the fourth most important factor for domestic student-athletes when it came to school choice (p. 182). T36 “didn’t think I would end up here but fell in love with the school and most importantly the team,” and S50 felt “the team was very welcoming on my visits.” Overall, the coach was the factor that was most mentioned by international student-athletes, while the team was the most mentioned by domestic student-athletes.

Student-athletes were also asked whether the school they were attending was the first choice. Of the 20 international student-athletes who addressed the question, 12 said it was their first choice. Of the 29 domestic student-athletes, 14 said it was. In Conference 1, eight said the school was their first choice, while four said it was not. In Conference 2, 14 said it was their first choice, while 17 said it was not. Interestingly, that number breaks down further: 10 of 18 ISAs (56%) said it was their first choice, while

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

only four of 13 (31%) DSAs agreed it was. The results were 2-2 in Conference 3, all DSAs. Perhaps it would be helpful to know whether any of the student-athletes felt that they had not gone to their first choice of school because they lost a spot to someone from the opposite status.

What was asked, however, was whether they felt that their school choice options were affected in any way by their status. Amongst the ISAs there were five who said yes and 12 who said no. Amongst the DSAs, 14 said yes, and 19 said no. While many did not expand on their answer, G53, a DSA, said she felt that domestic is better for the reason she gave above in question (2) “domestic has better recruiting chances because coaches can come watch those recruits more easily,” which in the context of this question would seem to mean that DSAs have more options because more coaches see them. Three student-athletes from Canada mentioned that they did believe that their status affected their options. G8 wanted to be “relatively close to the Canada/USA border,” while S11 said that “going to the States for a scholarship pays for schooling, where as Canadian school is more expensive w/little athletic scholarships.” S27 was a combination of the prior two, “Yes, I wanted to be close to home but I also wanted my education paid for and in Canada they don’t do that.” So because they are Canadian, these ISAs were forced to look at American schools for an athletic scholarship. According to Wilson and Wolverton (2008), the “United States is the only country where students can get an education and compete in sports at the same time. In most others, athletes must choose between higher education and pursuing their sport professionally” (p. A27).

Scholarship Opportunities. When asked whether they believed there were similar scholarship opportunities in their sport for all athletes regardless of their status, respondents overwhelmingly said “yes.” Of the 53 responses, 50 were affirmative, including 100% of ISAs. T30, an ISA, knows “lots of international players that are studying in US with full scholarship” and T34 similarly said, “Yes, there are many opportunities,” while G62, a DSA, said she “observe[d] a lot of international student-athletes receiving a good amount of support because of their status.” And further, S10 said, “Yes. Nearly every team I have ever played has an international player.” The follow-up question regarding scholarship opportunity was whether it was affected in any way by status. To this, the response was an overwhelming “no,” 47 of 53. However, S11, an ISA, “believe[s] that if I lived in the U.S. I would have been showcased better and found a great scholarship” (S11 is on an 80% athletic scholarship). G3, another ISA (who is on a 50% athletic scholarship), said, “Yes – as out of state I could receive the NSP (academic) scholarship which helps the coach out because now she doesn’t have to offer me as much athletic scholarship.” There were not any responses in which a student-athlete specifically mentioned that a scholarship or scholarship opportunity was lost to a player of another status.

Starting and Playing Time. Participants were asked if they believe that whether someone is on an athletic scholarship had any effect on playing time or starter status. There were 54 responses to this question. Twenty-four student-athletes believed that they do, with 10 ISAs and 14 DSAs. Thirty-four did not, with 10 ISAs and 20 DSAs. Amongst ISAs then, the results were split 50-50, while with the DSAs, 41% believed

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

there was an effect. Whether the participants responded yes or no, the common theme was that the best players play. According to G5, an ISA, “Yes, better players receive more scholarship,” and S10, a DSA, “Generally speaking players on scholarship are dominant players on the field.” T34, an ISA, said:

It has an affect [*sic*]. But here is the thing – better players are likely to get more scholarship money, therefore they are likely to play more matches, not because of money but because of how they play.

