2021

The Athletic Identity of Collegiate Athletic Trainers: A Descriptive Study

Christianne M. Eason
University of Connecticut

Stephanie H. Clines
Sacred Heart University

Recommended Citation

Eason, C. M., & Clines, S. (2021). The athletic identity of collegiate athletic trainers: A descriptive study. *Journal of Athletic Training.* Doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-0628.20

doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-0628.20

The Athletic Identity of Collegiate Athletic Trainers: A Descriptive Study

Christianne M Eason, PhD, ATC
Vice President of Sport Safety
Department of Kinesiology, University of Connecticut
2095 Hillside Road U-1110, Storrs, CT 06269
Phone: 860-486-4635 Twitter: CM_Eason
Fax: 860-486-1123 Website: ksi.uconn.edu
Email: christianne.eason@uconn.edu
Corresponding author
Twitter: CM_Eason

Stephanie Clines, PhD, LAT, ATC
Clinical Assistant Professor | College of Health Professions
Clinical Education Coordinator | Athletic Training Programs
Sacred Heart University

5151 Park Ave
Fairfield, CT 06825
203-365-4475
Twitter: *@SacredHeartMSAT*

The Athletic Identity of Collegiate Athletic Trainers: A Descriptive Study

Context: Empirical and anecdotal evidence suggest that many athletic trainers were former athletes and select the profession due to its affiliation with sport. Qualitative research has indicated that collegiate athletic trainers may have a strong athletic identity, but the concept of athletic identity has not been quantified in this population. **Objective:** To quantitatively asses the athletic identity of collegiate athletic trainers and determine if group differences exist. **Design:** Cross-sectional observational study. **Setting:** Collegiate clinical setting. **Patients and Other Participants:** A total of 257 (n = 93 (37%) males, n = 162 (63%) females) athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting were included in data analysis. **Main Outcome Measure(s):** Data were collected via a web-based survey platform which was designed to measure athletic identity. Demographic information was analyzed for frequency and distribution. Mann-Whitney *U* tests and Kruskal-Wallis tests were calculated to determine if group differences existed. **Results:** The large majority of participants (90%) self-identified as having participated in organized sport yet scored moderately on the athletic identity measurement scale (22.9 $\pm$ 7.9). There were no sex differences in overall athletic identity (p = .446), but females did have higher levels of negative affectivity (p = .045) than males. Testing also revealed group differences based on current employment setting for social identity (p = .020), with NCAA Division I scores less than Division II, III, and NAIA. NCAA Division III exclusivity (p = .030) was lower than NCAA Division II and NAIA. **Conclusions:** It appears that components of athletic identity vary based on the employment setting of collegiate athletic trainers and may have a relationship to the number of hours worked in the summer. The moderate athletic identity scores of collegiate

athletic trainers are comparable to former athletes who selected career paths outside of sport. This may indicate adaptive career decision processes. **Key Words:** Negative Affectivity, Social-Identity, Exclusivity, Foreclosure

Key Points:

1. The majority of collegiate athletic trainers self-identify as former athletes, though score moderately on the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale.
2. Females have higher athletic negative affectivity scores than males.
3. Athletic Trainers employed in the NCAA Division I setting have lower athletic social identity than those employed in the NCAA Division II, NCAA Division III, or NAIA settings.

Evidence suggests that many individuals who pursue a career in athletic training are former athletes[1-4] and recruits chose athletic training programs based on a strong affiliation with sport.[3] While the athletic careers of many athletic trainers did not extend past high school, often as the result of injury,[4] participation in sport activities has been suggested to impact self-perceptions and athletic identity regardless of activity level.[5] Athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting have discussed how their prior involvement in sport facilitated a continued importance of athletics and physical activity in their lives, which was speculated to also influence their decision to pursue a career in athletics as opposed to choosing a different healthcare profession.[1]

Identity is defined as a process that blends personality and connects an individual to the social world.[6] Athletic identity is a concept in which individuals self-identify with the role of

athlete. The athletic self-perception is developed as a response to group affiliations and social interactions based around sport[7] and influences the degree of importance of athletics in an individual's life.[8] Athletic identity has been studied extensively in various areas related to aspects of one's career. The challenge for many individuals who exhibit a high level of athletic identity is striking a balance between their development as athletes and their development as individuals and future professionals. Previous literature has identified that student-athletes who highly identify with their role as an athlete are more likely to explore a sport-related profession as compared to professions outside the athletic environment.[9,10] Additionally, a high degree of athletic identity has been linked to the increased risk of delayed career development,[11] burnout,[12,13] and anxiety.[14] However, there are also potential positive outcomes related to a strong athletic identity. Potential positive outcomes include a greater likelihood of long-term involvement in exercise behaviors and an enhanced development of sense of self.[8]

