Palacky University in Olomouc
Faculty of Physical Culture

Interpersonal Relationships in Multicultural Basketball Teams

Dissertation thesis

Author: Mgr. Anastasiya Khomutova

Department of Adapted Physical Activities
Faculty of Physical Culture
Palacky University in Olomouc
Supervisor: prof. PhDr. Hana Válková, CSc.

Olomouc 2014

Abstract:

This doctoral thesis contributes to the field of cultural sport psychology, which has been rapidly developing over recent years (Schinke, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009), with a particular focus on the functioning of multicultural sport teams, coach-athlete relationships in such teams, and potential problems that can occur in multicultural sports environments. The research sample consisted of six Central European basketball teams (two each from Germany, Latvia and the Czech Republic), and within this sample semi-structured interviews were conducted with six coaches, 17 immigrated and 18 local players. The interview data was subjected to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which established patterns in the interviewee accounts concerning various challenges for immigrated as well as local athletes (including motivation for immigration, challenges outside and inside sport context), and challenges that coaches face in multicultural teams (differences between cultural values, formation of ethnic subgroups, and working with Black players), who also suggested strategies for overcoming them. The thesis concludes by providing practical recommendations for practicing sport psychologists working with multicultural teams.

Keywords: acculturation, coach-athlete relationship, cultural diversity, immigrated athletes, multicultural teams, team cohesion

I agree that this thesis can be lent within the library service.

Jméno a příjmení autora: Mgr. Anastasiya Khomutova
Název disertační práce: Mezilidské vztahy v multikulturních basketbalových týmech
Pracoviště: Katedra adaptovaných pohybových aktivit
Školitelka: prof. PhDr. Hana Válková, CSc.
Rok obhajoby disertační práce: 2014

Abstrakt:

Tato disertační práce z oblasti kulturní psychologie sportu, která se v posledních letech rychle rozvíjí (Schinke, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009), se zaměřuje na fungování multikulturních sportovních družstev, na vztahy mezi trenérem a sportovcem ve zmíněných týmech, a na potenciální problémy, jež mohou v multikulturním sportovním prostředí vznikat. Výzkumný vzorek se skládal z šesti středoevropských basketbalových týmů (vždy dva z Německa, Lotyšska a z České republiky), včetně šesti trenérů, 17 zahraničních a 18 domácích hráčů. Údaje z rozhovorů byly podrobeny tematické analýze (Braun & Clarke, 2006), což umožnilo určit témata, která se ve výpovědích opakovala, týkající se problémů zahraničních i domácích hráčů (např. motivace migrace, problémy ve sportovním kontextu a každodenním životě), problémů, kterým v multikulturních týmech čelí trenéři (např. rozdíly mezi kulturními hodnotami, formování etnických podskupin, a práce s černými hráči), a zároveň strategií pro jejich překonání. V závěru jsou uvedena praktická doporučení pro práci sportovních psychologů v multikulturním prostředí.

Klíčová slova: akulturace, kulturní rozmanitost, multikulturní týmy, sportovní migrace, týmová soudržnost, vztah trenér-sportovec

Souhlasím s půjčováním práce v rámci knihovních služeb.

I declare in lieu of oath that I wrote this dissertation thesis myself under the supervision of prof. PhDr. Hana Válková, CSc. All information derived from the work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

Olomouc, …………………………...

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank to my supervisor prof. PhDr. Hana Válková, CSc for her support and priceless advices (for both academic and personal life) during all these years. I was blessed to have you around.

Thanks to all of the faculty staff, especially Milada Truksova, Helena Hanusova and Zuzana Hanelova, for the enormous support they give to all students – you make our life so much easier, and you manage to do it with a smile on your face! To all of my friends from Olomouc (Lucie and Ondra Jesinovi, Simona Safarikova, Radka Bartonova, Kamila Porembska - to name just a few) for your presence in my life, support, great advices and pushing me to pursue my dreams.

Also, I cannot be more grateful to Prof. Stuart Biddle and Dr. Sophia Jowett for making my visit to Loughborough University possible, which enriched me both as a person and as an academic, and significantly helped me in gathering theoretical information for this dissertation. Of course, I would like to thank to all the teams that participated in this research. I hope it was a great experience for all of you.

Finally, many thanks to my husband and my parents for their unbelievable patience and support, and for making this experience possible.

CONTENT

Introduction

Cultural sport psychology is a relatively new, yet rapidly developing area in the field of sport psychology, which attempts to better understand culturally diverse athletes, coaches and teams. Since the early 1990s, academics working in various human sciences have been urged to expand their studies by including such variables as ethnicity and race, and therefore avoid ignoring marginalised cultures (Duda & Allison, 1990; Ram, Starek, & Johnson, 2004). The phenomenon of globalisation in sport and widely spread sport migration led to the 'cultural turn' in sport psychology (Ryba, Schinke, & Tenenbaum, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009), which resulted in the origin of academic studies focusing on immigrated athletes and coaches working with international athletes.

These studies, particularly focusing on immigrated athletes' acculturation within new countries and team environments, were conducted by a small number of scholars, with Canadian researcher Robert Schinke arguably being the most prolific in this area over the last decade, publishing work conducted with numerous collaborators. One such study explored several acculturation strategies that immigrated athletes may use while adapting to a new team (Schinke & McGannon, 2013); another showed the key issues that immigrated athletes might face within a new cultural environment (Schinke, McGannon, Battochio, & Wells, 2013), including frustration with their home and host sport contexts, and the 'acculturation loads' – that is, the relative burden on athletes in adapting to new environments – which could be both adaptive or mal-adaptive. Schinke, Yukelson, Bartolacci, Battochio, & Johnstone (2011) study also contributed to the understanding of challenges that immigrated athletes face in sport, as well as outside the sport context, and also as they adapt to life within a new community overall.

In addition, several other studies have focused on coaches working with culturally diverse athletes, upon the recognition that sport labour migration may pose unique challenges for coaches as well. Coaches may have different expectations from players, based on their [players] ethnic background (Solomon et al., 1996), as coaches may, in particular, stereotype Black athletes (Burley & Fleming, 1997; Eastman & Billings, 2001), which can negatively influence relationships between coaches and their international athletes (Jowett & Frost, 2007). Building on these findings, other studies have suggested that coaches should adopt an empathetic approach to their immigrated athletes and consider the difficulties associated with their acculturation process, which would result in better interpersonal relationships between them (Duchesne, Bloom, & Sabiston, 2011; Schinke, 2011). However, while issues concerning acculturation and adaptation have been explored in this small collection of empirical studies, a focus on the functioning of multicultural teams and interpersonal relations in such teams still remain somewhat limited (if not neglected) in the academic field, which serves as the basis of this research.

This thesis therefore focuses on interpersonal relationships in multicultural sport teams. Sport teams are often compared to multicultural business groups, based on the similarities in working together in order to achieve a goal, whilst being under pressure from management to show results (Katz & Koenig, 2001). Such teams involve social environments which individuals wouldn't be likely to ever meet under other conditions, but as teammates they not only have to work with each other, but are also expected to communicate and establish productive working relationships with each other and their coaches or managers. While this can be a challenging proposition for players moving to another country, working in multicultural environments where teams are composed of many different nationalities can be difficult for all people involved. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that when exploring culturally diverse teams, researchers should not only focus on foreign players who have problems in adaptation and acculturation, or of the experiences of coaches working in such environments, but also the perspectives of domestic players who might feel uncomfortable because of their foreign teammates, and the overall effect of multicultural groupings on all relationships within teams. However, the existing research in the field of cultural sport psychology has largely focused on either immigrated players or coaches, to the relative neglect of 'local' players.

As such, this thesis contributes to the fast developing area of cultural sport psychology by exploring the challenges that cultural diversity can bring to sport teams, and does so by incorporating the viewpoints of immigrated players, local players and coaches

within several basketball teams located in Central European countries. The theoretical background for the evaluation of team dynamics and functioning was formed during the 1980s (e.g., Carron and colleagues' widely-used work on team cohesion), when the amount of international, migrant athletes in teams was not nearly at the level commonly seen today. Therefore, this thesis aims to summarise existing theoretical knowledge of team functioning, knowledge of multicultural communication, and the more recent knowledge of experience of immigrated athletes and their coaches, in order to further develop theoretical frames concerning how to assess the functioning, communication, and cohesion of culturally diverse teams. In order to make a meaningful contribution to the development of cultural sport psychology, the thesis also provides recommendations for practicing cultural sport psychologists based on the outcomes of the research.

Another reason for the origin of this thesis is that being a migrant myself, I have faced the difficulties that a new cultural environment can bring, what kind of effort is required from both migrants and their new colleagues in order to adapt and acculturate within a new country, and the challenges that establishing a new social network can involve. Furthermore, being able to fluently communicate in three languages, I decided to use this ability in order to accumulate the experience of immigrated and local players, together with their coaches, in order to describe the phenomenon of interpersonal relationships in culturally diverse sports teams, which has been only tentatively explored in the academic field so far. However, this thesis is written in the English language because the vast majority of the literature in this area, including sport psychology overall and cultural sport psychology particularly, is published in English as well. While predominantly, this English-language research draws upon samples taken from teams in Northern America or Western Europe, this thesis helps to widen the empirical scope of this field (as well as the theoretical one) by using a research sample from Central and Northern Europe.

1.   Group dynamics in sport

In order to understand the functioning of multicultural teams, it is important to first of all focus on the basic knowledge of the dynamics of sport teams overall. Therefore the focus of this chapter lies in reviewing the literature regarding group dynamics in sport in order to introduce the theoretical background for this topic. The chapter starts by offering a definition of teams and team dynamics, and then discusses group development, including team cohesion, forming of team norms, roles and goals, before finally turning to the importance of interaction and communication in teams. At the end of the chapter, brief interventions for team building in sport are introduced.

1.1. Definition of group and group dynamics

Group involvement is one of the most important characteristics in our society. All of us belong to several groups at the same time, but what exactly can we call a group? For the nature of this thesis it is important to define what a group, and particularly a sport team, actually is; or, sometimes more importantly, what a group/sport team is not. According to McGrath (1984, as cited in Carron, Hausenblas, & Eys, 2005, p. 10), "groups are not just any aggregate of two or more people", first of all they should have "mutual awareness and potential mutual interaction" in order to be named a group. Therefore the following aggregates cannot be considered as a group:

- Artificial aggregates, e.g. statistical groups categorised by sex, age, nationality etc.;
- Unorganised aggregates, e.g. audience, crowd, public;
- Units with patterned relationships, e.g. culture (Canadians), subculture (French Canadians);
- Deliberately designed social units , e.g. organisations with large aggregates of people who are recruited for specific roles;
- Less deliberately designed social units, e.g. associations formed for specific purposes with present interaction between members.

Such aggregates might reveal what cannot be considered a group within sport, but how can real sport groups be defined? "Every group is like all other groups, like some other groups, and like no other group" (Carron et al., 2005, p. 11). All sport groups have something

in common, but at the same time have unique characteristics, and therefore it is almost impossible to find any two absolutely similar groups. There are many definitions of groups in the literature; for example, a group is "A collection of individuals, whose existence as a collection is rewarding to the individuals" (Bass, 1960, p. 39) or "A group is a social unit which consists of individuals who stand in (more or less) definite status and role relationships to one another and which possess a set of values or norms of its own regulating the behaviour of individual members, at least in matters of consequence to the group" (Sherif & Sherif, 1956, p. 144), or "a group exists when two or more people define themselves as members of it and when its existence is recognised by at least one other" (Brown, 2001, p. 3). Each of these perspectives focuses on and stresses particular elements, such as communication, structure, influence, external recognition, and so on.

However, among general categories that connect the majority of definitions are: common fate for their members (individual players may contribute differently to the game, but at the end the whole team wins or loses); mutual benefits associated with membership (prestige to be in an elite sport team); social structures (norms, statuses, roles); and group processes (interaction and communication among members). Therefore a sport team can be defined as:

Collection of two or more individuals who possess a common identity, have common goals and objectives, share a common fate, exhibit structured patterns of interaction and models of communication, hold common perceptions about group structure, are personally and instrumentally interdependent, reciprocate interpersonal attraction, and consider themselves to be a group (Carron et al., 2005, p. 13).

In addition, "group members should be aware of each other, relate to each other in some way, and be able to interact with each other through group process" (Gill, 2000, p. 289).

Sport teams are not ordinary social groups; they are limited by particular rules and have a common goal – winning (Slepička, Hošek, & Hátlová, 2006). Professional basketball teams, which are the empirical focus of this present study, have all the aspects of sports teams outlined above. They have more than 2 playing individuals (12 overall with 5 playing on the court, to be precise) who share a common identity (e.g. name of the team), a common fate when winning or losing, and therefore also a common goal – winning. They have a social structure (players' positions on the court as well as formal and informal team roles –

newcomer or veteran, leader, social outsider/"black sheep", etc.), and their own communication model – that is, basketball-specific language, including sub-cultural slang and formal game terminology (e.g. screen, back door, two-man) (Carron et al., 2005, p. 13).

Sport groups, especially on the professional elite level, are often compared to workplace groups due to their apparent similarities in working together for accomplishing a task and being under intense pressure to produce results in competitive environments (Katz & Koenig, 2001). As with sport groups, a key element to the successful performance of work groups is group cohesiveness (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Sundstrom, De Meuse, & Futrell, 1990), which is discussed later in this chapter. Also, a prominent measurement of the cohesiveness in sports teams The Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) (Widmeyer, Brawley & Carron, 1985) has been used to adapt in the working place environment (Carless & De Paola, 2000).

Having attempted to list some definitional characteristics of groups and sport teams, and suggesting how these characteristics feature on professional basketball teams, it is important to now consider how groups form and develop over time. In the following section are presented the features of the group development and dynamics, particularly cohesion; team roles, norms and goals; and finally interaction and communication.

1.2 Group development

There are several models of group development (e.g. Gersick, 1988; Schutz, 1961), and the majority of them assume that groups develop following processes of moving from one 'stage' to another. During each of the stages arise critical issues, and if a group successfully deals with the issue, it can progress to the next stage. The timing of dealing with each stage is very individual and varies from one group to another; however, what is common for all groups is the fact that all must go through each of the identified stages in order to be effective (Carron et al., 2005).

One of the most cited models of group development was introduced by Tuckman and Jensen (1977, as cited in Lavallee, Kremer, Moran, & Williams, 2012, p. 203) and includes the following stages: Forming, Storming, Norming, Performing, and Adjourning. Forming, which is an orientation phase, sees individual members get to know each other, define their respective roles, identify group tasks and strategize in order to achieve them. Storming, which is the stage wherein interpersonal disagreements occur, sees members of the group challenge

the nominal team leader(s), leading broadly to conflicts and tension among group members as well as resistance to group tasks and strategies. Next comes norming, which is the phase when social and task roles become established, while cohesion and harmony develops along with a prevalent task-based cooperation and group consensus with respect to goals and objectives. This is followed by performing, which is characterised with group orientation on performance and productivity, every member knowing and accepting their roles and sharing a complete focus on team success. Finally the group reaches the adjourning stage, wherein the group's task is completed, members' duties finished, and corresponding contact among members and their emotional interdependency decreases, with a possibility of the group's break up.

Among other established models (Carron et al., 2005; Lavallee et al., 2012) which also include stage processes (otherwise labelled "linear models"), Garland, Kolodny, and Jones' model (1965, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 24) involves the following stages: pre-affiliation (when individual explores the possibility of either joining or not a particular group), power and control (definition and formalisation of the new relationships within a group, possible formation of subgroups), intimacy (strong relationships and cooperation), differentiation (high cohesion and mutual respect among the members) and finally termination-separation stage (group reminiscence and evaluation). Both of the models show sequential stage perspective and are quite similar to each other, and include initial phase when players get to know each other, that is followed by settling phase when team goals, norms and roles are set and team cohesion occurs (on both social and task levels), which leads to the performing phase and ends with separation phase. Both of the models are sequential, meaning that once the team successfully finished one stage, it can continue to another.

However, some models focus on repeating cycles (pendulum) of group development instead of linear processes, such as in the model proposed by Arrow, Poole, Henry, Wheelan and Moreland, in 2004, which consists of a repeating cycle of 5 stages: discontent – when members, especially newcomers, feel alienated from the group and do not consider the group as part of their identity; group identification – increased commitment to the group, unification; group productivity – individual contribution to the team towards the common goal; individuation – demand for the recognition of individual achievement; and decay – members become less attached to the team and show/invest less energy toward the team goal. In pendulum models, the resolution of certain issues in particular stages is temporal and the team can "go through" to the same cycle over and over again.

William Schutz's theory (1966, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 26) is another pendulum model of group development. According to this model, the group (regardless of its size) must successfully handle the problems in areas of inclusion (communication and interaction between members), control (forming the roles, especially leadership functions and decision making responsibilities) and affection (the level of intimacy and friendship the member would like to have between each other), which reappear during the life of the group. Schultz suggested that when breaking up, the group development process follows the stages in the opposite direction: from affection, which disappears first, to control, when a group doesn't care who the leader is any more, and finally to inclusion, when members of the group do not contact or communicate with each other anymore.