The point is furthered by S61, a DSA, “Yes, the people on athletic scholarship are the people that were recruited to play and most likely be the ones starting and playing the most.” Conversely, S26, a DSA, said, “No. The best players play” and S16, another DSA, insists, “No, because whether they are a walk-on or have a scholarship the coaches pick on girls’ ability and attitude.” And, in golf, DSA G49 said, “No. For us it’s simply who shoots the lowest scores” and G53 agrees, “No, before each tournament we all qualify with the lowest scores going to the tournament.” G59, a DSA, explained:

Yes it probably does to a certain degree. The coach will probably play the person on scholarship before someone who isn’t, but if they don’t prove themselves then everyone else is able to play. Here at [Conference 3 school], we have qualifiers to see who gets to play, so it’s fair.

That idea of a coach at least, at first, favoring the scholarship player is also mentioned by 2 other DSAs; S48 said, “To some degree coaches want to keep recruited/scholarship players happy by giving them playing time but ultimately the best players are going to play,” and S56 answered, “Yes. Coaches feel more pressure to play those players on scholarship.” However, according to DSA S40:

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

No, because when the coach gave you the scholarship he has only seen you play a little but if you don't play your best when you show up to college I don't think you will play no matter what your scholarship is.

Perhaps the recipients of the scholarships feel a certain pressure as well. According to T32, an ISA, "because you get [it] all for free, you should give a certain thanks and give all your effort" and T33, another ISA from the same team (the all-international tennis team from Conference 2), "if you have a full scholarship you are more motivated to play good and it's required as well." G60, a DSA, has the opposite view – perhaps the scholarship comes with a sense of entitlement. She "believe[s] that those who are on full scholarships think they don't have to work hard for their positions because they think they have top priority due to their scholarship."

The participants were also asked if they believed that starting or playing time was affected in any way by status, and further whether they personally had their playing/starting time affected. Fifty-four responses were given, 51 of which indicated that status was not affected by starting/playing time generally, or theirs in particular. Playing time was "defined according to my tennis skills" and "it doesn't matter what is your status, it all depends on how good you [are] playing." "It depends on work ethic," and "I do not think status affects playing time or position. However, injuries ha[ve] affected my playing time."

Team. In Question 10, participants were asked if they were on a team with both international and domestic players, and then what that was like. Fifty-seven student-athletes responded, 47 of whom indicated that they were on a team with both. There were five ISAs and five DSAs who were not, which is consistent with the earlier mention

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

that the five tennis participants from Conference 1 were from an all-domestic team, and the five tennis participants from Conference 2 were from an all-international team. Amongst the 47, 40 elaborated on what it was like, with 23, 15 DSAs and eight ISAs, calling it a positive experience; 15, 13 DSAs and two ISAs, considering it the same or “no different”; and two DSAs, who had a negative reaction. To be considered “positive,” participants had to use language that would be typically associated with a good experience, such as “awesome” or “fun” or “really cool.” S20, an ISA, “love[s] it. Love meeting all of my teammates that are from all over.” G58, a DSA, is “a member of a team with both domestic and international players. Our team has great chemistry and it has been a very positive experience.” Most of those who considered it the same or no different used those exact words. S14 and S23, an ISA and DSA respectively, said, “no different” and “no different really” in their response to what is it like to have both international and domestic teammates. S51, a DSA, explains, “We have 2 Canadians on our team and I don’t think it’s any different than if everyone was from the US.” Canadians were specifically mentioned eight times, three times in a positive context, and five times in a similar/no different context. Perhaps this is because “they’re from Canada so they’re similar to us,” and “there are no major differences between the personalities and playing styles” and finally, “they’re Canadians so there is really no difference. They just say ‘eh’ a lot.” The two “negative” responses indicated that “it can be a struggle occasionally because the [foreign] girl on our team doesn’t have the same boundaries we do” and “it’s difficult because of the communication behavior.”