Research examining the work-life interface has highlighted the role individual level factors, such as personality and values, play on both individual level (job satisfaction, turnover, health, stress) and organizational level outcomes (job performance, culture, policies, labor force composition).[15] Within the collegiate employment setting organizational factors including inadequate staff size, inequity between hours and salary, and a perceived lack of work schedule autonomy have been cited as factors negatively impacting job satisfaction and career intention.[1] In recent years, athletic training literature has begun to explore individual level factors[1,16,17] and former athletic trainers indicate individual level factors contributed to their departure from the profession.[18] An examination of athletic identity, an individual level factor, can help researchers better understand the work-life interface of athletic trainers.

Limited evidence examining the idea of athletic identity in this population exists despite reports of athletic trainers choosing the field because of an interest in sport and their own prior involvement in athletics. Due to the identified relationship between a strong athletic identity and career challenges that have been documented in the athletic training profession,[19] we identified a need to quantitatively assess the athletic identity of athletic trainers due to a lack of literature on this topic. Previous qualitative data revealed that collegiate athletic trainers value the role of athletics in their lives,[1] but as previously mentioned, the concept of athletic identity was not quantified in this population. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to quantify athletic identity among an athletic trainer population employed in the collegiate setting. In addition, we wanted to determine if any demographic group differences exist regarding athletic identity among this population.

METHODS

Study Design

The study utilized a cross-sectional design and data were collected through an online survey program (Qualtrics, Provo, UT) to gather descriptive information related to the athletic identity of collegiate athletic trainers. The study was approved by Lasell University's institutional review board prior to data collection.

Procedures

Data presented were collected in conjunction with data related to the work-family guilt of collegiate athletic trainers.[20] For this study only data related to participant demographics and athletic identity were analyzed and will be presented.

A random sample of 2,500 emails of certified athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting was generated by the National Athletic Trainers Association (NATA) membership services. Individuals were emailed a recruitment letter which explained the purpose of the study and a web link to the online survey. In an attempt to increase enrollment, reminder emails were sent to all email addresses initially contacted at 14 and 21 days after the initial request for participation was distributed. Researchers emailed participants directly to ensure personal emails could not be linked to responses to help ensure confidentiality. All potential participants were Bcc'd on emails to further help ensure confidentiality.

Participants

Inclusion criteria for this study was full-time employment in the collegiate clinical setting. The collegiate setting was selected because it represents one of the highest categories of athletic trainer employment among NATA members, with 25.1% of certified NATA members employed in the collegiate setting at the time of data collection.[21] The collegiate setting also encompasses numerous challenging organizational factors that influence the athletic trainer's career.[19] Participants were asked to self-identify their employment setting and acknowledge their position as full-time. Participants who completed the questionnaire that did not meet the inclusion criteria were removed before data analysis. Exclusion criteria included: 1) graduate assistants or interns and 2) full-time academic appointment.

A total of 257 (n = 93 (37%) males, n = 162 (63%) females) athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting were included in our data analysis. Additional participant demographic data can be found in Table 1.

Questionnaire

The web-based survey was comprised of a demographic section and the Athletic Identity Measurement Scale (AIMS). [22] The demographic portion of the survey gathered information related to participant age, sex, race/ethnicity, years of experience, contract length, current position, average hours worked, marital and family status, and previous involvement in organized sport. Prior to distribution the survey was trialed by two certified athletic trainers with survey research experience and employed in the collegiate setting. The purpose of this step was to establish likely participant response latency, clarity of demographic questions, comprehension of terminology used, survey flow and visual appeal, and functionality of the survey link. At the conclusion of the trial, minor grammatical changes were made to the demographic questions.