Group development can differ from one group to another in many important aspects. As outlined here, there are several theoretical models of group development, which usually consist of a few stages or cycles from the forming of the group until the group's break-up. The common aspects identified within these various models seem to be overcoming specific difficulties and issues that occur at each stage, which improves the relationships in the groups and makes them stronger, more united, and better focused on the common goals shared by members. Within these models, achieving a high degree of cohesion between members is often identified as an important obstacle to be overcome on the way to reaching stages characteristic of group success; and it is to the issue of cohesion that this chapter now turns.

1.2.1   Cohesion

An integral part of all successful teams is unity, teamwork, closeness, "togetherness" or simply – cohesion (Carron, Eyes, & Burke, 2007). Team cohesion has been thoroughly examined by several research projects during the last 40 years, with the special focus on its connection to team performance and team success (Beal, Cohen, Burke, & McLendon, 2003; Carron, Colman, Wheeller, & Stevens, 2002; Evans & Dion, 1991). When talking about cohesiveness, terms such as "team unity", "we-ness", "sticking together" are frequently used (Gill, 2000, p. 308), along with other descriptions which refer to the classic definition of cohesiveness: "the total field of forces which act on members to remain in a group" (Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1950, as cited in Gill, 2000, p. 308).

The conceptual model for cohesion in sport teams, presented by Carron, Widmeyer & Brawley (1985), divides between task and social dimensions of cohesiveness, as well as individual and group orientations. In other words, each member of a group develops their own perception of group cohesiveness in 2 general categories: group integration or perception of a group as a whole and individual attraction of each member to the group – each of the categories has task and social aspects, which result in the following model (Carron et al., 2005; Gill, 2000; Lavallee et al., 2012):

Group integration – Social (GI-S): group members' perception about similarity, closeness and bonding within the whole group regarding social aspects

Group integration – Task (GI-T): group members' perception about similarity, closeness and bonding within the whole group regarding its tasks

Individual attraction to the group – Social (ATG-S): group members' perception about personal involvement and acceptance

Individual attraction to the group – Task (ATG-T): group members' perception about personal involvement with group tasks, goals and objectives

One of the most influential descriptions of cohesiveness within sport psychology scholarship has been provided by Albert Carron and colleagues in 1998, who described the features of cohesion as follows (Carron et al., 2005; Gill, 2000):

- Cohesion is multidimensional and is influenced by many factors, it can be different even between very similar groups;
- Cohesion is dynamic, therefore it changes over the time so as its sources and consequences for the team;
- Cohesion is instrumental, meaning that members in a group cohere for personal reasons, e.g. to be a part of successful team;
- Cohesion is affective, therefore social cohesion develops even in highly task-oriented teams as a result of interaction between members;
- Cohesion is perceived differently by different groups and members.

This conceptual model further includes four main correlates of cohesion which are particularly salient within professional sport teams, namely situational (environmental) factors; personal factors; leadership and team factors (Carron et al., 2005, pp. 243-255; Gill, 2000; Martin, Paradis, Eys, & Evans, 2013).

Situational (environmental) factors include several aspects. Firstly, contractual obligations, which is the main difference between social groups and professional sport teams, because members of many groups can usually leave them when they prefer to, apart from professional sport teams and its players who can be "tied in" with contractual obligations. Also, sometimes it is difficult for a team to get rid of a player who refuses to terminate their contract. Second aspect is culturally normative pressures which prevent athletes from leaving the team; for instance, in order that society will not perceive them as "quitters". Another aspects is level of competition: wherein lower levels of competition usually presume greater social and task cohesion – for example, according to previous research high school teams would have higher social and task cohesion than college teams (Granito & Rainey, 1988) - although the grounds of this are still a question for further research. Forth aspect is proximity (physical and functional), meaning that individuals who are physically close to each other in the locker room or on the pitch, tend to have stronger interpersonal connections. Finally, group size is an important aspect as "cohesion decreases as group size increases" (Carron et al., 2005, p. 245), therefore moderate-sized teams (6 persons) tend to show greatest cohesiveness.

Personal factors imply characteristics of group members which influence cohesiveness in a team and include demographic attributes as similarities between team members in terms of social background, race, sex and other demographic factors; cognition, which includes shared perceptions, such as similarities in motives, attitudes and beliefs, self-deception, such as when all the group's qualities and achievements are overvalued in comparison with opponents, and attribution for responsibility, wherein members of highly cohesive teams tend to assume greater responsibility for negative outcomes; affect, which is the relation between feelings of belongingness and affect and emotions, which can include state anxiety (where athletes who perceive their team as highly task-cohesive report lower levels of cognitive anxiety and perceive it as more facilitative) and individual satisfaction (the cycle of cohesion-performance-satisfaction) and behaviour, including sacrifice behaviour, such as when an athlete makes a sacrifice to the group, they feel more attracted to it; adherence behaviour, meaning that athletes who perceive their team as cohesive are more likely to stay in the group (Robinson & Carron, 1982), and work hard on the trainings (Prapavessis & Carron, 1997).

Leadership factors assume the role of the coach in team cohesion, which can also involve negative forms of cohesion, when players unite against the team coach or team management. This factor category includes leadership behaviour, as for good team cohesion

it is very important to clarify group goals and strategies (see subchapter 2.2.2.), which is the task of a leader; also, among several other aspects, social support and positive feedback from the management is associated with higher task cohesion among athletes (Westre & Weiss, 1991, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 251); and decision style, as study showed that athletes usually prefer democratic decision style approach, also delegative styles can be useful for encouraging the perception of a team as a united entity, by creating an atmosphere where all team members are responsible for particular tasks (Kozub, 1993, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 252).

Finally team factors, as the last correlate of cohesion, includes status – the higher athletes perceive task-cohesion, the less attention they pay to importance of their own status (Jacob & Carron, 1997, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 252); role involvement and group norms, which are presented more broadly in following subchapter 1.2.2; and collective efficacy, implying that the sense of cohesiveness increases the sense of collective confidence.

Over the last several decades, Carron and colleagues' model has had a significant impact on research into team cohesion, helping understand its origins, development, and major influences, within a conceptual model which has become a background for a wide body of research in the field. The greatest attention has been paid to examining the relationship between cohesion and performance, hence there is still room for further studies that will focus on other aspects of cohesion. The conceptual model highlights significant distinction between task and social types of cohesion and how both of them are perceived by team members (Lavallee et al., 2012). The model was a basis for further elaboration (Cota, Evans, Dion, Kilik, & Longman, 1995) and for the development of the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ, as mentioned above) (Carron et al., 1985; Widmeyer et al., 1985), which is used to assess athletes' perception of team cohesion, and has remained the most popular and best-validated in the field (Lavallee et al., 2012).

As has been stated, cohesion within sports teams is influenced by several factors emerging from within these developing groups, such as roles and norms; and also by the group processes, including group goals and communication. Such team factors have been the prime focus of much cohesion research in sport psychology (Eys, Burke, Carron, & Dennis, 2010; Lavallee et al., 2012), and it is this research that following subchapter focuses on.

1.2.2 Team roles, norms and goals

Norms and roles are inseparable attributes of any team, and are crucial contributors to cohesion, as discussed above. According to Carron and colleagues, "a role is the pattern of behaviour expected of an individual in a social situation" (2005, p. 153). Roles are based on athlete's responsibilities, position and status in the group.

According to Mabry and Barnes (1980), there are two categories of roles in every group: formal and informal. Formal roles are set surrounding the functional organisation of a group – for example, within sports teams, this might include roles such as coach, team captain, manager, forward, defender, and so on – which are examples of both leadership roles and performance roles. On the other hand, informal roles occur as a result of interactions among the group members, and they can have a positive or negative influence on the team – for instance, whether a team member is labelled as a "team player", a distracter, and so on.

Another way of categorising roles was suggested by Bales and Slater (1955, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 154) and included categories of task roles that are focused on accomplishing group's goals (like winning or performing as a team) and social roles that are connected with team harmony and cohesion.

Individual roles in teams are crucial for the team cohesion and therefore for the team success. While informal roles emerge naturally in teams, individual formal roles should often be communicated from the role sender (coach, teammates), who announces the responsibilities to the focal person (athlete). According to Carron and colleagues (2005), there is a communication process of role responsibilities, which consists of cycle of 5 events: coach presents to an athlete expectations and responsibilities; using verbal or nonverbal communication, coach pressures the athlete to perform according these expectations; the athlete perceives the coach's expectations; the athlete responds to those expectations, which can be positive and would involve proper execution of coach's expectations, or negative – especially if coach's communication was unclear, which will result in frustration, confusion or dissatisfaction; and finally the coach makes a judgement regarding athlete's response to the role expectation.

Role responsibilities are influenced by several elements (Carron et al., 2005; Eys et al., 2010), including: role performance, which represents the behaviour that is expected from the focal person assigned the role; role clarity, which is the individual's understanding of the responsibilities connected with the role they have been assigned, with clear implications for their ability to produce the desired performance; and role ambiguity, which concerns a lack of

important information and understanding of a role, leading to potential disruption within teams (Eys, Carron, Beauchamp, & Bray, 2003); role conflict, which occurs when an athlete doesn't have time, motivation or abilities to achieve the expected performance, or can also occur because of incongruent expectations from others; role efficacy is the athlete's belief in their own capabilities to perform the expected responsibilities, which improves when role ambiguity and role conflict are minimised; role acceptance is achieved when an athlete's perception of their own role responsibilities is similar to those that were determined by the role sender. The athlete doesn't necessary have to be fully satisfied with the role in order to accept it, while role acceptance can be enhanced with the minimisation of the status differences between all roles in the team, and with the permanent stress on the importance of all roles in the team in order to win games or wider competitions; and finally, role satisfaction is the level of an athlete's satisfaction with their current role in the team. Satisfaction is influenced by opportunities to use skills; recognition and feedback; perceptions of role significance; and feelings of autonomy (Rail, 1987). Generally, athletes who understand their role in teams are more satisfied (Eys, Carron, Bray, & Beauchamp, 2003) and perceive their team as more cohesive (Eys & Carron, 2001). Therefore athletes' roles should be clearly explained, including the consequences for not following the role (e.g. less playing time on the pitch).

While roles can be largely described in terms of the positions within any given group/team which members are seen to occupy, norms are "informal rules that groups adopt to regulate and regularize group members' behaviour" (Feldman, 1984, p. 47), and are representative of the "standard for behaviour that is expected of members of the group" (Eys et al., 2010, p. 138). They can be task-relevant (like norms for productivity in training) and task-irrelevant (such as the way athletes treat team staff), and can differ across the contexts within which groups such as sports teams exist – for instance, during competition, practice, the off-season and social events (Munroe, Estabrooks, Dennis, & Carron, 1999, as cited in Eys et al., 2010, p. 139).

Norms can be divided into the following groups (Mott, 1965, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 173-174): prescribed norms, which describe appropriate behaviour for group members and usually include norms for productivity; proscribed norms, which are the opposite of prescribed norms and describe behaviour that is not expected; permitted norms, which focus on behaviour that is accepted but not required; and preference norms, which describe behaviour that is preferred whilst not required. Norms such as these develop through interaction in teams, which includes members clarifying to each other the standards that are

acceptable or expected of the team, or through the reinforcement of acceptable behaviour and discouraging of unacceptable types (Carron et al., 2005).

Generally, norms serve two main functions within a team: informational, to show newcomers how the team works and what is expected from new players so they can be in harmony with the team's more established players; and integration, when the player who agrees with the norms and follows them is more readily accepted onto the team. More widely accepted norms tend to be stable, which means that they can persist in a team for as long as 5 generations after the original members have been removed from the group (Jacobs & Campbell, 1961, as cited in Eys et al., 2010, p. 139). This is also valid for norms perceived as negative or harmful for a group, such as abusive behaviour, and therefore it is important to prevent such norms from forming at their origin.

Norms, as was already mentioned, are generally considered to be a crucial element in generating team cohesiveness. Moreover, this relationship is circular: norms contribute to the development of cohesiveness, and the more a team is cohesive, the greater conformity occurs in the group regarding expected behaviours (Eys et al., 2010). As such, norms develop alongside any given group's development and cohesion. Not following the norms can lead to the punishment or even exclusion from the group, therefore if a group has a high cohesion then members tend to adhere to the group norms and accept group influence even if it has a negative impact, such as hazing of new members, or low standards for productivity. Norms for productivity relate to the acceptable level of performance established within a team, which influences the group's actual productivity and chances for (competitive) achievement (Eys et al., 2010). Moreover, according to the study of Stogdill (1972, as cited in Eys et al., 2010, p. 139), groups' norms for productivity are the main factors influencing the relationship between cohesion and performance. Thus, the productivity of a team with high cohesion, but low norms of productivity will be negatively affected, and teams with low cohesion but high norms for productivity will outperform low cohesion and low productivity norms teams.

Finally, another important factor for team cohesion is team goals. They can be defined as "a target, objective, standard, destination, aim, or end toward which effort is directed" (Carron et al., 2005, p. 264). However, it was argued by Zander (1971, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 264) that team athletes have personal goals apart from the team goals. Therefore in teams there are goals generated by the individual that consist of personal goals and goals for the team, and also there are goals generated by the team that consist of team's goal for members, in addition to broader, collective goals.

The research in sport psychology has mainly focused on individual goals rather than group goals; however, the beneficial nature of goal setting (both individual and group) has been concluded by several studies (Brawley, Carron, & Widmeyer, 1992; Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984; Locke, Shaw, Saari, & Latham, 1981). According to Brawley and colleagues, the team goals are usually very general, e.g. 'to win the competition', 'to play good', thus their effectiveness is vague, because the more specific and detailed the goal is, the greater its effectiveness (Carron et al., 2005). Goal setting is one of the essential aspects of team building in sport, and so will be returned to in more depth in subchapter 2.3, below.

1.2.3   Interaction and communication

Another characteristic that influences team cohesion is interaction and communication, which are essential for every social group, not excluding those within professional sports environments. Communication is important to share views, ideas, and needs, and to help avoid conflicts, and therefore overall is critical to team success (LaVoi, 2007; Yukelson, 2010). Therefore, defining communication is an important first step towards understanding how this vital group process occurs. Simplistic definitions describe the process of communication with respect to the transmitting of messages between communicating parties; however, one party's intended messages are not always necessarily received or clearly understood by the other, hence effective communication is best conceived of as involving mutual sharing and understanding. According to Yukelson, "communication is a process that involves sending, receiving (encoding), and interpreting (decoding) messages" (2010, p. 150).

Communication can be verbal, non-verbal, written and visual. There are 3 principles of group communication (Burgoon, Heston, & McCroskey, 1974, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 293): communication patterns are normally homogeneous (individuals tend to communicate with others whose attitudes and characteristics are similar to their own); communication is more effective among people who are homogeneous, meaning among the people who share the same or similar language, motives, attitudes or culture; and lastly, effective communication leads to increased homogeneity in dynamic characteristics, such as beliefs or attitudes.

Within sports teams, players are often very different, with varying backgrounds, beliefs, attitudes, communication styles and other personal characteristics, which can at times

frustrate this apparent need for homogeneity. It is very important for the team that players remain capable of clear communication in spite of such differences, in order to make the team work effectively. Interaction and communication are essential for forming the structure and dynamic of the group, including goal setting, task and social cohesion, cooperation – in other words, all of the aspects that contribute to the team "chemistry" (Carron et al., 2005). It is very important for the team to have open communication about the current issues, players' thoughts, needs, feelings, which should all be taken seriously and be dealt with. Therefore, not only is mutual sharing between players expected, but also mutual understanding becomes an integral part of team communication. Hence regular team meeting and discussions will lead to greater cohesion, and will also build mutual trust and support (Yukelson, 1997).

Communication is an essential part of team building and subsequent development (see above regarding theoretical models of group development). Successful teams depend upon open and direct communication between players, and coach and players regarding both task related issues and personal relations, and also regarding role clarity, team norms and goals, as misunderstanding or miscommunication is the source of many interpersonal problems for teams (Yukelson, 2010).

According to Harris & Harris (1984, as cited in Yukelson, 2010, p. 154) there are the following categories of communication which are particularly relevant to sports teams:

Coach – team communication. Successful group cooperation comes from the ability of a leader to share the vision of what the "ideal team" could look like if everyone uses their skills and genuine commitment for the same goal. Therefore players are expected to be united, have homogenous attitudes and expectations, and always try for consensus. In order to achieve that, suggested communication principles for the leader (coach) are: *impart* information, such as clearly stating goals, the team's mission, strategies, and so on; *inspire* athletes to work their best, as coach should make sure that everyone feels significant and needed, while simultaneously exhibiting values such as honesty and directness in communication with all players, and monitoring the team's progress using goal-setting programs, giving feedback and adjusting goals if needed; *clarify* the situation about team/player progress, wherein the coach should talk openly about everyone's responsibilities, effort and goals; and finally *reinforce* the behaviour that is useful and helpful for the team's achievement, by encouraging and disciplining the team/players based on their efforts. Communication style is also important and should not be aggressive from the coach's side, as it can be negatively interpreted by the team athletes, leading to the less satisfaction with coaches (Kassing & Infante, 1999).

Coach – athlete communication. The coach is responsible for building a social and psychological environment which is conducive towards goal achievement. In order to do that, the coach might find it useful to find all information about an athlete, especially their strong or weak sides. The most important thing in coach-athlete relationships is feedback, which should be open and honest, so the athlete knows about their progress and further steps they need to take in order to improve the situation if needed, and about the decisions that the coach has made, especially if the coach's decision requires a role change for the athlete. Problems occur when a coach doesn't give feedback (especially negative) in a supporting manner, or when an athlete takes the feedback personally instead of constructively. Communication should be open, so the athlete can seek for the coach's feedback anytime he or she needs. This is especially important for young athletes, who can require coach's consultation on various issues outside of the sport world as he/she is being perceived as a mentor or teacher, or during the athlete' rehabilitation from the injury (Wiese, Weiss, & Yukelson, 1991).