Participants were then asked if they would label their team as an international team, and if so, why or why not. All 58 participants responded; 28 said yes, while 30

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

said no. If the aforementioned five tennis DSAs are removed (all said no), and the five tennis ISAs are removed (all said yes), that leaves 12 ISAs who would label their team international and four who would not, and 11 DSAs who would while 21 would not. In the previous question, 47 participants said they were on a team with both international and domestic players, and yet here, of the 48 responses, 25 did not believe that their team was “international.” One factor seemed to be language. According to S9, an ISA, her team is not “international” “because although we have a lot of internationals, we all blend and speak the same language,” while S12 said, “not really because we speak English well as a 1st language.” Another deciding factor seemed to be the numbers. G2, an ISA, said, “yes, because only 1 player is from USA,” while S10, a DSA, and S11, an ISA, said yes because “50% Canadian” and “because we are half Canadian.” G54, a DSA, said no because “we currently have more domestic players” and, similarly, G50 would not, because the “majority of our players are from the United States.” Further, G59 said “no” because she has “a mostly domestic team. We do have several international players though.” A third factor seems to be the location of the university. S21, a member of that team with “50% Canadians” said, “no we play in America!”, and another DSA team member, S13, stated “no, although we have people from Canada we play in the States.” G56, a DSA, believed “we are a domestic university and our team atmosphere follows that structure.”

Sport. Participants were asked if they perceived that their sport had a high number of international participants at the NCAA level, and then what they thought the percentage was. Forty-two participants said they believed that their sport had a high number, while only seven said they did not (although one of those still rated the

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

percentage at 40%). By sport, 16 of the 18 golfers said they believed it was a high number, eight of whom specifically mentioned around 50% or higher. The actual number is 16.5% (NCAA, 2010). According to G5, an ISA, “I say about 60% are international.” G49, a DSA, “think[s] there is a high number of international students. I have no idea as to the percentage,” and G58, a DSA, says, “Yes, I believe there are many international student-athletes in women’s golf. In my opinion, 25-30% of golfers are international.” For G58 then, she considered a number less than 50% to still be high. For soccer, 19 of 29 players specifically said it was a high number, but only three put that number over 50%. S9, an ISA, said, “Yes for sure. I’d say just under 40%. Maybe 30%.” G50, a DSA, agrees, “Yes the sport I play has a high number of international participants at the NCAA level. I would say 15-20% of players are international players.” S22, an ISA, also said “Yes” but puts that number even lower, “Probably 15%.” Division I women’s soccer participation is 5.7% international (NCAA, 2010), for which S51 was right on: “I’d say there’s a relatively low percentage. Maybe 5% total.” Perhaps because that 5.7% is a 200% increase in the last 10 years (NCAA, 2010), it changes the perception of those playing the sport. S22’s 15% was the lowest percentage listed in any of the affirmative responses that included a number.

Of the 11 tennis players, nine said yes, while two DSAs’ answers did not include a yes or no, but both included a percentage, “15%” and “somewhat, 35-40%,” respectively. Not surprisingly, all six tennis-playing ISAs said yes. T31 “guess[ed] it can be almost half of all players in women’s tennis teams,” while T34 “would say 70% of athletes playing at this level would be international” and T35 said, “Yes, my sport has a high number of international players, more than 60%.” For the DSAs, T36 said, “Yes,

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

there are a lot...international players have taken over the game” and T37 said, “Yes and the percentage is probably at least half of the population.” Both of these DSAs are on the all-domestic Conference 1 team, as is T46, who agreed, “there are a lot of international athletes in our sport,” but she has a lower number in mind, “It’s probably around 40%.” The actual number is 35.2% (NCAA, 2010). Seven tennis players explicitly stated a higher number.

The responses to the qualitative portion of the questionnaire indicate that there are, in fact, differences in perceptions between international and domestic student-athletes in terms of their actual recruiting experience, as ISAs had less opportunity for face-to-face contact, as well as in their view of the recruiting process, as ISAs felt that their recruiting was the same as domestic, while domestic felt it was different between the two. Both sides agreed that there is perhaps an advantage for the domestic student-athlete, in particular because of that face-to-face contact opportunity. In terms of coaches considering status, perhaps the price of the international scholarship was a factor, but the idea that coaches just want the best players, wherever they can get them from, was a common theme. Additionally, coaches were, overall, the most-named factor when it came to school choice, and in particular for ISAs, while other factors included money, location, academics and the team itself. DSAs most often cited the team. Both sides agreed there are similar scholarship opportunities in their sport, regardless of status, and further that they did not believe that they personally had that opportunity affected in any way by status. Both sides also agreed that ultimately the best players play. And finally, most student-athletes, regardless of status, felt that being on a team with both international and domestic student-athletes was a positive or neutral experience, and then

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

further that there was a “high” percentage of international participation in their respective sport.