Athletic Identity

The 7-item composite AIMS[22] was used to identify participants' athletic identity. The AIMS has been shown to be a reliable and valid measure of athletic identity.[8,22] Internal consistency of the AIMS (α = .81-.93) has been obtained[8,23] and AIMS scores have been shown to increase with level of sport involvement, perceived importance of sports competence, and other constructs that relate to athletic identity.[8,23] The AIMS was initially designed to investigate the relationship of athletic identity to emotional disturbance during common transitions encountered by athletes and from a developmental perspective.[8] The original AIMS was a 10-item measure and became the most commonly used measure of athletic identity,[22] however the dimensionality of this scale was questioned by various researchers. In order to discern the dimensionality of the AIMS, Brewer and Cornelius[22] examined its factorial structure and invariance and removed three items from the original scale. The 7-item composite AIMS was used for this study given

the issues identified in the original 10-item measures and because it has been shown to be appropriate for assessing athletic identity in both males and females[22] and among athletes and non-athletes.[22]

The scale consists of three factors that have been shown to be subordinate to one higher-order athletic identity factor; 1) social identity, 2) exclusivity, and 3) negative affectivity.[22] The social identity subscale measures the degree to which an individual views themself as occupying the role of athlete. The exclusivity subscale measures an individual's degree of self-worth by participating in athletics. The negative affectivity subscales measure the degree to which unwanted athletic outcomes impact negative emotions.[5] Higher scores on all subscales indicate higher levels of each individual factor. Previous research has also indicated that participation in sport may influence the self-perceptions of recreational sports participants, even if the participant themselves did not define themselves as athletes per se.[5] The items on the scale are rated on a 7-point Likert scale and are summed to create an overall athletic identity. Scores on the scale can range from 7 to 49, with higher scores indicating a higher athletic identity.

Data Analysis

Data were downloaded from the online survey platform into an Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, USA) and then transferred in to an SPSS (version 22.0; IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) worksheet. The data were cleaned by listwise deleting if the participant did not complete at least 90% of the survey instrument. A total of 257 participants were included in data analysis, after removing 89 participants who did not answer at least 90% of the questions. The a priori

level was set at $p < .05$ prior to data analysis and all descriptive and significance testing was completed via SPSS.

Scores were summed for the AIMS and three factors and a Kolmogrov-Smirnov test was calculated to determine the normality of variables, revealing data were nonparametric. Spearmen correlations were calculated to determine the relationship among athletic identity, age, years of experience, years of Board of Certification (BOC) certification, years in current position, and average hours worked per week (in-season, off-season, and summer). Separate Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to determine if any differences existed in athletic identity score based on sex or family status. Kruskal-Wallis tests were performed to determine if there was a difference in athletic identity score based on race/ethnicity, highest level of education, current position title, length of contract, organizational reporting structure, marital status, and NCAA Division of employment.

RESULTS

Demographics

The 257 participants included in data analysis represent a 10% response rate. The average age of participants was 40 $\pm$ 10 (range 25 – 64) and had been certified by the BOC for 16 $\pm$ 9 years (range 0 – 41). Participants indicated they worked 58 $\pm$ 14 hours per week providing "in-season" athletic training services, 45 $\pm$ 11 hours per week during their nontraditional season, and 30 $\pm$ 13 hours per week during the summer months. Additional demographic information can be found in Table 1.

Reliability Statistics

Reliability testing revealed good internal consistency for the AIMS among our population; α = .82. Additionally, self-identified former athletes in our sample scored statistically significantly higher than self-identified non-athletes (U = 1127, p = .001), further validating the survey among our sample.

Athletic Identity of Collegiate Athletic Trainers

Our participants average athletic identity score was 22.9 $\pm$ 7.9 (range 7 – 43) with the majority indicating that they have participated in organized sport as an athlete (236 (91.8%) = yes, 19 (7.4%) = no). Table 2 presents the athletic identity score for the entire sample and select demographic groups with corresponding AIMS factor scores.

Results of the spearman correlation indicated significant positive association between athletic identity score and number of years of participation in organized sport (rho[226] = .238, p < .001). Additionally, significant negative association between athletic identity and average hours worked in the summer (rho[199] = -.203, p = .004).

Demographic Group Differences based on Athletic Identity

Results of the Mann-Whitney U test revealed no statistically significant differences between sex and athletic identity scores (U = 7057, p = .446) or family status and athletic identity scores (U = 7771, p = .654). A statistically significant difference existed between males (6 [IQR; 3, 8]) and females (7 [IQR; 4, 9]) in regard to their negative affectivity score (U = 6365.5, p = .045) but no sex differences among social identity or exclusivity. There were no statistically significant differences between family status and any of the AIMS factors.