Athlete – athlete communication. Working relationships and effective intra-team communication are very important for team success (Hanin, 1992). Ideally, athletes can provide social support for each other, and team building is a perfect intervention for improving communication and mutual sharing. There are a lot of issues that can occur in a team because of miscommunication, such as tensions, conflicts, jealousy, freshmen adjustment, personal incompatibility and others (Yukelson, 2010). Moreover, although some of the studies suggest the differences in intra-team communication between male and female teams, for example male teams can be involved in more negative conflict than female team (Sullivan & Feltz, 2003), there has been no proven significant difference between male and female communication in team sports (Sullivan, 2004).

Interpersonal relationships, group norms, roles and goals, and team communication (both between athletes, and between team and coach) are essential aspects of cohesion. When the team cohesion needs to be improved, specialists can work with various psychological interventions. The next subchapter is dedicated to the team building strategies that can be applied in order to enhance cohesiveness.

1.3 Team building in sport

According to Carron et al. (2005, p. 327), team building is "team enhancement or team improvement for both task and social purposes". Earlier studies (e.g. Nueman, Edwards, & Raju, 1989) found out that "team building was the most effective intervention for improving individual satisfaction and changing attitudes" (as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 327).

Team building relies on enhancing a shared vision of group goals, and is based on improving commitment, individual and group responsibility, communication and collaboration among a team (Yukelson, 2010). Therefore the aim of team building is "to increase group effectiveness by enhancing group cohesiveness" (Gill, 2000, p. 315), and in any effort to build a team it is therefore important to develop the right skills, chemistry and behaviour that will lead to the "optimal team functioning" (Yukelson, 1997, p. 74).

However, an effective team is not necessary a team that doesn't have any internal conflict at all, but rather the team, whose conflicts are presented on an appropriate level for the team dynamics (Burke and Collins, 1986, as cited in Lavalee et al., 2012, p. 217). Forsyth (2009, as cited in Lavalee et al., 2012, p. 218) argues that team building should be more oriented to the task-related activities instead of teams' social bond, because the aim of intervention is not creating a friendlier team with no conflicts, but rather an effective team for performance.

Syer and Connolly (1984, as cited in Lavalee et al., 2012, p. 217) defined the following benefits of team building: it enhances loyalty to the team and/or coach, satisfies players' need for belonging; it provides feedback on personal performance and support from other team members, and finally it enables teams with a chance to win against a rival team which is more technically advanced, but has a lower level of cohesion.

Other benefits of team building (Woodcock and Francis, 1994, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 329) contribute to coherent and acceptable leadership; understanding and acceptance of the team roles; dedication of players' effort for collective achievement; and efficient team meetings that are used for diagnosing weaknesses in order to reduce or eliminate negative effects (that is, clearer and more task-oriented forms of team communication).

Before its application to sport, team building programs had been used in various settings in order to develop more successful groups, mainly including 4 general types of team

building interventions that can be used either separately or in combination (Carron et al., 2005, p. 328):

- Group goal-setting assumes establishing or clarification of collective goals and steps to achieve them;
- Interpersonal relationships are used in order to prevent conflicts, or to improve task and social communication;
- Individual role involvement – as outlined above, group members need to understand and accept their roles, in order for the team to be effective. Therefore this strategy is used for the role clarifying or for improving role acceptance and overall performance;
- Managerial grid approach focuses on managers and/or group leaders in order to help them to lead teams/organizations to higher productivity.

When working with sport teams, there are usually 2 types of team building intervention being used: direct, which is provided by the coach or invited consultant, and indirect, which involves a consultant working with the coach, who then introduces the team building intervention program to the team (Carron et al., 2005, pp. 331-333). According to Martin, Carron, & Burke (2009), both of these types of interventions are equally effective.

The direct form of intervention consists of the following stages: assessment of the situation, education, brainstorming and establishing team building goals (Yukelson, 1997). During assessment it is important for the consultant to be perceived as a part of a team, which will help them to observe, listen and talk to all of the players and coaches and then to determine the team's expectation, goals and concerns. The educational stage focuses on providing athletes with a foundation of knowledge about the nature of groups and their development. During brainstorming, the team generates a list of issues that should be addressed, which then become the goals of the team building intervention, helping to develop the intervention program itself. The goal-development phase involves each athlete determining personal goals and establishing several team goals that are essential for team success, and then discussing them in small sub-groups and later in one large group, in order to reach a consensus. Due to the fact that sports teams are very dynamic and changeable formations, the team building intervention should also be dynamic and flexible, in order to satisfy the needs of all players and coach.

Another commonly used direct intervention into team building (Widmeyer & McGuire, 1996, as cited in Carron et al., 2005, p. 332) focuses on the use of team goal-setting programmes. This approach starts with an educational phase, which occurs at the beginning

of the playing season and involves an overview for the athletes about the benefits of goal setting generally, and for the team's more specific needs. The aim of this phase is to present athletes with different techniques for goal setting and convince them of its benefits for team success. A goal-development phase follows the initial educational stage, ensuring that all team members, regardless their age, status or experience, participate in the goal setting and therefore improve team cohesion and goal clarity. Following this, the implementation phase monitors the differences between the team's goals and the team's performance. Finally, the renewal phase focuses on revision and establishing a new level for each goal. Team goal setting was found the most effective type of direct intervention within team building activities (Martin et al., 2009).

Alternatively, indirect interventions typically consist of introductory, conceptual, practical and intervention stages. The first two stages are provided by the sport psychologist or consultants to the coach, who then introduces the final stage to the team him/herself. The introductory and conceptual stages focus on educating the coach by providing him/her with essential knowledge of the general benefits of group cohesion and team building, introducing models for better understanding of team dynamics, and so on; in essence, empowering the coach to deliver specialist psychological knowledge themselves. The practical stage involves brainstorming from the coach in order to generate the team building strategies tailored for the specific needs of his or her team. During the intervention part the strategies applied to the team.

To summarise these different approaches, the following are core components viewed as important in building a successful team (Yukelson, 1997): *Shared vision and unity of purpose* - coach shares a vision of the team goals, players' roles and overall expectation for the season. Since it is a collaborative effort, group members should share their perception of the expectations and their vision of a "perfect team", and therefore it will help to outline the norms, define roles and team goals; *collaborative and synergetic teamwork* implies clear understanding and acceptance of each player's own role and the roles of teammates. Essentially, "everyone must be on the same page", and each player should be involved in collaborative work in order to achieve team success; *individual and mutual accountability* - taking responsibility, especially for the negative outcomes, is very important for team cohesion; *positive team culture and cohesive group atmosphere* - the responsibility of the coach is to develop and maintain positive team culture and cohesion, and help players to place the interest of the group in front of their own. In addition, every team member should feel important for the team and feel appreciated for their efforts; *team identity* - members

should be attracted to the team and be proud to be a part of it, as this key for successful team building interventions. In this respect, a team should have its own traditions and "uniqueness" that separates the team from all others, such as a motto, dress kit or team song or other attributes; *open and honest communication processes* - it is important for players not only to learn how to express feelings, but how to express them effectively in order to be heard and understood. As have been mentioned before, regular team meetings and discussions will contribute for effective team communication; p*eer helping and social support* - ideally, teammates should help each other, because they spend together the majority of their time and therefore know each other very well. It is especially important for older, more established athletes to help newcomers, and there are also situations when mutual support is expected in times of need. In order to improve social connections, it might be good for the players to get to know each other outside of sport.

1.4   Summary of Chapter 1

This overview of the research literature shows that a team with clearly defined roles, established productivity norms and high team cohesion is likely to be more successful in performance. It also reveals several competing perspectives on how coaches and consultants might enhance these characteristics through team building interventions via educating athletes about the importance of cohesion, personal and team goals, open communication and role acceptance.

The many theories pertaining to various different aspects of group dynamics which have been discussed in this chapter are rather general, and therefore can be applied to the majority of sport teams. However, the focus of this thesis is *multicultural* sport teams, i.e. teams that consist of players with various cultural, ethnic, religious and other backgrounds. The team dynamics, communication and relationships formed in multicultural teams have been in the focus of the academic research for only a fairly short period of time. In order to understand the origin of multicultural teams and their functioning, it is important to analyse the influence of globalisation to sport, which led to the origin and fast development of sport labour migration. The phenomenon of sport migration, resulting in the sudden and widespread development of multicultural teams, subsequently led to the "cultural turn" in sport psychology (Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009; Ryba et al., 2010), which resulted in a shift

within the academic studies of sports teams' group dynamics, from mainstream or homogenous populations to the inclusion of minority cultures. These and other aspects are presented and discussed in the following chapter.

2. Multicultural sport teams

In the previous chapter was presented a literature review concerning group dynamics in sport teams. This chapter moves this discussion towards a more specific focus on the functioning of multicultural teams – teams that consist of players from different national, cultural, social, ethnic and other backgrounds. In order to provide historical context for understanding the origin of multicultural teams in sport, this chapter begins with an overview of the global context of modern sport, the impact of globalisation on sport, and sport migration as one of the most important outcomes of it. The phenomena of globalisation in sport and sport migration led to the 'cultural turn' in sport psychology (Ryba et al., 2010; Schinke, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009) and the growth of the multicultural teams, which are the main interest of this dissertation.

2.1. The global context of sport

Globalisation in sport is part of a much wider process of world globalisation, which is the process of diminishing borders between economies, industries, cultures, languages and other parts of human lives (Maguire, 1999). The development of global and multicultural sport cannot be explained without exploring globalisation in its wider context.

During the last few decades, the concept of globalisation developed from a technical term to a broader context of politics and social life (Rowe, 2003; Waters, 1995). There are a variety of approaches to theorising globalisation, and some of them stress the fact that globalisation is not simply a phenomenon of the 20th century, but has been known for centuries, starting with colonising processes throughout the world (Horne, Tomlinson, Whannel, & Woodward, 2013; Massey & Taylor, 2004). Robinson summarises three major perspectives used to define globalisation:

…it is a process that has been going on since the dawn of history, hence a 5,000–10,000 year time frame. In the second [approach], it is a process coterminous with the spread

and development of capitalism and modernity, hence a 500 year frame. In the third [approach], it is a recent phenomenon associated with such processes as post-industrialization, postmodernisation or the restructuring of capitalism, hence a 20–30 year frame (Robinson, 2007, p. 127).

Globalisation is an objective process of formation, organisation, operation and development of fundamentally new global systems, characterised by deep mutual relations and connections in all areas of international companies. Appadurai (1990) and Hannerz (1990) refer to globalisation as a series of global and cultural flows, which connect the world, making it one network. This is an extension and deepening of social relations in space and time so that on the one hand, everyday human activity is increasingly affected by events taking place in other parts of the globe. On the other hand, activities of local communities can have important and serious global consequences. Therefore 'globalisation is a broad process in which markets, trade, labour relations and culture have attained global dimensions; the forms of organisation that connect them have a global character' (Horne et al., 2013, p. 194).

The early 20th century was characterised by a rapid development and great progress in economy, culture, technologies and social mobility, which enabled people, money, ideas, and other cultural practices, to travel over the Earth with a great speed: 'The world becomes 'compressed' as the scope and intensity of global interconnectedness has increased' (Maguire, 1999, p. 13). One of the basic impulses of globalisation was the revolution in transport in the mid-20th century, which led to the origin of new or improved types of transport, such as cars, trains or planes. However, the key transition in globalisation happened in the 1960s, a decade which featured widespread global industrialisation, mass production, extensive foreign trade, and internationalisation (Hobsbawm, 1994, as cited in Horne et al., 2013, p. 196).

Moreover, another of the factors affecting the dynamics of globalisation was the adoption of English as the main language for business, education and communication (Mezřícký, 2003). According to Pells:

The effectiveness of English as a language of mass communications has been essential to the acceptance of American culture. Unlike German, Russian, or Chinese, the simpler structure and grammar of English, along with its tendency to use shorter, less abstract words and more concise sentences, are all advantageous for the composers of song lyrics, ad slogans, cartoon captions, newspaper headlines, and movie and TV

dialogue. English is thus a language exceptionally well suited to the demands and spread of American mass culture (2006, pp. 26-27).

At first, globalisation was perceived as a set of economic activities, which also have social consequences – for example, the increasingly free movement of people across national borders due to increasing international business and trade practices. Residents of the relatively poor 'third world' countries were increasingly used as unskilled labour in developed countries. Despite the difficult working conditions, for many people living and working in these countries seems more attractive than remaining at home. Some of the workers hope to gain a permanent residence there, while others want to improve their qualifications and skills. The main centres of globalisation in this sense are always big cities, where cultural differences started to blur during the last several decades, hence these cities are referred to as 'melting pots' (D'Innocenzo & Sirefman, 1992; Mezřícký, 2003).

The term 'globalisation' is often associated with the USA: as the wider world accepts American values and way of life, 'Americanisation' is said to take place (Maguire, 1999; Malcolm, 2008). This can be explained by the fact that the United States of America is usually one of the first places in terms of technological progress, along with the influence of English as the 'global language' and other aspects mentioned above. However, people outside of the United States may feel uncomfortable due to the global influence of American culture. The most common concerns include the possibility of extinction of European and other national languages and traditions, and loss of original cultural awareness of individual states under pressure of newly imported American customs, habits, traditions and mentality. The United States government has created several organizations or programs to promote and expand the influence of American culture and values around the world. However, similar efforts propagated by other countries with the same purpose, like the British in India and the Middle East, the Germans in Africa, and the French in Indochina, are often overlooked (Gienow-Hecht, 2006). Thus, it is reasonable to claim that 'Americanisation' is but one cultural movement among many, as the global export and promotion of one nation's cultural values is in fact a fairly well established historical phenomenon.

Similarly, whilst the apparent Americanisation of sport has been one of the common subjects in the sport and globalisation research of the 20th century, sports scholars often forget about the influence of other countries in global sport. If one claims that Americanisation takes place, it is also necessary to discuss Asiaticisation, Africanisation,

Hispanisation, or other '-isations', although the influence of these trends have been significantly weaker (Maguire, 1999).

2.2. Globalisation in sport

Globalisation in sport is characterised with the appearance of national and international sport organisations, standardisation of the rules in individual and team sports, the development of regular international tournaments, the organisation of special events such as the Olympic Games and various world championships, all of which connect athletes from all over the world (Horne et al., 2013; Maguire, 1999; Sekot, 2008).

In efforts to describe and explain the development of sports and sports culture in the various countries of Western Europe, it is fair to presume that European sport has three primary, historical sources. The first, and arguably most profound, derives from early modern English models of sport. Its main function is to compare success using competition and the pursuit of records. Two teams compete with each other; they are defined as equal at the beginning and different in the end due to victory or defeat. The second source is Turnen ('gymnastics') in Germany and the gymnastic organisation Sokol in the Czech Republic. These movements were developing simultaneously to, but in deliberate isolation from, the English model of sport. Turnen and Sokol focused on physical health, bodily functions, and strengthening and improving skills, spirit and courage in danger. At the same time, and of equal importance, Turnen promoted mental and moral growth, which connects this kind of sport with the assumed stereotypical German character. The third source is Swedish gymnastics. It can best be compared to a 'machine' model, where human movements were divided into separate components that are constantly renewed in order to strengthen specific body parts and muscles. Various European countries have benefited from these sources in different ways and have formed their own national sport concept, based on derivatives of these original models (Pfister, 2003).

Robertson (1990, as cited in Maguire, 1999, pp. 77-84) described the first phase in the globalisation of modern sport as beginning during a period of rapid sport development in Europe starting with the period between 1870-1920, when there was a huge increase in various international political agencies, the development of global awards and prizes, the origin of a global communication system, and the standardization of human rights. During this period, thanks to the popularity of Danish and Swedish gymnastics, German Turnverin,

and a growing litany of sports media including dedicated sports magazines, newspapers and radio (Horne et al., 2013, pp. 198-199), the European models of sport spread around the world. This period is considered as involving the 'Europeanisation' of global sport, and saw the development of several major sports organisations, many of which were formed earlier than some of the very important general organisations (e.g., International Federation of Gymnastics, 1881; International Olympic Committee, 1894; FIFA, 1904; League of Nations, 1919; World Bank and United Nations, 1945) (Horne et al., 2013, p. 198).

In the next phase (1920-1960), which Robertson names a 'struggle for hegemony' (1990, as cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 78), the situation changed: English ideals were replaced by the American ideas, including the social system underlying playground movement, and an increasingly academic and scientific approach to sport as part of physical education. This approach was adopted very quickly by continental Europe (Quanz, 1991, as cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 84). Moreover, in the early 20th century, a 'feminist wave' in international sport saw women begin to organize their own international sports movements, and international competitions, such as in Athletics in Monte Carlo in the early 1920s (Dyer, 1982, as cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 85).

The period in which we find ourselves now was named by Robertson as the 'uncertainty phase' (1990, as cited in Maguire, 1999, p. 78), in which global institutions and movements are experiencing tremendous growth, but this in turn causes problems with multiculturality and polyethnicity. This reflects a general decline in the traditional Western power base in world sport, as non-Western nations have begun to take a greater presence within the organisation, production and consumption of global sport.