Chapter V: Conclusion

Amongst the international and domestic student-athlete participants in this study, there were differences in their perceptions regarding their recruitment and the recruiting process, and differences in factors that influenced school choice. In terms of scholarship opportunities and perceptions regarding the internationality of their sport, there seemed to be more similarities. Domestic student-athletes, in all cases, had some sort of face-to-face contact with their coach during the recruiting process, while for international student-athletes, 42% had never met the coach in person before attending their university. This seems somewhat contradictory to Wilson and Wolverton's (2008) assertion that the "surest" way to find top international players is to go watch them play in their country, and further, some international players expect to meet with the coaches before committing. Four ISAs who did have actual face-to-face contact specifically indicated that they had to come to the United States and play in some capacity in order for the coaches to scout them. Another difference in perception between ISAs and DSAs was whether status was a factor in the recruiting process and then who held the advantage. ISAs thought the process was the same, while DSAs thought it was different. These are some of the same ISAs who indicated that they in fact had a very different recruiting process, the aforementioned lack of face-to-face contact. There was agreement, however, that DSAs had a recruiting advantage, and indeed "most coaches try to sign the best American athletes, the top U.S. players are inundated with offers" (Wilson & Wolverton, 2008, p. A27).

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

According to Popp et al. (2011), the value of an athletic scholarship, the coach's personality, and academics are some of the most important items for ISAs when it comes to school choice. And, in fact, all three of these items were mentioned by international student-athletes who participated in this study, with coaches being mentioned the most. DSAs, according to Popp et al. (2011), valued getting to know members of the team over the personality of the coach, but both were amongst the top five factors in school choice. This was also consistent with the current findings, as DSAs most often mentioned their team and teammates. However, academics and location were also often mentioned by DSAs, neither of which were top five categories in the Popp et al. (2011) study, although that study did suggest that females, regardless of country of origin, "place a greater emphasis on academic factors" (p. 186). Popp et al. (2009) suggest that there is a "highly contentious" debate presently in the United States regarding the emphasis that student-athletes place on academics, and further that it may be more important to ISAs, but the results here suggest that it is of relative importance to both types of participants and to DSAs in particular, especially those coming from the Conference 1 school. This is more consistent with Pauline's (2010) study of lacrosse players, a sport with little international participation for women (1.1%), that found that four of the five highest ranked factors in school choice were related to academics.

Both international and domestic student-athletes in this study overwhelmingly believed that there are similar scholarship opportunities in their sport, regardless of status. According to Abbey-Pinegar (2010) student-athletes from around the world "flock" to the United States in order to take advantage of the opportunities for scholarships (p. 341). However, she further contends, many domestic student-athletes view their international

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

counterparts as competition when it comes to scholarship availability. In tennis, the rise of international participation is “a topic of concern” and that the “domination of foreign players” has resulted in the best [American] 18 and under players not being able to get a scholarship and then therefore a possible decline in American tennis (Weston, 2006, p.833). Whether or not this is true, the athletes in this study did not seem to share these feelings, and amongst the tennis players in particular, only one (a DSA) of 11 thought there were not similar opportunities, and even that one participant (T38) did not think that she personally had her scholarship opportunity affected in any way by ISAs. It is worth noting, however, that the participants in this study did in fact have scholarships or were at least members of a college team. Potential student-athletes who were unable to attain either were not surveyed, therefore perhaps having a different view on scholarship opportunity. It is also worth remembering that 23 of 49 participants indicated that their present university was not their first choice, though there were not any specifically mentioned incidents of losing a spot to someone of another status.

Another area in which both ISAs and DSAs had similar perceptions was in terms of the level of international participation in their sport. Most agreed that it was a high number, and further many overinflated the percentages. It is important to note that while women’s sports were studied, there are similarly increased numbers in the last 10 years for the men: in golf, the number increased from 3.9% to 12.3%, in soccer, from 4.9% to 13.1%, and in tennis, from 16.6% to 40% (NCAA, 2010). According to Wilson and Wolverton (2008), “more blue-chip players in golf, tennis and soccer are turning pro right out of high school, leading to a shortage of American talent...there are just not enough of the best American athletes to go around” (p. A27).