Results of the Kruskal-Wallis Test revealed no statistically significant differences between race/ethnicity, highest level of education, current position title, length of contract,

196 organizational reporting structure, NCAA Division, or marital status in regard to athletic identity
197 score. There was statistically significant difference in the negative affectivity factor and highest
198 level of education (χ^2 [2] = 10.092, p = .006) with a mean rank score of 75.83 for Bachelor's
199 Degree, 131.47 for Master's Degree, and 144.33 for Doctoral Degree (Table 2). Post hoc testing
200 revealed a statistically significant difference between the Bachelor's Degree and Master's
201 Degree groups (p = .002) and the Bachelor's Degree and Doctoral Degree groups (p = .022)
202 indicating that individuals with an earned Bachelor's Degree had lower negative affectivity than
203 both individuals with an earned Master's Degree and individuals with an earned Doctoral
204 Degree.

205 Additional statistical significance was observed based on current work setting and two
206 of the AIMS factors. There was a statistically significant difference in the social identity factor
207 and NCAA Division (χ^2 [4] = 11.653, p = .020) and the exclusivity factor and NCAA Division (χ^2 [4]
208 = 10.731, p = .030). Post hoc testing revealed statistically significant differences between the
209 NCAA Division I group and NCAA Division III group (p = .019), NCAA Division II group (p = .020)
210 and NAIA group (p = 0.010) as it relates to the social identity factor and a statistically significant
211 differences between the NCAA Division III group and NCAA Division II group (p = .030) and NAIA
212 group (p = 0.025) as it relates to the exclusivity factor (Table 2).

213 **DISCUSSION**

214 The goal of this study was to quantify the athletic identity of collegiate athletic trainers
215 and to determine if demographic differences existed. Because the literature has identified that
216 athletic training students are drawn to the profession because of a strong affiliation to a
217 sports/team model[3] it is important to quantify the athletic identity of those currently employed

as athletic trainers to better understand if athletic identity is driving entrance into the profession. Our findings revealed that the large majority of collegiate athletic trainers indicate previous involvement in organized sport as an athlete, though they scored moderately on the athletic identity scale. There were no sex differences in total athletic identity scores, though females scored higher than males on the negative affectivity subscale. Participants employed in the NCAA Division I setting had lower social identity than their colleagues employed in the NCAA Division II, NCAA Division III, and NAIA settings. Additionally, the exclusivity scores of respondents employed in both the NCAA Division II and NAIA collegiate settings were higher than their colleagues employed in the NCAA Division III setting.

Our results highlighted several demographic differences in the athletic identity of our participants. Previous research has shown males have higher athletic identity than females,[5] despite reports from Cuppett and Latin[24] that female athletic trainers are more physically active than their male counterparts. Previous gender sport research has argued that participation in sport for women is contrary to societal expectations,[25,26] and this has been used to explain lower observed athletic identity in females. However, our findings revealed no sex differences in total athletic identity score. This result could be an indication that individuals, regardless of sex, are drawn to the collegiate clinical athletic training practice setting because of their athletic identity. Future research is warranted to explore this topic further.

Our results did highlight that female athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting had higher negative affectivity scores than their male counterparts. Negative affectivity is a measurement of negative emotions stemming from unwanted sporting outcomes. Lamont-Mills and Christensen[5] identified that both elite and recreational female athletes had the same level

of negative affectivity and speculated that female's participation in sport, particularly at a recreational level, is more related to physical self-worth or self-concept than athletic identity. They went on to speculate that for females, unwanted aspects may be more related to physical as opposed to athletic characteristics and that participation in sport may be linked to a desire to be physically active.[5] Our findings could help explain Cuppet and Latin's[24] findings specific to female athletic trainers' physical activity compared to males and may indicate that males and females are active in sport for different reasons.

Uniquely, our participants overall athletic identity score is comparable to retired athletes who chose careers not related to sport.[27] Shachar et al.[27] investigated the athletic identity of former athletes who chose to become coaches and those who chose careers not related to sport. The retrospective athletic identity of both groups did not differ at the time of their athletic career retirement, but participants who pursued a career in coaching had significantly stronger athletic identity at the time of assessment than those who entered careers outside of an athletic setting. Interestingly the athletic identity reported in non-coaches (25.42)[27] was similar to the athletic trainers surveyed in our study (22.9). Though we did not assess athletic identity retroactively, we can say that athletic trainers have athletic identity scores similar to that of retired athletes who chose careers outside of sport.