According to others' conceptualisations, globalisation in sport can today be seen as existing in 5 main directions (Horne et al., 2010; Scholte, 2000): 1) *Internationalisation*, which has led to the cross-border exchange of athletes, and to the increase in the number of international competition circuits; 2) *Liberalisation*, as an increase in athletes' and spectators' freedoms and opportunity, which resulted, among other outcomes, in the Bosman ruling, allowing players to easily transfer from one team to another; another example is TV broadcasting which allows the viewers to follow sport competitions all over the world; 3) *Universalization* of culture, occurring when the existing cultures from around the world blend together to produce a globally homogenous cultural experience, such as the Olympic Games; 4)*Westernisation/Americanisation*, which led to the ascendancy of capitalist forms of sport, with their fundamental grounding in written rules and established leagues; and 5) *Deterritorialisation*, a change in the perception of space and distance, which has led among

other things to the development of large fan groups outside of the country of origin of a particular team, league, or sport.

Recently, the ascendancy of transnational capitalism has resulted in multinational corporations trying to sell various types of products affordable to every consumer, and thus the modern sports have been systematically marketed all over the world, not only as a source of pleasure, but also as a sign of prestige and power (Jarvie, 2006; Maguire, 1999; Sekot, 2008). Western values, marketing, advertising and consumption affect the ways people around the world use, imagine and feel their bodies (Fallon, 1990; Lake, Staiger, & Glowinski, 2000). Undoubtedly, there exists the economic purposes of the production and consumption of global sports and leisure products, which has resulted in the relative dominance of a small selection of Western forms of sport, suggestive that the 'Americanisation/Westernisation' idea outlined previously has had a very important impact on the formation of contemporary global sport culture.

One of the major influences on sport globalization has been the global media. Sekot (2008) states that a significant role in these processes is played by the mass media as a mediator of global values and as part of the globalization of sports, including technical, migration, economic and ideological aspects. Media coverage contributes to globalization by broadcasting sport events all over the world, enabling people from different countries to watch them, therefore shrinking consumers' perception of time and distance. This helps viewers to feel closer connections with athletes, enabling the growth of extra-territorial fan bases as outlined above, with clear implications for marketing, merchandising, and thus the wider economic expansion of sports and sports teams.

The broadcasting of international sporting events also has political and cultural consequences. For example, they often create atmospheres of political tension by depicting sport as a battle between nations, potentially enhancing viewers' feelings of patriotism towards their respective country or hostility against their sporting and/or political rivals, which can also be used for propaganda purposes. Sports media can also create or enhance stereotypes about athletes' ethnic background (see Andrews, 2013), enabling the spread of cultural prejudices from one part of the world to others, such as 'the perception of the natural ability and tactical naivety of black African footballers [and] beliefs about the innate aggression and uncontrolled character of African–American athletes' (Malcolm, 2008, p. 166).

Within this context of increasingly globalised media sport, viewers in many countries around the world turn on their TV in order to watch National Basketball Association (NBA)

games, where the best players from North America and Europe perform or Champions League in football, which teams consist of players from almost all over the world. The players use equipment that was designed in Europe, financed in the USA, made out of materials from 'developing countries', assembled in the Pacific Rim (Maguire, 1999). When media tycoons, such as Rupert Murdoch and Silvio Berlusconi, invested a fortune into the development and promotion of sport in the 1980s-90s, association football became highly popular, especially when Murdoch's SkyTV sold the rights for broadcasting football matches of the English Premier League to other countries. With the addition of other national football leagues, and regional tournaments including the Champions League and UEFA cup, the popularity of televised football soared. After the introducing of free movement for players following the Bosman ruling in the mid-1990s, footballers started to change their teams much more easily, which helped clubs' owners to buy the most famous players and form 'star-teams'. Suddenly footballers (and other athletes) became celebrities; they became recognisable around the world, receiving ever-increasing salaries, traveling over the world for exhibition games, and promoting the sports equipment and other products of their sponsors.

Apart from this media influence, including the global broadcasting of sport events, there are three other factors that can be considered for the expansion of athletes' roles to include global celebrity status: the increased social value of sport with the emphasis on the body, health and fitness; the commercialization of the sports industry and its economic power; and the presence of new role models during the so-called masculinity crisis of the late twentieth century (Malcolm, 2008).

Therefore, sport seems to be a global phenomenon, which is influenced by the following trends of globalisation: many sports are played throughout the world by the same rules; sport more generally has an important function in the social process of international integration; many sports are connected by international sports associations; and sport is influenced by general trends of globalisation in modern society. Media coverage of sporting events around the world, far greater opportunities to travel and attend sporting events, the production and distribution of sports equipment and sports facilities, and the emergence of an international labour market for professional athletes - all these have resulted in the development of sport as a global phenomenon (Møller & Andersen, 1998).

2.3. Sport migration

Globalisation in sport resulted not only in the international broadcasting of major tournaments and overall commercialisation of sport, but also led to the increasing labour migration of professional athletes (Maguire, 1999; Sekot, 2008). Sports labour migration occurs in three levels (Maguire, 1999): within nations (McGovern, 2000; Williams, 1994), between nations located within the same continent (Maguire & Stead, 1998; Molnar, 2006) and globally between nations located in different continents and hemispheres (Collins, 2000; Maguire, 1990, 1996). Sometimes migration can be seasonal or "tournamental", as in case of tennis players and golfers, who have to move to a number of various countries during the season to play in each for a few days, therefore change their workplace constantly (Bale & Maguire, 1994; Maguire, 1999; Sekot, 2008). According to Broskamp (2000, in Hogenová, 2001), performance and professional sport are seen as a transnational social space for cultural production, with a specific framework for this type of elite migration, which is reserved for a relatively small group of outstanding artists and professional athletes.

Sport migrants can be divided into several categories: 'pioneers', such as the representatives of the Sokol/Turnen movement, who tried to develop a new sport in various different host nations; 'settlers', who stay and perform in a new country for a longer period of time, usually 4-5 years, and can afterwards settle for a permanent residence; 'mercenaries' or 'hired guns', consisting of athletes usually motivated by short-term financial aims and do not have any attachment to the locals or current country; and 'nomads', whose cosmopolitan outlook motivates them to move for the possibility of new cultural experiences (Maguire, 1999). Further studies have also identified 'mercenary', 'settler', and 'nomadic cosmopolitan' categories, whilst adding three new categories of sport migrants, such as 'ambitionists', who try to migrate to enhance their career or play in higher level competitions (Maguire & Stead, 1996, 1998); 'exiles', who choose to leave their country due to political or other reasons, and the 'expelled', who are being forced away from their country for various reasons (Magee & Sugden, 2002). Sport migration from the former Czechoslovakia between 1948 and 1989 is a clear example of the 'exiles' type of sport labour migration (Válek, 2011).

Among the major milestones for sport migration's rapid development were the collapse of the Soviet bloc, which led to the opening of borders between the global West and East, and the Bosman ruling in football, which was a legal ruling made by the European Court of Justice in 1995 (Bale & Maguire, 1994; Taylor, 2006). The Bosman ruling radically changed the process of football players' transfers within the EU after the end of their contract

without a transfer fee being paid. The ruling has also changed the existence of so-called "quota systems" in various European leagues, according to which only a limited number of foreign players (specifically meaning players from other EU countries) were able to play for one club during any given match. After the ruling, an unlimited number of EU players could play for any club during any match, although the number of non-EU players remained strictly limited. While the Bosman case was primarily concerned with professional association football, its consequences were felt in a range of team sports played throughout the EU.

This process of sports labour migration includes not only athletes, but also coaches, mangers and other personnel. Due to the high amount of American personnel migrating mainly to Europe and other continents, spreading their values and vision of sport, the concept of Americanization became popular, which, among other things, involved a raise in playing standards and a change in teams' and leagues' marketing strategies. Labour rights in sport still remain a central issue in the sport migration flow, especially for players in team sports, who are considered to have much less freedom in movement than individual players (Maguire, 1999; Malcolm, 2008).

Hockey players from the USA and Canada used their professional skills in the UK, Germany, France and Switzerland, and American ice hockey clubs aimed to attract top players from Scandinavia, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Russia. American universities seek especially talented athletes, footballers, rugby players, basketball players and swimmers in Europe and, more recently, in Africa (Bale & Maguire, 1994). According to the latest International Basketball Migration Report (CIES Observatory, 2013), in seasons 2010/11 and 2011/12 FIBA registered more than 6500 international transfers of basketball players with increase of 6 per cent between these two season. There was also a sharp increase in transfers among players between 21 and 23 years of age, which might suggest that players more often decided to move abroad right after the contract with their first team has expired. According to the report, USA had the most transferred players (45.2 per cent, compared to the 6.2 per cent of Serbians on the second place), and that might explain the highest negative balance of imported/exported players in Europe (-397), who hosted mainly the American (among of all immigrated) players in its teams. Since 1997, when the agreement between FIBA and NBA concluded the request for the Letter of Clearance for each international transfer, the number of transfers between FIBA and NBA has been growing, resulting in 75 per cent of all European migrant players heading to NBA, and 76 per cent of all NBA American migrant players going to play in Europe last season (2012/2013). For women basketball players the numbers are quite similar, reaching 78 per cent and 80 per cent consequently.

Arguments in support of global sports migration are based primarily on increasing the attractiveness of sport and therefore increasing the interest of sponsors and media, on the opportunity to see top players (Maguire, 1999; Maguire & Stead, 1998). The opposite view argues against labour migration in sport based on identity politics; the de-territorialisation of sport and de-ethnicisation of the nation (Poli, 2007) is seen to have a negative impact on national teams and sport's contribution to national culture (Darby, 2007; Maguire, 1994).

Sport migrants, as with any other migrants, face certain difficulties when moving to a new country (Maguire, 1999; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009; Schinke et al., 2011). These difficulties can become particularly visible within the context of team sports. Athletes' labour in professional teams are owned by their clubs, in a way they are commodities and can be bought, sold or loaned, depending on the interests of team. As players move from one city or country to another, they are undoubtedly influenced by new cultures and social norms. Constant movement among populations with different cultural, ethnic or racial backgrounds puts specific demands on sports migrants, including personal flexibility, resilience, a need for quick orientation to a new environment, and general willingness to learn new forms of behaviour (Schinke et al., 2011). Athletes from different countries have different temperament and emotions and thus abilities to adapt. Therefore it is possible to observe trends in migration, such as African players who find suitable employment especially in southern European countries, but not in Scandinavia. Generally, players from Latin America and Southern Europe are perceived as more fragile emotionally and less adaptive to new cultures, while Scandinavian players are known for their language skills and maximum adaptability to new environments (Maguire, 1999; Sekot, 2008).

In this regard, it is worth emphasising the fact that globalisation has led to a much greater level of diversity within professional sports teams. Practitioners in sport psychology started to work with athletes and coaches from various different cultures; hence there occurred a need for more information regarding working with multicultural teams and athletes, and the importance of knowledge or awareness of how different cultures can influence team dynamics, what can be the most common issues in multicultural teams and how immigrant athletes cope with adaptation in a new team. In other words, there was a turn to focus on the cultural aspects of sport psychology in theory and practice.

2.4. Cultural turn in sport psychology

Cultural aspects have been included in sport psychology research only for a relatively short period of time; however, cultural studies as a general research area has a long history, with origins in the 1960s with the foundation of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham in England. Since this time, cultural studies has been largely influenced by English-speaking scholarship and particularly English-language sociology. Because of this, the course of cultural studies' development saw the field deal with class, gender and race issues, as well as examinations of the ideological, moral and ethical impact of Western-power knowledge on various aspects of society (Ryba et al., 2010). In its initial application to sport psychology, the efforts of feminist sport psychologists like Diane Gill, Carol Oglesby, Dorothy Harris and others openly challenged the existing field over "issues of difference, identity, power, meaning, reflexivity, and praxis – all of which are central to cultural studies scholarship" (Ryba et al., 2010, p. 6).

The first time that a lack of attention to such cultural aspects within sport psychology research was pointed out was by Duda and Allison (1990), who urged scholars to recognise the need to examine racial and ethnic factors (as two aspects of culture) in sport and exercise behaviour. After examining 36 issues of the *Journal of Sport Psychology* (between 1979 and 1987), they found out that only 1 of 13 theoretical papers and 7 of 186 empirical papers considered these factors. Duda and Allison pointed out that leaving racial and ethnic factors out of academic research is not only morally wrong in regards to the (mis)representation of minority groups, but also leaves a huge gap in academic theory and invites professional practice biased largely towards a dominant, white-defined, male-centred, mainstream Western view of culture. This effectively meant that when White European or North-American scholars advised practicing sport psychologists how to work with athletes, their recommendations were grounded within empirical data and theoretical frameworks fundamentally biased towards the particular needs of White male athletes (Ryba et al., 2010; Ryba, Stambulova, Si, & Schinke, 2013). Therefore it was difficult, if not impossible, to effectively generalise such recommendations in order to work with non-White ethnic groups, or with women. All practitioners were taught how to deliver the same techniques to all the clients, regardless of their ethnical, cultural or other background. Soon enough, practitioners realised that to effectively deliver their knowledge, and improve their work with diverse groups of athletes, "requires cultural understanding" (Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009, p. 4).

Initially, cross-cultural research focused mainly on work with Black populations in sport, leaving other non-White groups – such as Latino or Asian populations – aside (Gill & Williams, 2008), although recent studies started to include these as well (Kontos & Arguello, 2005). Lee & Rotella's (1991) attempt of showing how to work with Black student athletes was one of the first in this area, but was criticised for generalising and endorsing stereotypes of Blacks, and thereby perpetuating racial prejudice (Andersen, 1993). Moreover, American Anthropological Association' official position stands that the "evidence from the analysis of genetics (e.g., DNA) indicates that most physical variation lies within so-called racial groups. This means that there is greater variation within 'racial' groups than between them" (1998). Hence while working with multicultural athletes one should always remember that difference within the group is greater than between different groups, which can be applied not only to grouping of individuals by the race, but also by religion, gender, culture and other factors (Hanrahan, 2011; Lloyd, 1987).

A decade after these first efforts to establish culturally-sensitive research in sport psychology, Ram and colleagues (2004) conducted a content analysis of the main three journals in the field – *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* and *The Sport Psychologist*, between the years 1988-2000, 1987-2000 and 1989-2000 respectively, in order to measure scholarly output within this area. However, they found that only 15 articles and 4 papers (19.86 per cent of the total published) examined the role of race and ethnicity in their results, and concluded that there was still no systematic attempt to investigate the experiences of athletes outside of the White racial 'mainstream'. Other authors have pointed to similar conclusions: not much attention is being paid to culturally-specific aspects of the sport and exercise experiences of non-White populations (Kontos & Breland-Noble, 2002; Ryba & Wright, 2005). Recognising this ethnocentric (particularly coming from Euro-American cultural approach) position in the academic field of the sport psychology, the American Psychological Association (APA) released multicultural guidance (2003). The guidance focused on the *cultural awareness* (understanding beliefs, attitudes and values, based on the particular culture), *cultural knowledge* (knowledge and understanding of different worldviews) and *cultural skills* (usage of culturally appropriate communication and intervention in practice) (American Psychological Association, 2003; Ryba et al., 2013).

The introduction of these initiatives was highly demanded, especially since the number of non-White athletes in professional sport, not to mention the prevalence of multi-racial/multicultural teams following the rapid expansion of sport labour migration, has been growing tremendously. For instance, Richard Lapchick's *Racial and Gender Report Card* has

been monitoring the gender and racial diversity in sport for several years. According to the latest report card, in 2013, 76.3 per cent of NBA players were African-American while 81 per cent of players were players 'of colour' (i.e., non-White), and MLB (Major League Baseball) employed 8.3 per cent Black, 28.2 per cent Latino and 2.1 per cent Asian players. Meanwhile, in the season 2011-2012 more than 33 per cent of NHL players were immigrated (NHL international, 2013). Outside of North America, during the 2011/2012 football season in Europe, the number of international players (of various ethnic backgrounds) reached 55.7 per cent in the English Premier League, 36.3 per cent in Spanish La Liga, 45.1 per cent in German Bundesliga, 28.1 per cent in French Ligue I and 52.2 per cent in Italian Serie A (Poli, Ravenel, & Besson, 2013). Regardless of the fact that there is a significant number of non-White athletes in these globally popular sports, their corresponding management and leadership still remains predominantly White. For example, the NBA league office employed 34% people of colour of all professional employees in 2011 (Lapchick, 2012). In 2011, the number of NBA head-coaches that were other than White, reached a record high of 53 per cent (47 per cent were Black), making them prevailing for the first time ever not only in the NBA league, but in any professional sports league (Lapchick, 2012).

As the representatives of White population, which prevails in the academic world, academics very often do not recognise their own ethnically-based privileges (Gill & Williams, 2008), which can lead to misunderstanding with marginalised populations while working with them. White privilege in sport and its influence on working with multicultural athletes have been the centre of attention in research for some time (Anshel, 1990; Butryn, 2002, 2009; Martens, Mobley, & Zizzi, 2000), and continues to occupy a position of importance in studies in this area. This issue is also mentioned in the methods chapter (Chapter 5) of this thesis.