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

The small sample size of this study and the fact that the tennis participants from Conference 1 were all domestic, and Conference 2 were all international, may have affected an ability to generalize the data, in particular in terms of perceptions and feelings regarding participating on a team with a mix of both types of players. It would be interesting to research how many schools in sports with larger international participation have similar circumstances. Future researchers could gain more insight by conducting focus groups with the athletes and interviewing coaches. It could also be useful to explore the use of academic scholarships in terms of inducing student-athlete school commitment. For example, investigating schools that create full rides that consist of a combination of partial athletic and academic scholarships, and whether this practice is being used as a recruiting strategy.

References

- Abbey-Pinegar, E. (2010). The need for a global amateurism standard: international student-athlete issues and controversies. *Indiana Journal of Legal Studies*, 17(2), 341-365.
- Bale, J. (1991). *The brawn drain: foreign student-athletes in American universities*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Drape, J. (2006, April 11). Foreign pros in college tennis: on top and under scrutiny. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Kankey, K. & Quarterman, J. (2007). Factors influencing the university choice of NCAA Division I softball players. *The SMART Journal*, 3(2), 35-49.
- Love, A. & Kim, S. (2011). Sport labor migration and collegiate sport in the United States: a typology of migrant athletes. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 90-104.
- Mulhauser, D. (2001). NCAA cracks down on foreign athletes, while urging members to relax rules. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(12), 44-46.
- NCAA (2010). *1999-00-2009-10 NCAA student-athlete ethnicity report*. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.
- Pauline, J. (2010). Factors influencing college selection by NCAA Division I, II, and III lacrosse players. *The ICHPER-SD Journal of Research in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance*, 5(2), 62-69.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

- Pierce, D., Popp, N., & Meadows, B. (2011). Qualitative analysis of international student-athlete perspectives on recruitment and transitioning into American college sport, *The Sport Journal*, 14.
- Popp, N., Pierce, D., & Hums, M.A. (2011). A comparison of the college selection process for international and domestic student-athletes at Division I universities. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 176-187.
- Popp, N., Hums, M.A., & Greenwell, T.C. (2009). Do international student-athletes view the purpose of sport differently than United States student-athletes at NCAA Division I universities? *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 93-110.
- Sato, T. & Burge-Hall, V. (2008). International student-athletes' experiences at a historically black college and university. *VAHPERD Journal* 29 (4), 16-18.
- Thibault, L. (2009). Globalization of sport: an inconvenient truth. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23, 1-20.
- Weston, M.A. (2006). Internationalization in college sports: issues in recruiting, amateurism, and scope. *42 Willamette Law Review*, 829-860.
- Wilson, R. & Wolverton, B. (2008). The new face of college sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 54(18), 27-32.

Appendix A: Informed Consent - Survey

Consent to Participate in a Research Study **“Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics”**

Purpose of the Study:

This is a study in Sport Management that is being conducted by Erica Zonder, a candidate for a Master’s Degree at Eastern Michigan University. The purpose of the study is to examine the effect of the increase in international student-athletes on both domestic and international student-athlete’s perception of their experience.

What will be done:

You will complete a two-part survey, which will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. The first part of the survey will ask demographic questions. The second part asks 13 questions regarding the student-athlete’s experience in terms of recruiting, scholarship opportunity, factors that determined school choice, and playing time/starter status in comparison to student-athletes with the opposite “status”, i.e. international vs. domestic. We ask for demographic information (e.g., age, domestic vs. international status, sex, sport played) so that we can accurately describe the general traits of the group of student-athletes who participate in the study.

Benefits of this Study:

While you may not receive a direct benefit from participating in this research, some people find sharing their stories to be a valuable experience. We hope that this study will be a useful addition to the body of research examining the aforementioned issue.

Compensation

There will be no compensation for participation in this study.

Risks or discomforts: No risks or discomforts are anticipated from taking part in this study. If you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether. If you decide to quit at any time before you have finished the questionnaire, your answers will NOT be recorded.

Confidentiality: Your responses will be kept completely confidential. All participants and their organization (school, team, etc.) will remain anonymous. Information from in-person surveys will be kept in a secure and locked location until the data is transferred to a computer. The researchers will enter study data on a computer that is password-protected and uses special coding to protect the information.