Former athletes who choose careers in coaching are more likely to commit to a career without examining other professional pathways, which may indicate maladaptive characteristics.[27] Despite research indicating that athletic training students select their academic and career path based on sport affiliations[2] our results suggest, given the similar athletic identity score of non-coaches, that athletic trainers employed in the collegiate setting

likely use an adaptive approach toward making career choices. An adaptive career decision approach involves exploring and narrowing career options, committing to a specific career goal, and implementing the selected career.[28] It is important to note that we did not measure tendency to foreclose in this study, and therefore cannot say with any certainty if collegiate athletic trainers use an adaptive or maladaptive approach to career selection.

A career in athletics has been labeled as a lifestyle choice rather than an occupation, due to its unique demands and expectations for high performance regardless of position.[29] As a result, the workplace culture of athletics has been characterized by high levels of work-life conflict and role imbalance. [30,31] Similar to the identity conflict experienced as a student-athlete,[30] the now athletic employee may continue to experience role imbalance within the athletic environment, potentially leading to role conflict and burnout.[32] However, former athletes who choose careers outside of sport likely see a decrease in their athletic identity because distance from sport reduces the importance of the athlete role in their lives,[27] and enables them to capture a larger portion in the multidimensional self-concept.[33] Therefore, athletes who invest in their role as student during college may have more of an opportunity to explore non-sport career options,[34] highlighting the importance of diversifying self-identity, particularly early in the academic years.

Previous research has identified that a large number of athletic trainers are former athletes,[1] and our results confirm this with more than 90% of our participants self-identifying as a former athlete. While all of the athletic trainers in our study were employed in a career and setting that included a high level of involvement with sport, their athletic identity was interestingly lower than what we see in former athletes who select a career in coaching.[27]

Several possible explanations exist to explain our results in regard to athletic trainers having lower athletic identity than former athletes who chose a career in sport.

First, athletic trainers are allied healthcare providers who work with the unique subpopulation of physically active individuals. Analysis of the services provided by athletic trainers[35] and the rationale for the utilization of athletic training services[36] clearly emphasizes the role of the athletic trainer as a healthcare professional, rather than a member of a sports team. While determined to be a weak influence, the opportunity to help others and provide medical care has been identified as an attractor to the athletic training profession.[3] Because athletic trainers have made a decision to enter a healthcare profession, it is possible that their own self-identity has expanded, which could explain the lower comparative athletic identity score. This could indicate the reason many professionals persist in the athletic training profession is related to the desire to become a healthcare professional,[2] rather than solely to work in sport, demonstrating an expanded self-identity extending beyond athletic affiliation over time.

Conversely, this expanded self-identity to include the role of healthcare professional may also contribute to attrition from the athletic training profession. Research has identified that bureaucracy and politics of the traditional athletic setting can lead to the experience of burnout in collegiate athletic trainers. [37,38] Additionally, the ability to have a successful career as an athletic trainer and persist in the field, particularly within the NCAA Division I setting, has been discussed in the context of one's ability to "fit the mold" of the environment.[38] While this investigation did not explore the relationship between athletic identity and organizational culture within this athletic setting, it is possible that the evolution of both athletic identity and

self-identity influence the athletic trainer's perception of their ability to "fit the mold" long term, subsequently influencing attrition within the clinical setting or profession.

Lastly, given the high number of hours that collegiate athletic trainers work (58 ± 14 hours per week in our sample) there may not be time to engage in personal sport activity causing a subsequent drop in athletic identity. Because we did not assess athletic identity retrospectively and previous research has indicated that athletic trainers do value and make time for physical activity in their lives[1,24] this is not substantiated by our research. Additionally, our results did reveal a weak negative correlation between athletic identity and the number of hours worked in the summer. This finding could be an indication that individuals who work less in the summer have more time to engage in sport or individuals with higher athletic identity chose employment settings that require them to work less in the summer so that they have more time to engage in recreational athletic activities. This relationship, however, was weak, and more research is warranted to explore this concept. Athletic trainers currently employed in the NCAA Division I setting had lower social identity scores than those employed in NCAA Division II, Division III and NAIA settings. The social identity subscale measures the degree to which an individual defines themselves as an athlete. An observed relationship between athletic identity and the number of hours worked in the summer in combination with the negative correlation associated with summer hours is thought provoking. Previous research has indicated that NCAA rule changes that allow more sanctioned activities in the summer have impacted the summer workload of athletic trainers employed in the NCAA Division I Collegiate Setting.[39] Our findings further support to the idea that summer hours may impact the ability to engage in athletic activities.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our study is not without limitations. While the collegiate employment setting was intentionally selected because it represents one of the largest employment settings and most often operates within an athletic organizational model, our results cannot be generalized to other athletic training employment settings. While many athletic trainers select employment settings that allow them to treat athletes as their patients, athletic trainers work with a diverse group of patients across many job settings. Future studies should quantify the athletic identity of athletic trainers employed in other settings, particularly those working in non-traditional settings. It may also be beneficial to compare the athletic identity of athletic trainers with other healthcare professionals to examine any potential differences. Our cross-sectional study collected data at one time point and did not involve any retroactive assessment of athletic identity which would have allowed us to determine if the athletic identity of athletic trainers decreases over time. Retroactive examination of athletic identity could be valuable information to further examine the career choices of potential athletic training students. As our profession transitions the professional degree level this could be valuable information to help determine why students are attracted to the profession. A retrospective examination of athletic identity could also help shed light on the career exploration process of athletic trainers and could help to explain attrition from educational programs or early career attrition. Additionally, it is recommended that future studies explore any potential relationships between athletic identity and individual outcomes (i.e. burnout, long term exercise behaviors, anxiety) as previous research has linked athletic identity to these constructs. [8,12-14]