Beilock and McConnell (2004) confirm that negative stereotypes in sport are still very common, suggesting that they can lead to a decrease in performance among highly capable and motivated athletes. Mainly, racial stereotypes exist concerning African American athletes, who are commonly perceived as 'naturally' more athletic by both White and Black groups (Krueger, 1996), with their success being attributed to 'innate' abilities (Johnson, Hallinan, & Westerfield, 1999) rather than hard work, dedication, or other desirable character traits. Black players are often expected to be better in certain sports, such as basketball, because of their assumed innate physical abilities and affinity for specific forms of physicality. This can result in Black athletes' overachievement in this game in comparison with the underachievement of White players (Hall, 2002), as internalised racial stereotyping

leads to disproportionate athlete uptake and achievement, eventually reinforcing the original stereotypes. Furthermore, following these same beliefs about natural abilities, African American athletes are often assigned certain peripheral positions within team sports, where the main requirement is for physical speed and quickness, while White players tend to hold central, higher-status positions, where decision-making, technical skill, or leadership is required (Maguire, 1988).

Cultural turn in the sport psychology led to the filling the gap in the academic and practical fields of the sport psychology. Academics started to acknowledge the differences that can potentially be between groups with different racial, cultural, ethnic and other backgounds, and also the differences that can occur within these groups. Several statistic report in basketball and baseball (Lapchik, 2012, 2013), and in football (Poli et al., 2013) showed increasing numbers of international players in these team sports, e.g. players from another cultural and racial/ethnic background, which potentially leads to the changes in the team dynamics.

2.5. Dynamics within multicultural sport teams

As it is obvious from Chapter 1, team dynamics is multidimensional and can be influenced by several different factors such as team roles, norms and goals, cohesion and communication. In this chapter the focus is placed on the factors of team dynamics that are unique for the multicultural teams, therefore the main attention is paid on the potential cross-cultural issues that can occur in such teams, including verbal and non-verbal communication, differences between individualistic and collectivistic approach and formation of the ethnic sub-groups.

Team dynamics within multicultural or culturally diverse teams differ from observations of classic team dynamics in several aspects. Cultural diversity includes race, ethnicity, age, gender, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, disability, language, and socioeconomic status (Hanrahan, 2011). All of these factors and their combinations can influence dynamics within sports teams.

Allport (1954, as cited in Prentice & Miller, 1999) assumed that positive intergroup relation (if the members have different ethnic origin) depends on the equal status and pursuit of a common goal. However this assumption proved to be insufficient, as there are a lot more

factors that should be taken into account, for instance voluntary contact and more characteristics or interests in common besides the membership (Prentice & Miller, 1999).

Practitioners should be aware of how athlete' culture and origin can influence their norms and behaviour. In addition, practitioners should be aware of their own culture, how it can influence their judgements and how their clients (especially from marginalised cultures) can perceive them. People tend to believe that their culture is the mainstream one, and that all other cultures are exotic (Gill & Williams, 2008). However, it is very important to avoid generalisation based on any of those factors. We cannot treat all athletes from Latino countries the same, as we wouldn't have done it with all European athletes – there's a big difference between athletes from Greece and Norway, so as between athletes from Chile and Argentina (Schinke, 2010). Although the awareness of the culture, race and other cultural aspects of the human behaviour can anyway lead to the stereotyping of these influences.

2.5.1. Common cross-cultural issues

The international nature of a group can lead to cross-cultural conflicts – a phenomenon which has been widely explored during the last few decades, particularly in research of business organisations (Berger, 1996; Matveev & Nelson, 2004; Moran, Harris, & Moran, 2010). Problematic points that can occur within culturally diverse teams include, but are not limited to: verbal communication, coach-athlete communication, non-verbal communication, differences between collectivistic and individualistic cultures, and the formation of ethnic hierarchies within a team.

Verbal communication. Communication is an essential part of everyday life, and especially so within sport. However, inter-cultural contact may cause confusion and cognitive dissonance when people are exposed to a foreign language, a different communication style, unknown behaviours and the use of unfamiliar non-verbal expressions (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). When two communicating individuals speak the same native language, they speak quickly, sometimes even automatically. However, in conversational pairings where one of the participants speaks their native language, but the other does not, such a disparity can lead to less effective communication. For instance, it can be very difficult for foreigners to communicate with a native speaker of any given language, because of the slang and dialects that they might not be aware of. For example, Swiss German is not only different from the German language that is used in Germany; it also varies according to cantons like Bern, Basel

and so on. In addition, there are several 'borderline' languages like "Franglais" (English with French), "Portuñol" (Spanish and Portuguese), and "Spanglish" (English and Spanish), which result from localised blends of languages, for whom native speakers (of, for instance, English or Spanish) may understand little.

Sometimes there are differences in the language inside the border of the same country, with locally-specific dialects or slang. In the United States there is a difference between the Western and Eastern coasts – for example, New Yorkers tend to speak quicker than California residents. Consequentially, New Yorkers can perceive Californians as less intelligent and less receptive, while for some residents of the West Coast, New Yorkers seem to be domineering and ambitious (Lewis, 1999).

A separate but related issue is in manners of expression; conversational directness, for instance, may be perceived either positively or negatively within different cultures. In North American culture, open and straightforward communication is considered as an ideal way of communication, although not as much as it is common in German culture, and bragging is also common among Americans (Hall & Hall, 1990). There are even a few English expressions which emphasise the importance of open communication: 'Get to the point', 'Do not beat around the bush', and so on. Another way to determine whether a culture is focused on open communication or not, is to focus how members of that culture express disapproval or, to simplify, how they say "no." In Japan or Korea is considered to be very rude to say "I disagree with you.", therefore in their preferable indirect style of communication they use several different options to say "no" without a word being actually said directly (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Lewis, 1999).

Given this range of communicative difficulties, the manner in which people from different linguistic cultures manage to communicate, often with limited knowledge of one another's languages, is of concern when considering the effectiveness of multicultural teams. With this in mind, it has been argued previously that sport provides a potentially effective way to unify a multicultural group, being conducive to forms of communication which do not rely on the use of words, and sports activities are regularly used to aid in the assimilation and socialisation of immigrants into foreign countries (Allen, Drane, Byon, & Mohn, 2010; Ito, Nogawa, Kitamura, & Walker, 2011; Stodolska & Alexandris, 2004; Walseth, 2008).

Coach-athlete communication. In professional sport environments, communication between coaches and athletes from different ethnic or racial backgrounds can lead to misunderstanding or dissatisfaction. In a study conducted by Solomon and colleagues (1996) it was proposed that coaches have different expectations from athletes based on their

[athletes'] cultural backgrounds and race; for instance, giving Black athletes more instruction and giving White athletes more praise, based on prejudicial stereotyping (as outlined above). Similarly, Jowett and Frost (2007) interviewed 12 Black football players in the UK, who were playing in teams trained by White coaches, and found that some of the players felt that their relationship with the coach was less 'open' compared to how the coach related to their White teammates, and was thought to be less satisfying overall due to their skin colour. However, all the participants in this study felt that the coach-athlete relationship in the case of different racial or ethnic backgrounds was dependent mainly on individual characteristics.

In addition to concerns over players' race, coaches also face with difficulties while training foreign immigrated athletes. For instance, Duchesne and colleagues (2011) found that basketball coaches were aware of multiple problems that immigrant athletes can encounter; in particular, coaches would try to help them to integrate to the team and improve team cohesion between foreign and local players, in addition to generic concerns in coach-athlete relationships. By aiming to help athletes to develop in a variety of ways, the coaches in this study overall described their relationship with immigrated athletes as "parental", stressing the importance of learning about international athletes' cultural traditions and background in helping to accomplish such ends (Duchesne et al., 2011). Similar findings were presented by Schinke, Ryba and colleagues (2007), in their study of elite Canadian Aboriginal athletes and their coaches of non-Aboriginal origin. They found that the most effective way for coach-athlete communication in this case was empathy, compassion and knowledge of athlete's cultural background from the coach's side.

Non-verbal communication. Non-verbal habits are an important element in all types of communication; they are a spontaneous phenomenon, expressions which people are not commonly conscious of making, and it also helps "signal personal and cultural identities while also sending messages about how one feels toward the situation one is confronted with" (Andersen, 2000, p. 293). Non-verbal expressions are greatly important, especially in communication between people from different cultures for whom language is not always effective. The various different types of non-verbal communication, which are mostly influenced by cultural differences, include proxemics, chronemics, kinesics, haptics.

Proxemics, or using of space during interpersonal communication, was described by Edward Hall (1966) and presented as 4 zones (distances) of communication among Northern Americans. The distances included zones for 'intimate' space (up to 46 cm between individuals), which is used for touching or whispering; personal space (46 cm to 1 m) is used when interacting with close friends or family; social space (1 to 3.5 m) for interacting with

acquaintances and public space (beyond 3.5 m) for public speaking related activities. That distance is changeable and depends on cultural and individual factors, and also on gender and social occasion. For instance, in Latin cultures the corresponding distances are relatively shorter, with people feeling more comfortable being closer to each other. But for Nordic cultures, North African and Asian cultures, the opposite tendency is observable (Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009).

Chronemics is connected to the structure of time, more specifically to the perception and usage of time in various cultures, wherein time is perceived and used differently. The understanding and the perception of the past, present and future by various cultures helps in understanding their communicative strategies. For instance, according to Hall (1983), Persian culture is very traditional and is oriented on the past, which has a great importance to them. Meanwhile North American cultures are oriented to the future, they like to try new things, and love changes. They also perceive time as something fixed and scheduled, while Latin cultures time has a much lower importance, they stress the present time as more important. Although chronemics is not directly connected to the communication, perception of time can influence the relationships between people from different cultures in various context, including online communication Lately the majority of the studies are focusing on influence of chronemics in computer-mediated communication (Kalman, Ravid, Raban, & Rafaeli, 2006; Walther & Tidwell, 1995).

In 1976, Hall (1983, 1997, see also Berger, 1996) introduced the model of low-context (monochronic) and high-context (polychronic) cultures. It is important to remember, that these time perception divide are not strict categories, but rather the try to describe the variety in cultures (Hall, 2010). According to this model, polychronic cultures do more things at once, they are flexible, and do not tend to follow time schedules (in case they have one at all). They have strong traditions and relations with family or friends, which is more important for them than prescribed tasks. In communication, such cultures tend to involve a preference for many implicit messages, using metaphors. They usually encourage an internal locus of control, taking personal responsibilities for failure. Polychronic cultures also tend to have a lot of non-verbal communication, and members of such cultural groups don't show reactions very explicitly. Among countries with polychromic cultures are those in Mediterranean, Africa, and South America (Hall, 2010).

On the other hand, monochronic cultures tend to encourage a focus on one issue at a time; they tend towards precision and keeping to established schedules; they encourage the perception of the completion of work and tasks as being more important than relationships

with friends and family. These cultures are characterised by being committed, with a lot of explicit and open communication and an external locus of control, and thus tend to place the responsibility for failure into others. Monochronic cultures put greater focus on verbal communication with explicit reactions, lesser feelings of loyalty, and flexible relationships. North American and Northern European nations can be described as monochronic cultures (Hall, 2010). As has been mentioned in subchapter 2.3, the differences within a group are greater than between groups, therefore it is important not to generalise the entire populations of these nations based on a few examples.

Kinesics, which includes body movement, body language, gestures, and facial expressions, can be subdivided into the following overarching categories:

- *Overall appearance and clothing*. We tend to judge people based on our perception of their attractiveness; however, these standards vary from one culture to another.
- *Body movement*. All cultures have their own body movements; for instance, Mediterranean cultures move and gesticulate much more in comparison with Scandinavians or Asians.
- *Facial expressions*. Facial expressions are often interpreted based on the context of communication, with meanings derived from cultural norms which, as with other elements of non-verbal communication, can differ markedly from one culture to another. Nevertheless, some facial expressions are universal – for instance, the smile is universally regarded as an expression for happiness and joy.
- *Eye contact*. The intensity and the length of eye contact are very different among cultures. Asian cultures, for instance, often prefer indirect eye contact, while North American and European countries (apart from Mediterranean) are characterised by moderate length of eye contact, and for Arabian countries and those of the Mediterranean, intense and long eye contact is more typical.
- *Gestures*. The same gestures in different countries can have different meanings. For instance, the famous American gesture for "OK" (making a circle with the thumb and forefinger) is considered vulgar in the countries of Latin America.

Haptics, which is communication that involves touching. People all over the world greet each other very differently, and this can involve hugging, kissing, handshakes or verbal greetings. Low-contact cultures tend to engage in less "touching" in this regard than high-contact cultures (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988). For example, Arabs feel a strong need

for close contact, including various touching behaviours, while North American cultures perceive this kind of behaviour as inappropriate or disturbing (Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hall, 1983).

Collectivism and individualism. As was mentioned earlier, equal status of its members and common goal are two essential factors to diminish potential issues in multicultural teams (Allport 1954, as cited in Prentice & Miller, 1999), however recent study by Greenfield, Davis, Suzuki and Boutakidis (2002) says that these conditions "cannot eradicate the difference between two very basic, yet unspoken value frameworks: individualism and collectivism" (p. 141).

There is an extensive research in a cultural psychology regarding individualistic and collectivistic differences (Gelfand & Realo, 1999; Gundlach, Zivnuska, & Stoner, 2006; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Rhee, Uleman, & Lee, 1996), with a particular emphasis on these orientations' influences on group dynamics (Brown, Hinkle, Ely, Fox-Cardamone, Maras, & Taylor, 1992; Kernan & Greenfield, 2005). Differences between individualistic and collectivistic approach is often used in order to illustrate and explain differences in norms, beliefs, attitudes and other aspects between different cultural groups (Triandis, 1996). For example, on one hand North American and European cultures are considered to be more individualistically oriented societies, they are more self-oriented, promote self, autonomy and encouraging individual needs over the group needs. On the other hand, collectivistic societies like Asian countries (Japan or China) emphases the collective needs, cooperation, conformity and personal modesty.

Apart from generation their own behaviour based on the dimension individualism-collectivism, people also tend to interpret the behaviour of others using the same cultural model. Therefore the most common cause for the conflicts in multicultural teams is "when the behaviour valued in one perspective is negatively evaluated through the lens of the other perspective" (Greenfield et al., 2002, p. 142). For instance, collectivistic cultures can perceive pursuing of individual needs and self-authonomy as egoistic, while individualistic cultures may see modesty, self-defence and admission of error as weakness or even a threat to self-esteem in a contrast with collectivistic cultures which interpreter these behaviour as positive.

Hierarchically arranged ethnic subgroups within a team. In any culturally diverse team the formation of subgroups based on the ethnic aspect is not uncommon, which can lead to the interpersonal misunderstandings or conflict based on the racial or ethnic basis (Sidanius, Levin, Rabinowitz, & Federico, 1999). The example of the basketball team, explored by Greenfield and colleagues (2002), revealed that Black players in multicultural

teams can feel superior toward their White teammates, and in addition they can also receive preferential treatment from the coach. This perception of unequal status among White players led to the conflict between them and their Black teammates and therefore to the racial tension, which was at some way "supported" by a coach. Subgroups can function as an "in-group" inside the team, excluding all other players from the participation, or even perceive them as an "out-group" that is inferior to them. Moreover, the differences in culture, race/ethnicity and other aspects between coach and players can also impact their relationship, which is described in more details in the next subchapter.

2.5.2. Coaching multicultural athletes

The international nature of teams or individual athletes can be a challenge not only for the players, but also for the coaches. The experiences of coaches working with culturally diverse teams and athletes have recently been explored by several studies (Duchesne et al., 2011; Jowett & Frost, 2007; Schinke, 2011; Schinke et al., 2013).

Differences in culture, race/ethnicity and other aspects between coaches and players can lead to racial stereotyping among coaches. Coaches can treat athletes from diverse backgrounds differently and also have different expectations from athletes of particular cultural or ethnic backgrounds; for example, coaches give more praise to European American athletes, while giving more instructions to African American athletes (Solomon et al., 1996), which can be explained by the stereotype that African Americans are 'naturally' athletic and excel in sport (Eastman & Billings, 2001; Stone, Perry, & Darley, 1997), but supposedly lack the discipline and concentration of European Americans. Black players are often perceived by coaches as lazy and not willing to play under bad weather conditions (Burley & Fleming, 1997). Racial stereotyping of Black players among coaches can lead to them assigning certain position on the pitch to players based on the players' race (Williams & Youssef, 1979), assigning Black players to the positions that require speed and quickness, and White players to the positions that require decision making (Maguire, 1988). The prevalence of these stereotypes can have a negative impact on coach-athlete relationships (Jowett & Frost, 2007).

Regarding culturally relevant coaching practice, Schinke (2011) suggested that coaches involved in work with culturally diverse groups of athletes should adopt empathic approaches to their athletes and consider their degree of acculturation, possible differences in perception of time and physical space, gender roles and individualistic or collectivistic

cultural orientations. These suggestions were supported by Duchesne and colleagues' (2011) study, which found that coaches who had knowledge about cultural differences were more able to support their culturally diverse athletes and help them to develop not only within sport, but also in their academic and personal lives. Another study by Schinke and colleagues (2013) suggested that coaches "may struggle with their own cultural practices in relations to another's cultural practices, as they attempt to meet immigrant athletes somewhere in the middle" (p. 8).