Decision to quit at any time:

Your participation is voluntary; you are free to withdraw your participation from this study at any time. There is no penalty for discontinuing or ending your participation at any time during the study. You also may choose to skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

How the findings will be used:

The results of the study will be used for scholarly purposes. The results from the study will be presented in educational settings and at professional conferences, and the results might be published in a professional journal in the field of sport management. As this study could potentially fill a gap in the research regarding the increased participation by international student-athletes on the domestic and international student-athlete experience, this knowledge could be further used to inform future policy decisions regarding scholarship opportunities and recruiting at the collegiate level.

Contact information:

If you have questions about this research, including questions about the survey itself or your participation, you can contact Brenda Riemer, Ph.D., Eastern Michigan University, Department of Health Promotion and Human Performance, 318N Porter, Ypsilanti, MI 48197, (734) 487-7120, briemer@emich.edu.

This research protocol and informed consent document has been reviewed and approved by the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee for use from 11-28-12 to 11-27-13. If you have questions about the approval process, please contact Dr. Gretchen Dahl Reeves, Chair, CHHS-HSRC, at (734) 487-3236, greeves@emich.edu.

Consent:

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in the study. You will be given a copy of this document for your records and one copy will be kept with the study records. Be sure that questions you have about the study have been answered and that you understand what you are being asked to do. You may contact the researcher if you think of a question later.

I agree to participate in the study.

Signature

Date

Appendix B: Questionnaire

Part I: Demographic Questions

1. What is your age? 18 19 20 21 22 Other (_____)

2. Where were you born? _____

3. If you were not born in the United States, when did you move to the United States?

4. What is your class?
 Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

5. Did you attend a community college before this University? Yes No

6. Are you an:
International Student-Athlete _____ Domestic Student-Athlete _____

7. Sport _____

8. Are you on an athletic scholarship?
 Yes No If yes, what percentage? _____

9. Are you on an academic scholarship?
 Yes No

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

4. What was the deciding factor for you to attend this university? Was this school your first choice?

5. Do you believe that your status had any bearing on your school choice options?

6. Do you believe that there are similar scholarship opportunities in your sport for all student-athletes regardless of their status?

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

7. Were your scholarship opportunities affected in any way by your status? If yes, please explain.

8. Do you believe that whether or not someone is on an athletic scholarship has any effect on playing time or whether that person is a starter? Please explain.

9. Do you believe that playing time or position as a starter is affected in any way by a student-athlete's status? Has your playing time or position as a starter been affected?

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

13. Do you have any other thoughts or feelings that you would like to share? Are there any other questions that you wished you were asked?

Examining the Internationalization of College Athletics

Appendix C: Human Subjects Approval

Eaglemail: MS #1095 - College of Health and Human Services Hum...

https://mail.emich.edu/zimbra/?app=email&app=email

The screenshot shows an email client interface with a navigation bar at the top containing 'Mail', 'Address Book', 'Calendar', 'Tasks', 'Briefcase', 'Preferences', and several 'Fwd: MS #1095 -' buttons. A search bar is also present. On the left, there is a 'Folders' pane with 'Inbox (975)' selected, and a 'March 2013' calendar. The main email content is as follows:

MS #1095 - College of Health and Human Services Human Subjects November 28, 2012 10:35 PM

From: Gretchen Dahl Reeves
To: Erica Zonder
Cc: The Authors, The Administrators

Dear Erica,

Congratulations! After careful review of your proposal "Student-Athlete Perceptions of Increased Internationalization in College Athletics" and its revisions the College of Health and Human Services Human Subjects committee is pleased to approve it. Thank you for highlighting the changes in color so we could locate them. Your informed consent is very clear and well-stated. As you have indicated, the dates in your informed consent should be "from 11/28/102 to 11/27/2013". I appreciate that your target for completion is in the spring 2013, but we always approve an investigation for a one-year period and this gives you some breathing room if you need it. Also note that if you do use an online survey, your informed consent would provide a statement that says "by completing this survey, you are indicating your consent to participate...". Other statements related to voluntary participation, withdrawal, etc. would also be applicable.

We stress that you do not stray from your proposed plan.

Good luck with your research effort. We believe that the information will be a valuable contribution to the literature and knowledge in your field.

Sincerely,
Gretchen Dahl Reeves, PhD
Chair, CHHS-HSRC