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Although collegiate athletic trainers have selected a career tangential to sport, their athletic identity is similar to former athletes who selected careers outside sport. This may indicate that athletic trainers are involved in adaptive career decision processes. Components of athletic identity appear to differ based on employment setting though it is not clear if this is a result of the work setting or represents a component of self-identity that is dictating career choices. Previous research has highlighted that many athletic trainers were interested in the profession due to their own involvement in sport and this study confirms the majority of collegiate athletic trainers participated in organized sport at one point in their lives. The results of this study may begin to offer insight into why and how potential athletic training students choose to enter the profession and warrant further exploration as to why athletic trainers persist in the field, as the factors that influence prospective athletic training students may evolve as the profession transitions to a professional level master's degree.

REFERENCES

1. Eason CM, Mazerolle SM, Pitney WA, Denegar C, McGarry J. An individual and organizational level examination of male and female collegiate athletic trainers' work-life interface outcomes: Job satisfaction and career intentions. *Athl Train Sport Hlth Care*. 2020;12(1):21-30.

2. Gardiner-Shires A, Mensch J. Attractors to an athletic training career in the high school setting. *J Athl Train*. 2009;44(3):286-293.

3. Mensch J, Mitchell M. Choosing a career in athletic training: Exploring the perceptions of potential recruits. *J Athl Train*. 2008;43(1):70-79.

371 4. Malasarn R, Bloom GA, Crumpton R. The development of expert male national collegiate
372 athletic association division I certified athletic trainers. *J Athl Train*. 2002;37(1):55-62.

373 5. Lamont-Mills A, Christensen SA. Athletic identity and its relationship to sport participation
374 levels. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2006;9(6):472-478.

375 6. Erikson EH. *Identity: Youth and crisis.* New York: Norton; 1968.

376 7. Brewer BW, Van Raalte JL, Petitpas AJ, Sklar JH, Phlman MH, Krushell RJ. Preliminary
377 psychometric evaluation of a measure of adherence to clinic-based sport injury rehabilitation.
378 *Phys Ther Sport*. 2000;1:68-74.

379 8. Brewer BW, Van Raalte JI, Linder DE. Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or achilles heel?
380 *International J Sport Psychol*. 1993;24:237-254.

381 9. Burns GN, Jasinski D, Dunn SC, Fletcher D. Athlete identity and athlete satisfaction: The
382 nonconformity of exclusivity. *Person Indiv Diff*. 2012;52:280-284.

383 10. Carbrita TM, Rosado AB, Leite TO, Serpa SO, Sousa PM. The relationship between athletic
384 identity and career decisions in athletes. *J Appl Psychol*. 2014;26(4):471-481.

385 11. Murphy GM, Petitpas AJ, Brewer BW. Identity foreclosure, athletic identity, and career
386 maturity in intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Psychol*. 1996;10:239-246.

387 12. Raedeke TD. Is athlete burnout more than stress? A sport commitment perspective. *J Sport*
388 *Exer Psychol*. 1997;19:396-417.

389 13. Martin EM, Horn TS. The role of athletic identity and passion in predicting burnout in
390 adolescent female athletes. *Sport Psychol*. 2013;27(4):338-348.

391 14. Masten R, Tusak M, Faganel M. Impact of identity on anxiety in athletes. *Kinesiology*.
392 2006;38(2):126-134.

393 15. Dixon MA, Bruening JE. Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *J Sport*
394 *Manag*. 2007;21:377-406.