2.5.3. Adaptation of elite athletes

The experience of athletes who relocate from their home country have recently been in the centre of attention in sport psychology (Kontos, 2009; Schinke et al., 2011; Schinke, Gauthier, Dubuc, & Crowder, 2007). The process of athletes' acculturation in sport psychology research focuses on what difficulties they encounter when relocating to a new country in order to pursue their careers, which involve changes in food, dress, language and many other aspects of everyday life (Kontos & Breand-Noble, 2002).

All immigrants face a culture shock when adapting to new environments (Pedersen, 1995), and sport immigrants are no exception. Moreover, they face a greater pressure to adapt very quickly in order to play at their best level, regardless how hard it may be for them to adapt in a new country. Furthermore, immigrant athletes are sometime being expected not only to adapt, but also to 'acculturate' to their new cultural setting (Schinke et al., 2006; Schinke et al., 2013). Acculturation is best assessed by the extent to which athletes retain their home culture or, on the other hand, assimilate to their host culture (Kontos & Breand-Noble, 2002).

For a long time, the immigrant acculturation framework developed by Berry (1997) was used in cross-cultural research. However, during the last few years, authors preferred to use Fiske's notion of 'adaptation pathways' (2004, as cited in Schinke et al., 2011; see also Fiske, 2009) within sport psychology practice. According to Fiske, there are 5 pathways that contribute to athletes' adaptation: understanding, belonging, trusting, controlling and self-enhancement.

Understanding is the cultural practices, community and sporting context of a new country. It might be useful for athletes to read literature about this particular country and

culture before relocation, and maybe try to find a contact with future teammates via Internet communication prior to moving.

Belonging is related to the immigrant athletes' endeavour for social support inside and outside of sport. The loneliness that relocated athletes usually experience during the first few weeks in a new country is the result of a lack of social connections. It is a very hard work to start "belonging" to their new group, at this requires a lot of time and effort, but it remains necessary to achieve, even when it brings feelings of discomfort. Social support from their team is considered to be very important at this point as well.

Trust is crucial for team cohesion and cooperation, which will result in mutual sharing and greater willingness to engage more in team activities. This, in turn, can contribute to greater feelings of belonging.

Controlling or showing the confidence, assertiveness at this stage is very important, so an athlete can control his or her activities with the team and mutual sharing of cultural practices. It's important for host teammates and the coach to give an immigrated athlete space and possibility to express him/herself, especially to talk about his/her challenges in current adaptation.

Finally, *self-enhancement* considered to be an integral part of the adaptation in a new country, which requires permanent work – learning new skills, local language, and cultural practices. It's important to remember (for both immigrated athletes and local athletes within hosting teams) that this process takes time and cannot be gained overnight.

Adaptation of immigrated athletes can be also analysed through the lens of acculturation process or acculturation experience that particular athlete and his (her) team can adopt (Schinke & McGannon, 2013). First possible strategy perceives *acculturation as the athlete's responsibility*, which implies that coaches and teammates expect the athlete to fit into the team context, to learn the local language and meet team's training standards, otherwise (s)he will be perceived as an outsider and can be excluded from the team. Immigrated athlete in this case does not receive any support or guidance from the management or teammates, and has to cope on his (her) own with challenges of adaptation, feelings of loneliness, language barrier and other issues, while trying to pursue his (her) sporting career (Kontos, 2009). Not only the athlete does not receive support from the coach or teammates, but may be exposed to embarrassing or negative feedback from the teammates (e.g. teammates can make fun of athlete's attempts to learn and use new language in the context). Athlete in this situation may choose to remain silent and avoid contact with teammates, and his (her) performance may also decline.

Another acculturation process implies *limited reciprocity*, in which teammates and coach instead of demanding the change from immigrated athlete, focus on encouraging and supporting of athlete's attempts to learn new language, adapt to a new culture etc. In this case athlete is still expected to assimilate to a dominant culture of the host country, and athlete's home country identity and culture identity is not taken into account. Moreover, athlete may deliberately choose to comply with the coach' and teammates' expectations regarding acculturation, just in order to avoid possible conflicts in the team or because of fear of losing his (her) place in the team. This process may result in athletes' identity confusion or frustration with self (Schinke et al., 2013).

Finally, the last type of acculturation experience is *immersed reciprocity*, which implies a deeper sharing of the responsibilities connected with acculturation process. Mutual sharing and learning about each other's cultures, values and beliefs lead to recognition and reflection of each other's cultural values and identities. This approach, that implies integration and inclusion, can contribute to the immigrated athlete' understanding of his (her) new cultural environment, team hierarchy, role and so on, and on the other hand it can help local players and the coach learn immigrated athlete' cultural norms via shared acculturation process.

Expanding the subject of acculturation of immigrate athletes, Schinke and colleagues (2013) interviewed 13 elite athlete immigrants and 10 coaches in order to find out the characteristics of the acculturation process for immigrant athletes and the key acculturation issues that immigrant athletes face within an unfamiliar sporting context. Using thematic analysis, they found two key issues that immigrant athlete encounter during the process of acculturation, with both of these divided into several sub-themes.

The first key issue concerned *navigating two world views* – athletes were talking about dealing with two contrasting sport worlds that they have to manage, describing acculturation as fluid:

Frustration with the host sport context. This included struggling with limited financial situations, especially when athletes "considered their experiences in the host country through the lens of their home country" (Schinke et al., 2013, p. 4). Another difficulty was immigrant athletes' perception of their host teammates as spoiled, soft and lazy. The coaches, who in this research were a mix of Canadian-born (host country) and immigrants themselves, agreed with this perception, describing immigrant athletes as more determined and having a high fighting level in comparison with home athletes who do not have to "prove" anything and fight very hard in order to stay in the country.

Frustration with the home sport context. In the 'nature versus nurture – pre-selection' sub-theme, immigrant athletes described their host country as "a system that nurtures athletes regardless of their physical composition and talent" (Schinke et al., 2013, p. 6), meanwhile their home country was using the system of early talent identification and natural selection with intolerance of physical imperfection (e.g. children were chosen to the synchronised swimming team based on their height and weight, and also on the look of their parents to have a prediction about a child's further development). In the 'nature versus nurture' sub-theme, post-selection immigrant athletes compared the training in their home country, describing it as a hard approach that led to detriment (including food and drink deprivation while training), with the treatment in a host country that was softer and more compassionate.

Second key issue was *acculturation loads* – which could be adaptive or mal-adaptive depending on whether it included team support or not:

Sharing the load. Describes not only the efforts of immigrant athletes, but also their surroundings – teammates and coaches. The efforts can be shown through shared communication learning, with teammates helping to overcome a language barrier by encouraging their new, immigrated teammate to make the effort to learn the local language. It is also important for the immigrated athletes to make this effort themselves (e.g., through communication based on posture or facial expressions). Therefore this kind of 'meeting halfway' will bring about mutual trust and respect. Another strategy is shared cultural learning, which involves mutual (immigrant athlete, coach and host teammates) learning about each other's cultures and cultural norms. The next strategy is sharing experiences with established immigrant athletes, who have experience and the knowledge about what it's like to be an immigrant and how to deal with difficulties. Even if these experienced immigrants are not athletes themselves, it is nevertheless useful to have someone around who can provide an immigrant athlete with basic knowledge and help to broaden their social network, which leads to a more positive view of the new country and new culture.

Shouldering the load. Immigrants are expected to acculturate and learn the language one-directionally – with no or little support from their team, coach, or wider social environment. Sometime these efforts are expected from an immigrant athlete before their teammates can make a "step forward" in helping to "share the load", as above.

Based on Schinke and colleagues' (2011) research, in which the authors analysed their working experience with immigrated athletes over at least 15 years, they found out the following challenges that immigrated athletes encounter during their first year of relocation:

- *Challenges in a new community*

Regardless of an athlete's level of professional achievement, or their sex or age, they lose their social ties when relocating, and all speak about loneliness from family and friends, as well as their community and culture. The loneliness seems to be felt the strongest after 6-8 weeks of relocation, when the initial excitement and novelty of their new country disappears. Although athletes learn how to deal with loneliness in time, especially with the development of global communication technologies such as Skype and Facebook, this feeling can remain and not fully disappear.

Another difficulty is the loss of community and social life with minimum social contacts, unfamiliar food, and unfamiliar every-day life, including simple activities such as shopping. At this stage, peer helping is very important in order to facilitate an athlete's adjustment to their new culture.

- *Challenges in a new culture outside of sport*

This challenge includes differences in time perception, personal space, eye contact, language, and verbal and non-verbal communication (see previous subchapter). The most frustrating of these for immigrated athletes is communication, and their slow progress in learning the language when they are trying to express themselves. Usually only a few people, if any, understand them, therefore for immigrant athletes the fear that others perceive them as stupid is quite commonplace. The amount of free time spent socializing also varies from one culture to another, but can also be a very individual choice. Some athletes prefer to stay at home and get a rest after training, while others prefer to go out partying. Some athletes prefer socializing while drinking and chatting with friends through a whole evening, while others, according to one of the interviewed athletes, "drink to get hammered, and that's not fun at all" (Schinke et al., 2011, p. 15).

- *Challenges in a sport context*

Immigrated athletes can encounter difficulties during both training and competition, which can involve differences between individual and collective cultures or behaviour (as was described earlier); adjustment to a new athletic role, which can require stronger physical demands such as unusual and much harder training than in their home country; and also adaptation to the "little fish in a big sea" syndrome (Schinke et al., 2011, p. 16), when

athletes who were the best in their home countries have to gain a new position or accept less playing time and fight hard for their place with a new team environment.

2.6. Summary of Chapter 2

Globalisation in sport is part of a much wider process of world globalisation, which is described as the process of diminishing borders between economies, industries, cultures, languages and other parts of human lives (Maguire, 1999). With the rapid development of sport labour migration, based on, among the other factors, Bosman ruling and the fall of "iron curtain", athletes started to travel for work all over the world. Sport migration resulted in very frequent encounter of cultures and ethnics that have never met before and the formation of multicultural sport teams. In order to adapt to this trend and find out the best strategies to work with international athletes and culturally diverse teams, cultural turn in the sport psychology (Ryba et al., 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009) was inevitable. Thank to this turn, both academics and practitioners started to pay more attention to the influence of culture, race and ethnic on the relationships between players and sport psychologists, between teammates and between coaches and their athletes, in order to improve relations, team cohesion and results in both individual and team sports.

However, despite several studies that have been provided in the area of cultural sport psychology, the psychological challenges brought about by global migration and recent transformations of the international sports system remain relatively under-examined (Ryba et al., 2010, p. 15). This present study aims to at least partially address the lack of empirical research in this area to date, by exploring various issues relating to group cohesion, team-building, and communication among European basketball teams which include migrant players from North America and Europe.

3. Qualitative research

The methodology of the present study involved choosing to conduct qualitative research; therefore this chapter offers a brief overview of the theoretical background for this type of approach. Qualitative research is a broad term for the group of approaches or techniques which focus "specifically on the understanding of the social phenomena and the ways in which people make sense and extract meaning from their experiences" (Jones, Brown & Holloway, 2013, p. 3; see also Gibbs, 2007; Young & Atkinson, 2012). In this respect it differs from quantitative research, which instead focuses on the examination of different phenomena by primarily gathering objective, numerical data and testing pre-determined hypotheses. Nevertheless, these types of the research are not in opposition to each other, but are rather two techniques that are used to answer different types of questions, using different procedures and different skills (Jones et al., 2013).

Qualitative research has expanded massively during the 20th century, and now includes several methods, such as interviews, observation, documentary and media analysis, visual methods, and ethnography, all of which help researches to "go both broad and deep" in the understanding of social phenomena (Young & Atkinson, 2012, p. x).

According to Jones and colleagues (2013), among the main characteristics of qualitative research are: 1) Flexibility, coherence and consistency – flexible study designs, which can be changed in the early stages and be adapted accordingly, going back and forth between data collection-analysis-findings, yet should still remain true to the following principles and procedures (points 2 through 7); 2) Priority of data – qualitative research is inductive, which means that gathered data allow for the emergent discovery of unanticipated patterns or hypotheses, which allows greater flexibility than only interpreting data on the basis of pre-determined theory; 3) Context sensitivity – the data from qualitative research should always be analysed within its context, including locality, time and culture, such that the researcher is required to be context-sensitive or context-intelligent, which can make the generalisation of findings difficult, although not impossible; 4) Thick description – detailed description of people's feelings, intentions and so on, using direct quotes, which are strongly connected to the context and lived culture of participants; 5) Immersion in the setting – researchers fully engage in the situation that they study, with the participants, building trust and relationships with people; 6) Insider/outsider perspectives – or 'emic' views, which refers to the participants' understanding or opinion of the group insiders, and 'etic' views, which is researchers' perspectives, that are less empirical or concrete; 7) Reflexivity and

"critical subjectivity" – researcher's values, beliefs, status are all seen to affect the research, therefore there remains a need to reflect on their own position and involvement within the research. They need to be part of a study without influencing their sample. Qualitative research can never be neutral or perfectly objective; therefore influences on the subjectivity and related forms of self-disclosure on the part of the researcher should always be taken into account.

3.1. Sampling

Sampling is an essential element of all research on human beings, and according to Coyne (1997, p. 623), "in qualitative research sample selection has a profound effect on the ultimate quality of the research". Within the qualitative approach, sampling is different compared to quantitative research. For instance, the technique of random sampling that is used very regularly in clinical, quantitative research is not appropriate for all qualitative methods (Marshall, 1996), particularly those which seek to generate data specific to a certain group of people. In order to decide on the sample, qualitative researchers must consider which population groups (demographic characteristics, people with specific life experiences, etc.) that they want to sample and how they want to do it, because it is important to describe the choice of the sample, justify it and explain how they gained access to this sample, in line with the principles of qualitative work outlined above (Jones et al., 2013).

The variety of sampling types is quite wide, including homogeneous, heterogeneous, chain referral, theoretical sampling, and so on. The most common technique used in qualitative research is, as described above, 'purposive sampling' (Creswell, 2007), which means that the participants will be chosen by the researcher in order to answer their specific research questions, which makes this selection criterion-based (Jones et al., 2013; Miovský, 2006). Using this technique, researchers deliberately organise their sampling around groups whose specific life experiences and knowledge make them the best choice for inclusion in the chosen study.

3.2. Data collection

There are several types of data collection that can be used in qualitative research. The following sections provide a brief theoretical overview of the qualitative methods that have been used in this study in order to answer the main and secondary research questions.

3.2.1. Semi-structured interviews

According to Jones and colleagues, "the purpose of the interview – the 'why' of interviewing – is to uncover the world of participants, their thoughts and feeling on phenomena, and an account of their experience" (2013, p. 47). Interviews allow researchers to explore participants' knowledge, feelings, and understanding of a particular phenomenon, and are primarily based on a relatively formal or, in some cases, informal interaction between researchers and participants. Interviews are particularly useful for the exploration of areas which are relatively under-researched, as they provide researchers with access to the opinions and experiences of others. Data generated through such interviews can then subsequently lead to generalizations or the generation of new theories and further research questions.

One of the most common forms of this method is the 'semi-structured' interview. Unlike structured interviews, which are useful for both qualitative and quantitative research projects, semi-structured interviews allow research participants to have some control over the conversation with the interviewer. While this method usually proceeds on the basis of an interview guide or schedule of questions drawn up and used by the researcher (providing the interview with a 'structure'), the conversation which results from this is flexible, and can adjust according to the participant's responses. The interview guide, which is prepared in advance, allows the researcher to ensure that the conversation follows the main research aims, and also to come back to important topics during pauses in the interview. In this sense, this approach to interviewing avoids the drawbacks associated with both 'structured' and 'open-ended' interview methods, which either impose a rigid and artificially narrow framework on the interviewees' responses, or see the discussion frequently running 'off topic', respectively. Semi-structured interviews can include several types of questions (Flick, 2014): open questions, when interviewee can provide an answer based on his/her knowledge; theory-driven, hypotheses-directed questions, which are oriented to 'scientific literature about

the topic or are based on the researcher's theoretical presuppositions (p. 218) and confrontational questions, which are related to already presented theories in order to re-examine them.

3.2.2. Observation

Observation has its origins in anthropology and sociology and is probably the earliest form of qualitative data collection, having been "used by researches to explore and understand a group or a culture" (Jones et al., 2013, p. 69). It is method that integrates almost all sense from everyday life, like hearing, seeing, and feeling (Flick, 2014). Observation can be indirect, which includes analysis of the documents or conversational analysis, or direct, which includes participant and non-participant observation (Hendl, 2005).

Non-participant observation implies minimum interaction with observed subjects, it is less obtrusive and is not influenced by emotional engagement of observer (Hendl, 2005). Participant observation can involve anything ranging from several minutes of the researcher watching people going about a given activity, to the researcher's full participation in said activity over a prolonged period of time, and therefore involves much more than just watching (Jones et al., 2013). In conjunction with interviewing methods, observation can provide useful, supplementary data, whilst allowing the researcher to discover some other problems that participants do not talk about (consciously or not) in the interviews. Therefore, it provides researchers with a holistic understanding of the problem being investigated (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), making it beneficial when used in triangulation with other methods (Flick, 2014). It is very important to keep a systematic record of observations, rather than relying on memory, particularly when conducting multiple observations of the same or very similar groups/activities, using field-notes or video/audio recording devises (Jones et al., 2013).