395 16. Mazerolle SM, Eason CM, Monsma E, Mensch JM. The role of personality in job satisfaction
396 among collegiate athletic trainers. *J Athl Train*. 2015;50(12):1247-1255.

397 17. Barrett J, Eason CM, Lazar R, Mazerolle SM. Personality traits and burnout among athletic
398 trainers employed in the collegiate setting. *J Athl Train*. 2016;51(6):454-459.

399 18. Kahanov L, Eberman LE, Juzeszyn L. Factors that contribute to failed retention in former
400 athletic trainers. *Internet J All Hlth Sci Prac*. 2013;11(4).

401 19. Oglesby LW, Gallucci AR, Wynveen CJ. Athletic trainer burnout: A systematic review of the
402 literature. *J Athl Train*. 2020;55(4):416-430.

403 20. Eason CM, Singe SM, Rynkiewicz K. Work-family guilt of collegiate athletic trainers: A
404 descriptive study. *Int J Athl Ther Train*. 2020;25(4):190-196.

21. National Athletic Trainers' Association. Membership statistics. http://members.nata.org/members1/documents/membstats/index.cfm. Updated 2020. Accessed October/10, 2020.

22. Brewer BW, Cornelius AE. Norms and factorial invariance of the athletic identity measurement scale (AIMS). *Acad Athl J*. 2001;15:103-113.

23. Good AJ, Brewer BW, Petitpas A J, Van Raalte JL, Mahar MT. Identity foreclosure, athletic identity, and college sport participation. *Acad Athl J*. 1993;8:1-12.

24. Cuppett M, Latin RW. A survey of physical activity levels of certified athletic trainers. *J Athl Train*. 2002;37(3):281-285.

25. Gill DL. Feminist sport psychology: A guide to our journey. *Sport Psychol*. 2001;15:363-372.

26. Whaley DL. Feminist methods and methodologies in sport and exercise psychology: Issues of identity and difference. *Sport Psychol*. 2001;15:419-430.

27. Shachar B, Brewer BW, Cornelius AE, Petitpas AJ. Career decision-making, athletic identity, and adjustment difficulties among retired athletes: A comparison between coaches and noncoaches. *Kinesiologia Slovenica*. 2004;1(71):85.

28. Blustein DL, Phillips SD. Readiness for career choice: Planning, exploring, and deciding. *Career Develop Quart*. 1994;43:63-73.

29. Weight EA, Taylor E, Huml MR, Dixon MA. Working in the sport industry: A classification of human capital archetypes. *J Sport Manage*. 2021;35(4):364-378.

30. Taylor EA, Smith AB, Graham JA, Hardin R. Adaptive lifestyles in intercollegiate athletes. *JIIA*. 2021;14:304-324.

31. Lu HD, Heinze KL, Soderstrom S. Playing multiple positions: Student-athlete identity salience and conflict. *JIS*. 2018;11(2):214-241.

32. Brewer BJ, Petipas AJ. Athletic identity foreclosure. *Curr Opin Psychol*. 2017;16:118-122.

33. Brewer BW, Van Raalte JL, Petitpas AJ. Self-identity and sport career transitions. In: Lavallee D, Wylleman P, eds. *Career transitions in sport: International perspective.* Morgantown: Fitness Information Technology; 2000:29-48.

34. Lally PS, Kerr GA. The career planning, athletic identity, and student role identity of intercollegiate student athletes. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. 2005;76(3):275-285.

35. Lam KC, Valier AR, Anderson BE, McLeod TC. Athletic training services during daily patient encounters: A report from the athletic training practice-based research network. *J Athl Train*. 2016;51(6):435-441.

36. Clines SH, Welch Bacon CE, Eason CM, Pagnotta KD, Huggins RA, Van Lunen BL. Influencing factors and rationale for the use of athletic trainers in secondary school athletic programs. *The Sport Journal*. 2018.

440 37. Pitney WA. Organizational influences and quality-of-life issues during the professional
441 socialization of certified athletic trainers working in the national collegiate athletic association
442 division I setting. *J Athl Train*. 2006;41(2):189-195.

443 38. Goodman A, Mensch JM, Jay M, French KE, Mitchell MF, Fritz SL. Retention and attrition
444 factors for female certified athletic trainers in the national collegiate athletic association
445 division I football bowl subdivision setting. *J Athl Train*. 2010;45(3):287-298.

446 39. Mazerolle SM, Eason CM, Goodman A. Exploring summer medical coverage within in the
447 national collegiate athletic association division I setting: A perspective from the athletic trainer.
448 *J Athl Train*. 2016;51(2):175-183.