3.3 Data analysis

Jones and colleagues state that "qualitative data analysis consists of exploring, managing and interpreting the data collected over time, starting with the raw data and transforming them during a reflective process" (2013, p. 151). A detailed and precise data analysis is an essential process in qualitative research (Hendl, 2005), and should be

conducted with explicit attention to the principles of qualitative research outlined above. Several different approaches exist for analysing qualitative data, such as grounded theory, phenomenology, narrative analysis, ethnography, mixed methods, and the generic approach, which is also known as thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Jones et al., 2013; Pope, Ziebland, & Mays, 2000; Smith, 2010), and is the analytical method used in this thesis.

Thematic analysis consists of several stages of work, and these have been explained in various ways by different scholars. For instance, Boyatzis (1998) described the following stages of thematic analysis: 1) Deciding on sampling and design issues; 2) Developing themes and coding, which can be theory driven, prior research or prior data driven, or inductively (e.g. raw data) driven; and 3) Validating and using the devised thematic coding system. This approach was further developed by Jones and colleagues (2013), who suggest the following four steps for good thematic analysis: 1) Data management, based on inventing a system for organising and storing data; 2) Transcription of the interviews and writing-up of any observational field notes; 3) Familiarisation with the data by listening to or reading it repeatedly; 4) Reduction of the data through coding and categorising it into recognisable themes. However, for the current thesis, the author is using the six steps of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006): 1) Transcription of verbal data and familiarisation with them; 2) Generating initial codes; 3) Searching for themes which unite initial codes; 4) Reviewing themes on the basis of emergent patterns; 5) Defining and naming themes; 6) Producing the final written report.

Managing the data (organising, sorting etc.) is essential for data analysis. Raw data need to be sorted and labelled on a regular basis, in order to keep the researcher from losing track of them. During this process, identifying details of the participants should be labelled with pseudonyms, which should be kept separately from their real names in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality – key ethical issues (see subchapter 5.5) for any study using interviewing. The first of the steps outlined in the model of analysis used in this study involves the transcription of interviews and field notes, which should ideally proceed from the moment of their initial collection in order that they not get lost in the large volumes of data subsequently produced. Some analytical approaches, such as discourse analysis, requires micro-transcription, which includes the notation of non-verbal elements (gestures, facial expressions) or laughter, coughing, pausing, and so on; however, other approaches such as grounded theory, phenomenological analysis, and thematic analysis, generally do not require micro transcription, and rely purely on the accurate transcription of participants' spoken

accounts (Jones et al., 2013).

3.4 Quality indicators in qualitative research

The issue of research quality in qualitative research has seen much discussion in recent years (Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2014; Seale, 1999; Sparkes & Smith, 2009). Several methods, criteria and schemes have been proposed for the description of the same matter, which refers to the appropriateness of researchers' chosen methods for generating reliable, valid data useful for answering the given research questions (Golafshani, 2003; Gratton & Jones, 2010; Jones et al., 2013).

Reliability and validity are important criteria in establishing and evaluating the quality of quantitative research; however, the relevance of these constructs to qualitative research is debatable, and their meaning is considered to be altered in comparison with quantitative research (Bryman, 2012). In qualitative research, the term of internal validity is used, which relates to "the honesty with which researches report and present the concerns and thoughts of the participants, and whether the latter find that it describes reality as they see it" (Jones et al., 2013, p. 166). Bryman (2012) distinguishes between internal validity, which relates to "whether there is a good match between researcher's observation and theoretical background they develop" (p. 390) and external validity, which means that the findings and conclusions remain true for other studies in different times and with different samples, and therefore can be generalised. This latter measure is extremely difficult to substantiate within qualitative work, which remains closely tied to the specific lived experiences of the research participants, and thus cannot be taken to represent the lives of others with any certainty.

Reliability (or replicability) of results, which is a vital measure of quality within quantitative research, is also widely questioned in qualitative research (Howitt, 2010). Given their often highly subjective nature, the results of qualitative research are never absolutely replicable; although studies can be repeated with relatively similar results, these remain highly dependent on different researchers' subjective interpretations and methods of analysis. However, if the results of the same study are consistent over time and with different researchers, this allows some confidence in their reliability (Creswell, 2009; Jones et al., 2013). Gibbs (2007) recommends the following reliability procedures for qualitative research: checking transcripts for obvious mistakes; checking the definition and meanings of

coding; coordinate communication among coders for any team research; and cross-checking the developed codes among different researches.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Guba and Lincoln (1994) (both as cited in Bryman, 2012, p. 390) proposed alternative criteria for assessing the reliability and validity of qualitative research: trustworthiness and authenticity. Trustworthiness consists of four criteria, each of which has an equivalent criterion in quantitative research quality measurement: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Credibility is an equivalent to internal validity, implying agreement or a "good match between researchers' observations and the theoretical ideas they develop" (Bryman, 2012, p. 390). *Transferability* is an equivalent of external validity in quantitative research, which implies possibility of generalising the results to the whole social area. *Dependability*, which is a parallel to reliability, implies the replication of the study by other researchers. Finally, *confirmability*, as an equivalent of objectivity, recognises impossibility of completely objective research, however requires that researchers would make it apparent that their personal values or theoretical knowledge would not change the conduct of research or its findings.

Further alternatives to reliability and validity for qualitative work were proposed by Yardley (2000), and include the following categories: sensitivity to the context of social settings, theoretical positions and ethical issues; commitment in rigour with the subject matter; transparency and coherence of the research methods, clarity of argument and reflexivity of the researcher; and the importance of having an impact to the community and significance to the development of theory. In addition, Creswell and Miller (2000) suggested an 8-step approach for the evaluation of qualitative quality indicators, which consists of the following: triangulation of methods and data sources; member-checking of the final report in order to determine accuracy of findings; usage of rich, thick description to describe the findings; clarifying the bias of the researcher using self-reflection, which results in the production of an open and honest narrative; presenting any negative or discrepant information that contradicts the general perspectives of the emergent themes; spending prolonged time in the field for developing an in-depth understanding of the study; using peer debriefing (review process) in order to enhance accuracy; and finally using an external auditor, who is, in contrast to the peer reviewer, not familiar with the researcher or their project.

Another quality indicator of vital importance to quantitative work, generalisability, describes how the results of a study can be reasonably assumed to apply to all people across a similar situation or population (Creswell, 2009). This is not the main aim of qualitative

research, with many qualitative researchers openly stating that they don't want their results to be generalised to the broader public, because the results are unique to the population involved. Instead of the term generalisability, many researches use term 'transferability' or 'theory based generalisation' (Jones et al., 2013) in order to show that some of the theoretical ideas deriving from their findings can be tentatively used in different contexts.

A final aspect of quality within quantitative research that is not achievable in qualitative work is objectivity. As discussed above, qualitative research is largely based around subjective data gathered using methods which cannot guarantee objectivity. Because of this, qualitative researchers openly acknowledge their own subjectivity, and examine it for bias (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Rather than try to eliminate this bias, researchers then adopt the principle of reflexivity and self-disclosure, identifying possible sources of bias in their written reports so as not to mislead their readers.

3.5   Summary of Chapter 3

Chapter 3 provides a brief overview of the theoretical background for qualitative research, used in this dissertation. Unlike quantitative research, which primarily focuses on examining particular phenomena by gathering numerical data and testing pre-determined hypotheses, qualitative research focuses on subjective experiences, opinions or attitudes toward situations, and may be more important in practice than objective statistical indicators. These two types of research, however, should not be opposed to each other, as both of them answer different questions of different issues (Jones et al., 2013).

Sampling techniques in qualitative research differ from quantitative types, and can include homogeneous, heterogeneous, chain referral, theoretical sampling and many others. However, this dissertation uses 'purposive sampling' (Creswell, 2007), such that specific participants were chosen by the researcher on the basis of desired qualities relevant for the research. The data collection sub-chapter includes the theoretical background for such methods as semi-structured interviews and observation, which are the qualitative methods used in this dissertation. Data analysis is an essential process in qualitative research (Hendl, 2005), and includes several widely known analysis techniques; for example, grounded theory, phenomenology, narrative analysis, ethnography, mixed methods, and the generic approach, which is also known as thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Jones et

al., 2013; Pope et al., 2000; Smith, 2010). The latter method was chosen in order to analyse qualitative data gathered within this research.

This chapter finishes with a brief overview of quality indicators in qualitative research, including such criteria as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Bryman, 2012). The aspect of objectivity, which is hardly achievable in qualitative research, is also discussed in this chapter. The above-mentioned theoretical background of qualitative research provides an important basis for the following chapters, which present the rationale, aims, and research methods used in this particular project.

4. Rationale, aims and research questions of the thesis

Cross cultural sport psychology is still a relatively new field, although has recently begun to develop rapidly as a subsidiary area of sport and physical activity research. The immigration of athletes has long been a centrally important issue within globalisation research in the sociology of sport (Magee & Sugden, 2002; Maguire, 1999; Maguire & Stead, 1996; Sekot, 2008); however, the knowledge and theoretical background for issues surrounding acculturation, immigration and adaptation of immigrated athletes are still relatively unexamined within sport psychology (Schinke & McGannon, 2013), and mostly focused on Eastern and Western Europeans' adaptation in North American environment (Schinke et al., 2011, 2013). Also, with the ever-increasing prevalence of multicultural teams and migrated athletes in many professional sports, practicing sport psychologists can face unexpected obstacles (Butryn, 2002; Kontos & Breland-Noble, 2002; Martens et al., 2000), while working with athletes from different cultural, religious or ethnic backgrounds within teams which are becoming increasingly cosmopolitan. Therefore, the aims of this thesis are to examine the issues faced by athletes and coaches within multicultural, professional sports teams in the Central European context, and to offer recommendations for sport psychology practitioners working within such environments.

The main research question focuses on the interpersonal relationships in multicultural teams, from different points of view: **"What are the most common challenges that occur in multicultural, elite, professional basketball teams?"**

The aim of the research was to gather personal experiences of immigrated players, their local (home) teammates and their coaches (who can be migrants or locals themselves), in order to define the most common obstacles to team cohesion, along with other, related

problems and issues, occurring within professional multicultural basketball teams in the Czech Republic, Latvia and Germany. The grounds for this sample (i.e. type of sport and national location of the teams) are clarified in subchapter 5.1, below. Based on the research aims, along with the main research question and literature review, several secondary research questions have also been defined, that will contribute to answering the main question:

1) What challenges do immigrated elite athletes encounter in multicultural basketball teams?

2) What are the main problems involved with coaching multicultural basketball teams?

3) What recommendations can be provided for practising cultural sport psychologists?

5. Methods

In this chapter, the theoretical material and other literature reviewed in the previous chapters are applied into the present study's research methods. Apart from describing the research sample, the qualitative approach and the specific data collection and analysis methods used will be explained, together with a discussion regarding the quality indicators in this particular case. This chapter is completed by a discussion of ethical considerations and limits to the current research, before shifting to the analysis of the research results in Chapter 6.

5.1. Research sample

The research sample was purposive, and consisted of professional basketball players (both immigrated and local) and coaches playing/working in the Czech Republic, Latvia and Germany. These countries were chosen because of the relative popularity of this sport, as well as because of familiarity. All teams were playing in the top leagues of their countries; therefore all participants were professional, elite athletes and coaches. Professional teams were chosen as a sample because they employ players with an international origin, whose presence was essential for this research. Therefore, no lower league teams or university teams were contacted. Because of the teams' elite level, establishing contact and relationship with teams was quite complicated and long-term process, which is well documented problem in

the previous studies (see Elliott, 2012; Elliott & Weedon, 2010; Magee & Sugden, 2002). However, despite the difficulties, that explain relatively small sample, the access to six elite basketball teams was gained. As Powell and Lovelock state, "the ultimate quality of a piece of research, indeed the very possibility of carrying it out, depends on the researcher successfully negotiating and sustaining access" (1991, p. 128).

Basketball teams were chosen because of the international nature of the sport, as basketball teams throughout Europe actively invite players from various countries to play. Also, because teams consist of only 12 players – a relatively small number compared to some other team sports – this theoretically enables players to build stronger or closer relationships, and exploring the dynamics of inter-personal relationships is important in realising the aims of the research project, outlined above. Another reason was the relative 'openness' of basketball teams, as despite the general difficulty of working with elite athletes mentioned above, it was considered that to obtain access to these teams would be easier than, for instance, football teams, which had initially been considered as a potential sample at the planning stage of this study.

Gender differences (as both female and male teams were included in the research sample) were not considered as a variable in this research. It is usual practice in various academic studies of sport to examine differences between men and women as oppositional binaries, assuming that everything in each category will be the same (Ryba et al., 2013); however this study is focused on the phenomenon of multicultural teams overall, from the viewpoint of athletes and coaches regardless of their gender. The author decided to adopt this wide viewpoint, and to focus on describing the overall situation within such teams, given the relative lack of research existing in this particular area so far.

All participants in the study remain anonymous, because of the sensitive nature of the data and their professional level (see subchapter 5.5 for research ethics). All names, mentioned in the interviews, have been changed. The following abbreviations are used in the remained of this thesis to refer to players: "IP" represents immigrated players, "LP" local players, and "CO" coaches – see Appendix 1 for a full list of interviewed players and coaches. List includes age and nationality for immigrated players. Also, due to the sensitive nature of the research, the coaches' nationality and age will not be disclosed, because disclosing this information could fairly easily enable their identification. Another variable that is not included in this table is how long foreign players were playing in their current teams in particular, along with how many overseas/foreign teams they have played in before. Again, these variables were not included because of the relative ease with which several

players, with somewhat unique profiles in this respect, could potentially be identified. Players and coaches in the table are not divided by teams for the same reasons. However, provided that ethical issues are adequately balanced with researchers' methodological priorities, it is recommended to include these variables in future research in this area.

5.2. Data collection

For the data collection in this thesis were used qualitative methods of semi-structured interviews and observation.

5.2.1. Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as a main method in this research in order to explore participants' experience and their thoughts regarding the various phenomena arising out of the experience of being, or working with, immigrated athletes. Interview length varied quite significantly, from 15 minutes to 1 hour. The longest interviews were conducted with the coaches, as they tended to have more time than players before training sessions, which is when the interviews were conducted. The researcher then also observed the team training in an unobtrusive way. Usually, interviews with the coaches were then resumed after training sessions, or were held after interviews with players, in order to clarify some issues or questions that arose or were noticed by the researcher during observation or other interviews.

At the beginning of the interview with players, they were informed about the researcher's personal background and the aim of the study. They were reminded about the anonymity of the research, about the possibility of not commenting on any question that they felt uncomfortable with and about the absence of 'right' or 'wrong' answers. Oral informed consent was taken prior to the interviews. Apart from direct questions to gather basic information about age and nationality, the questions for the interviews included various aspects of team dynamics and team relationships (see Appendix 2, 3 and 4 for further information). The questions were adjusted accordingly for the coaches, immigrated players and local players, for whom the subtlety of wording in some questions required changing, or different questions altogether needed to be asked. All interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder and then transcribed verbatim by the researcher.

5.2.2   Observation

As mentioned above, observation in this research was used during the teams' training in order to become more familiar with players and for them to become familiar with the researcher as well. Observation was always conducted following an initial discussion with the coach; therefore the researcher could always be aware of the team dynamics and any particular issues facing each team in advance. For this study, a non-participatory observation approach was used (Gold, 1958, as cited in Jones et al., 2013, p. 72), meaning the researcher was observing a particular setting but not as an active member of the group being observed.

All notes from the observations were recorded in a field diary and analysed within the same or following day, which helped to keep all documents in order and preserved the initial interpretive meanings that the researcher had intended within the notes. During the observation, the researcher focused on communication between players, their behaviour and communication with each other and the coach. For some players, the researcher's presence was unexpected and therefore caused distraction during the training process, which resulted in 3 (all immigrated) players being reluctant to give their interviews. The analysis of the observation was not a distinctive stage of the research, but rather an integrative process or reflexive activity (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, as cited in Flick, 2014, p. 329), and became an integral part of data collection principally through facilitating the interviews, which remained the primary source of data discussed in the remainder of this report.

5.3. Research management and data processing

For the data analysis, thematic analysis (Boyatzis, 1998) was chosen, which allowed for the categorisation of data from the interviews based on the most common topics that arose. Using the six steps of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006, see subchapter 3.3), all data were transcribed and then read several times in order to generate familiarity with them. Initial codes were then generated, and the main emergent themes between these codes were defined and named, and are presented in the results in Chapter 6. All collected data were triangulated by using interviews transcription and diary notes taken from observations.

In order to meet the criteria for the quality assessment of the thematic analysis, the interpretive analysis was systematic and analytic, and the identification of 'key' themes instead of quantity of themes, depended rather on the quality of how they capture important

aspects that will help to answer the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Therefore, the themes were chosen in order to reveal as much as possible regarding the issues pertaining to interpersonal relations in multicultural sports teams, rather than common, generic topics which were unrelated to this problem (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Schinke et al., 2011).

The researcher's master's thesis (Khomutova, 2009) was used as a pilot study for this research project, as its focus was on comparing team atmospheres within both multicultural and culturally homogenous basketball teams. The knowledge and skills developed by the researcher during this project helped to establish a grounding in the theoretical and methodological areas needed for the completion of this present study, and also provided initial contacts with teams in the Czech Republic via individuals working in team management who were now known to the researcher. One of these pre-selected teams couldn't participate, but provided contact with the head coach of a team in Germany. Another team in Germany was contacted via email correspondence with the press officer. Several basketball teams elsewhere in Central Europe were contacted in the same way via email; however only one team from Latvia agreed to participate on this basis. The press officer of that team subsequently provided contact to another team in this country. As a reward for their participation, coaches were offered a feed-back report regarding the relationships in their team (in anonymous form). The researcher visited each of the teams in their home setting, visiting their training (up to three training sessions for some of the teams, depending on their availability) and interviewed players and coaches in a private environment, both before (coaches) and after (players and coaches) the training. In total, 6 coaches, 17 immigrated players and 18 local players were interviewed for this research, all of which was conducted during 2010-2012.