449

Table 1. Participant Demographics

Demographic	N (%)
Sex (n = 255)	
Male	93 (37)
Female	162 (63)
Race/ethnicity (n = 254)	
Black not of Hispanic origin	12 (4.7)
Asian or Pacific Islander	6 (2.3)
White not of Hispanic origin	224 (87.2)
Hispanic	5 (1.9)
Multiethnic	6 (2.3)
Other	1 (0.4)
Highest level of education (n = 256)	
Bachelor's degree	18 (7.0)
Master's degree	229 (89.1)
Doctoral degree	9 (3.5)
NATA district (n = 248)	
1	28 (10.9)
2	40 (15.6)
3	35 (13.6)
4	45 (17.5)
5	19 (7.4)
6	9 (3.5)
7	6 (2.3)
8	26 (10.1)
9	27 (10.5)
10	13 (5.1)
Current position title (n = 256)	
Assistant AT	90 (35.2)
Associate AT	28 (10.9)
Head AT	82 (31.9)
Director of SM	18 (7.0)
Other	38 (14.8)
Length of contract (n = 256)	
9 months	11 (4.3)
10 months	46 (17.9)
11 months	15 (5.8)
12 months	171 (66.5)
Other	13 (5.1)
Org. reporting structure (n = 254)	
Academics	12 (4.7)
Athletics	204 (79.4)

Medical	32 (12.5)
Other	6 (2.3)
Marital status (n = 256)	
Married	146 (56.8)
Single	81 (31.5)
Divorced	18 (7.0)
Separated	1 (0.4)
Other	10 (3.9)
Sexual orientation (n = 252)	
Heterosexual	233 (90.7)
Homosexual	18 (7.1)
Bisexual	1 (0.4)
Family status (n = 255)	
No children	136 (52.9)
Children	119 (46.3)
Collegiate employment setting (n = 251)	
NCAA Division I	100 (38.9)
NCAA Division II	42 (16.3)
NCAA Division III	76 (29.6)
NAIA	15 (5.8)
Other	18 (7.2)

Table 2. Athletic Identity Scores by Demographics				
	Athletic Identity Score	**Social Identity**	**Exclusivity**	**Negative Affectivity**
	range (7 – 49)	range (3 – 21)	range (2 – 14)	range (2 – 14)
Total Sample	23 [IQR;17, 29]	12 [IQR; 8, 14]	5 [IQR; 3,8]	6 [IQR; 4, 9]
Self-Identified Former Athlete	23 [IQR; 17, 29]	12 [IQR; 8, 14]	5 [IQR; 3, 7.25]	6 [IQR; 4, 9]
Self-Identified Non-Athlete	18 [IQR; 9.75, 21.25]	9 [IQR; 4.75, 10]	5.0 [IQR; 2.75, 6.25]	2.5 [IQR; 2, 6]
Male	23 [IQR; 15.5, 28.5]	12 [IQR; 7.5, 14]	6 [IQR; 3, 8.5]	6 [IQR; 3, 8]
Female	24 [IQR; 18, 29]	12 [IQR; 9, 14]	4 [IQR; 3, 7]	7 [IQR; 4, 9]
Div I	22 [IQR; 16, 28]	10 [IQR; 8, 13]	4.5 [IQR; 3, 7]	6.0 [IQR; 4, 8]
Div II	24.5 [IQR; 20, 29.25]	12 [IQR; 8.75, 15]	6 [IQR; 4, 8]	7 [IQR; 4, 8.25]
Div III	23 [IQR; 16, 29]	12 [IQR; 8, 15]	4 [IQR; 3, 7]	6 [IQR; 3, 9]
NAIA	26 [IQR; 24, 29]	12 [IQR; 12, 15]	7 [IQR; 4, 9]	6 [IQR; 4, 8]
Bachelor's Degree	20.5 [IQR; 13.5, 25.25]	10.5 [IQR; 7.75, 15]	4 [IQR; 2, 8]	3.5 [IQR; 2, 5.25]
Master's Degree	24 [IQR; 17, 29]	12 [IQR; 9, 14]	5 [IQR; 3, 7]	7 [IQR; 4, 9]
Doctoral Degree	23 [IQR; 16, 27.5]	10 [IQR; 6.5, 13.5]	4 [IQR; 2.5, 7.5]	8 [IQR; 4, 9]

- Median and the 25% and 75% interquartile range are presented