Because all the interviews were conducted during the basketball season, the teams' schedules were very tight, which didn't leave much space and time for interviewing (see subchapter 5.6 for this and other research limits) – hence the relatively short nature of some of the player interviews in particular. Interviews were conducted in Czech, Russian and English languages, all of which researcher is fluent in.

5.4. Quality indicators in this research

Based on the theoretical overview in subchapter 3.4, the following steps were used in this research project in order to check for accuracy and credibility of the findings. As noted previously, the constructs of 'reliability' and 'validity' are both central aspects to quality indication of any research project, but tend to differ in their technical requirements between quantitative and qualitative projects. Validity in the qualitative research means checking the findings for accuracy by employing certain procedures (outlined above), while qualitative reliability should indicate that the approach of the study remain consistent in different studies with different researchers (Gibbs, 2007). For checking validity in this research, three strategies were used, as suggested by Creswell (2007, 2009), in order to enhance the accuracy of the findings: triangulation; rich, thick description; and clarifying researcher bias.

Data triangulation and methodological triangulation were used in this research in order to add to the validity of the study (Atkinson, 2012; Bryman, 2012). Qualitative methods of observation and semi-structured interviews were used in this research, and data collection was provided in several locations (Czech Republic, Germany and Latvia), from various sources (coaches, local players and immigrated players) in order to corroborate the evidence from various different sources.

Rich, thick description has also been used in analysis of this study in order to convey the findings (see Chapter 6). The research process, settings, and differing perspectives on each of the themes have been described thoroughly in order to make results "more realistic and richer" (Creswell, 2009, p. 192), providing readers with contextual information for better understanding the phenomena being described. The only limitation to the level of this description emerged through the need to sustain an adequate level of anonymity, as explored below.

In addition to these two quality indicators, perhaps the most important strategy is to clarify the potential sources of researcher bias in this study. First of all, the results and interpretation of these findings can be influenced by the researcher's sex – female – because the majority of the participants were males (n=26, female participants n=9). Secondly, the researcher's race and nationality could have been an influential factor as well, as none of the participants were of the same national background as the researcher (Ukrainian), while several participants were Black (researcher was White), and some of the questions were race- and/or nationality-related. Finally, not having relatable experience of professional team sport participation could have impacted on the researcher's ability to understand the experiences of

the players and coaches, and also possibly on the willingness of the participants to disclose information to someone who appeared as a relative 'outsider'. As such, all of the data derived from this study ought to be contextualised as having emerged from within interactions between individuals who often differed with respect to sex, race, national background, and degree of expertise within professional sport.

Disclosing such potential sources of bias is not intended to undermine the quality of the findings, but merely to provide a richer contextual framing of the data. It should be remembered in this respect that the current findings cannot be generalised, as the value of the qualitative research lies primarily in the ability to richly describe the themes developed within particular social contexts (Creswell, 2009).

5.5. Research ethics

Generally speaking, ethical considerations are important to make in the following moments during the course of any research project: when choosing the topic and aim; when gaining access to participants; when conducting the research; and when writing the report and disseminating the data (Jones et al., 2013, p. 9).

The present research was considered as not harmful (to either physical or mental health) to either the participants or the researcher. All participants, all of whom were adults, were recruited after their own consent and were informed about the possibility of withdrawal from the data collection process at any time. Participants were informed about the aims of the study, the data usage in this thesis, and the protection of their anonymity within the research. Due to the elite level of all participants, their names – along with any other identifying information, as mentioned above – remain confidential in order for their interview details not to be harmful for their current or future careers, and in order to prevent any misuse of the data by the media. In this respect, coded references (see the table in Appendix 1) are used in the players/coaches' quotations to protect all participants' identities.

Nevertheless, the nationality of immigrated and local players, along with their age and gender, remain unchanged in the results analysis in order to provide relevant details to contextualise data. The nationalities and age of the coaches remain anonymous, because providing more specific details as to their personal information may enable their identification.

5.6. Research limits

First of all, sport teams overall are very close and dynamic groups. Players and coaches can come and go during the season, which already influences team dynamics in either positive or negative ways. It is very difficult to get into contact with professional elite teams and establish professional relationships with them, as issue that has been previously discussed in the literature (Baillie & Ogilvie, 1996; Elliott, 2012; Elliott & Weedon, 2011; Magee & Sugden, 2002), as they tend to be relatively closed off to all external groups. As outlined above, this inherent limitation to working among professional sports teams influenced the choice of sport, as instead of football teams, which were initially planned before the data collection took place, basketball teams were selected, as these were perceived to be slightly more open to outsiders whilst still having all of the essential attributes for the research – such as a relatively high number of immigrated players.

A second problem, which is related to the first issue of the closed-off nature of professional teams, was the players' and coaches' attitudes. While some of the coaches were very open and sincere, and happy to volunteer as much time and access as the researcher required, one of them was nervous about the prospect that the researcher might find something 'bad' about his team, as team has never used a sport psychologist before and was concerned about the researcher's presence at training. It became apparent that the longer the time period spent with some teams, observing and interviewing players, the more likely the coaches' attitude towards the researcher would improve, with a concurrent effect on the degree of openness in the interviews. Regarding the players, the main issue which occurred within the vast majority of the interviews is that they perceived the purpose of the conservation to be similar to journalism, which the players were reasonably familiar with. Therefore, players were very often answering questions in a polite or very general way, as they were accustomed to when working with media. While the researcher tried to re-assure players that this process differed from journalist interviews, and was clear regarding anonymity and confidentiality, some players nevertheless remained guarded during the questions, refusing answer questions regarding their plans for the future. Also, 5 of the players' interviews were short because they didn't have enough time, given that their days were fully planned around training (as mentioned before, all interviews were held during the basketball season).

Thirdly, as there were several female participants included in this research sample, the difference between working with male and female participants became fairly obvious. As a

female, the researcher had to be constantly aware of her attitude toward male players and coaches, which aimed to strike a balance between being friendly and warm, and also being professional. Personal borders are very important during initial contact, especially in the case of female researcher working with male participants, or vice versa (Roper, 2002; Yambor & Connelly, 1991).

Finally, a further limitation to the research involves the language barrier, which is an inherent problem when working with multicultural samples. Luckily, the researcher was able to communicate with players in their native language in the majority of cases; however there were ten cases when both author and participant had to speak in a second language. While this did not appear during the interviews to be a significant problem in communicating with any of the participants, nevertheless it could have influenced the openness, trust and flow of the conversation.

6. Results and discussion

This chapter presents the results of the thematic analysis of the data collected during this research project. The chapter is divided into several subchapters, based on the major categories established during the coding process, which were reached using the six steps of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006), outlined previously. The organisation of the data within these coded categories represents the answer to the main research question, **"What are the most common challenges that occur in multicultural elite sport teams?"**, which consists of the first two secondary research questions, **"What challenges do immigrated elite athletes encounter in multicultural basketball teams?"** and **"What are the main aspects of coaching multicultural basketball teams?"**. The first subchapter, 6.1, is dedicated to the exploration of immigrated players' experience, although it includes several quotations from interviews with their local – that is, non-immigrant – teammates, in order to provide context and a more complete picture of athletes' relationships within multicultural teams. In this respect, subchapter 6.1 also includes some data taken from interviews with coaches; however, the main aspects of coaches' experience in working with multicultural teams are presented separately within subchapter 6.2. Each of these subchapters, along with the distinctive coded categories within them, includes data in the form of quotations from the participants (see Table 1, Appendix 1, column "Participant" for detailed information on each). Finally, the results of the third secondary research question, **"What**

recommendations can be provided for practising cultural sport psychologists?" are presented in the subchapter 6.3.

6.1. Challenges encountered by immigrated elite athletes in multicultural basketball teams

Based on the analysis of interview data, the following categories (and some subcategories) were established with relevance for the challenges encountered by immigrated elite athletes: **(a) Motivation for migration and expectation of a new country** that immigrated players had before moving abroad, as while some players had been abroad for several years or months and were widely travelled, for other players moving to their current basketball team was the first experience of being away from home; **(b) Challenges outside the sport context**, which included the issue of acculturation and adaptation of the immigrated athletes into the new culture, new social settings, and concurrent new cultural norms; and **(c) Challenges inside the sport context**, which included several important and distinctive sub-categories within the data, including team dynamics, cohesion within multicultural teams, issues with communication and interaction between players, and differences in values among immigrated and local players.

6.1.1. Motivation for migration and expectation of a new country

As was previously described in subchapter 2.3, there are several typologies of sport migrants, including such categories as 'pioneers', 'settlers', 'mercenaries' (or 'hired guns') and 'nomads' (Maguire, 1999) and additionally 'ambitionists', 'exiles' and 'expelled' (Magee & Sugden, 2002). The majority (n=10) of the immigrated players interviewed admitted the main reason for migration was financial. When asked the broad question of "why did you move to another country to play basketball", the following responses were common: "*Probably money. Money, the living situation is important*" (IP10); "*I needed to earn more money abroad before I retire in a few years*" (IP16). These 'type' of sport migration corresponds with the 'mercenaries' or 'hired gun' category of migrants outlined by Maguire (1999); such players are motivated by short-term aims, without any particular attachment to the country they are moving into.

Another reason for immigrated players to migrate to a new country was their desire to be able to play competitive basketball and develop their playing careers, which meant moving for a job abroad to get experience. This was particularly the case for the American players interviewed, who hadn't been able to find a position playing for any teams in the prestigious local National Basketball Association (NBA). According to one, "*I felt like I needed to come here to learn more about the game and get more experience in Europe, just to develop myself as a player and a person, then maybe try it again in NBA*" (IP9); another player agreed: "*In the USA if you don't make it to the NBA, then you go to Europe. I've got a great offer here, so I decided to leave the States*" (IP4). Additionally, some players believed that playing in lower-level European top leagues would at least provide them with attention from media, which would otherwise not be possible playing in America, or other countries, but outside of the NBA or other top-level league. In this respect, some players used their newfound media exposure as a "shop window" (Maguire & Stead, 1998) in order to demonstrate their best qualities and attract interest from a better team. Such aspirations were not uncommon among the sample in this research: "*In the future I would try to play in Italy, because they have a really good competition, I want to play against one of these teams. I wanna the best competition to see how far I can go as a player*" (IP12). Such motivation is assumed to be typical of the 'nomads' category of migrated players, which describes cosmopolitan players, who are motivated by new experiences (Maguire, 1999) or 'ambitionists' category, which describes players who are motivated by pursuing their career in a better (than their current league) level of competition (Magee & Sugden, 2002).

Overall, all of the interviewed immigrated players stated as the main reason for their migration was due to either the possibility of earning more money, or ensuring they had the opportunity to have a full-time playing career. These two motivations were not mutually exclusive, and many players often cited both as being important. Meanwhile, another main reason for migration was the players' desire to test themselves in a better league or against higher level competition, further corresponding with the typical motivations outlined within Maguire's (1999) and Maguire and Stead's (1996, 1998) theoretical typologies of sport labour migration.

Despite the various motivations listed above, local players largely believed that financial gain was the main motivation for immigrant players, especially among Czech players, which can be explained by the lower status of this league in Europe. According to one Czech player: "*You get what you pay for, don't you. More money means better player and better person. But we don't have so much money, so we can't afford the best players, so*

you can imagine their attitude" (LP14). This quote illustrates grounds for possible conflicts within multicultural teams between local and immigrated players, as local players such as LP14 believed that financial motivations could affect the 'attitude' of migrated players, particularly in lower-level competitive clubs.

Immigrant players also regularly stressed the importance of ensuring their families' comfort when moving abroad, because many players take their family with them when relocating. According to one such player, "*First it was the money and then it was a good place for me and my family, me and my wife to go*" (IP11). Or, as another American player explains: "*My family is here with me. I'm not gonna take my family to Bosnia or, you know, the Middle East. But if it's a place that is suitable for my family, for kids, friendly to Americans, than I'd take it to consideration*" (IP10). Mature players with families more often belong to the 'settlers' category of sport migrants (Maguire, 1999), because they do not choose a new country to play in just in order to have a new challenge or experience, or make short-term financial gains, but in order to secure a stable, financially secure base for themselves and their families, who often travel with them.

Typically within this sample, immigrant players reported that they had rarely formed any substantial prior expectations about the country they were going to, simply because they rarely had any knowledge of it apart from very basic facts. For example, one player mentioned that: "*The only thing I knew about Czech Republic is that it used to be Czechoslovakia*" (IP15). Some of the players based their expectations on their friends' shared experiences, such as one who "*…knew a player that played here before, but that's it*" (IP9), but most often they admitted to knowing nothing at all: "*I didn't know anything about the country before, I even didn't know where it was on a map! But that was the best place, financially, to be in*" (IP5). Again, the financial motivation was often strong for immigrated players, such that they would accept financially lucrative offers to play in teams from countries they have never heard of before, hoping the living conditions there would be on a reasonably high level. It is important to mention that this attitude was registered mainly among younger players (age range 18-20), for whom relocation to their new teams was their first experience of international travel. More mature players (age 23 and above), many of whom had played basketball in foreign countries for several seasons, reported being more careful in choosing their next country – such as players IP10 and IP11, as stated above, owing to a better understanding of what to expect as a migrant athlete. Although financial reasons in their cases were also important.

The only one thing that all immigrated players were expecting from being in a new country did not concern psychological or interpersonal issues, but better results and overall success of the new team they were moving to play for. For instance: "*I always expect to win a championship. You don't play just to play, to play to win. So for me is always to win a championship, to work hard. So it's always the same expectations for me*" (IP5). Other players agreed, noting that: "*Success of the team was essential. I wouldn't want to play for a team with no ambitions*" (IP1), or: "*It's important to find a successful group that will help me develop, get better. Winning is very important. In my previous teams we never won* [laughs]" (IP9). Success was the most important and anticipated factor in relocation. Athletes such as those interviewed in this project are competitive and want to be successful in their teams; in fact, several of these players mentioned the likely success of their potential new team as an essential criterion when planning a relocation.

Based on this sample, the immigrated players can be divided into 4 main categories: 'mercenaries' (Maguire, 1999), who do not have any attachment to the country they are moving to and are usually motivated by short-term financial gain; 'nomads' (Maguire, 1999), which includes players who were motivated to immigrate by the chance of getting new experience in a new country; 'settlers' (Maguire, 1999), who migrate to a new country to secure a stable, financially strong base for themselves and their families, who often travel with them and 'ambitionists' (Magee & Sugden, 2002), who try to migrate to enhance their career or play in higher level competitions. The majority of immigrated players did not have any expectations of the country they were going to, and some of them did not even know the location of the new country; however, mature and experienced immigrant players with families mentioned the importance of comfortable conditions for them and for their families after the relocation, while all were motivated by the prospect of joining competitive, successful teams.

6.1.2. Challenges outside the sport context

Apart from facing difficulties specifically occurring within their participation in elite, competitive basketball, which are outlined in the later subchapters, immigrated players are faced with many of the everyday problems experienced by all migrants, surrounding broad issues of acculturation and social adaptation within their new countries (Schinke & McGannon, 2013; Schinke et al., 2011). As outlined in Chapter 2, immigrated athletes can

experience many challenges during the adjustment process, including loneliness, homesickness, adjustment to a new team, new culture and language, adapting to a new coaching style, loss of previous social ties, and many others (Schinke et al., 2011).

Within this sample, it was found that immigrated athletes had to change their place of residence often; this could be at the close of a season, if a player decides to leave their team after his or her contract expires: "*I left* [previous team] *because the contract expired and I didn't really want to stay any longer. I needed a new challenge, new experience*" (IP13) – an experience which is not uncommon for 'mercenary' players motivated by short-term gains, or 'nomad' players eager for fresh challenges. This could also happen when a player spends the playing season, or part of a season, with their team before heading back to their homeland to spend some time with their family: "*I go home after the season, so I can be with my family for 3-4 months a year. Then I have to come back* [to the team] *and be away from them for the rest of the year*" (IP1).

Connected to the dislocating effects of this transitory lifestyle, the most common challenge in being abroad for all immigrated players, and particularly those who had left family when moving, was loneliness. According to one player: "*I have never been away from my family for that long. Sometimes I feel quite lonely here*" (IP3). Another player agrees: "*I guess the biggest problem being a foreigner is being lonely. You feel like you're by yourself, but obviously it changes with time. Everyone tries to be nice and supportive. It's just hard being away from home 8 months of the year, out of your comfort zone*" (IP1). This corresponds with the findings of several previous studies (Kontos & Arguello, 2005; Schinke, Gauthier et al., 2007; Schinke et al., 2011), which have largely confirmed the finding that immigrated athletes in various sports, and at various levels of participation, express feelings of loneliness and separation from their family or friends upon moving abroad.

Schinke and colleagues (2011) argue that the feeling of loneliness prevails shortly after athletes' immediate relocation, especially after around six to eight weeks, when the initial excitement of the relocation experience diminishes. However, findings from this study show that some of the immigrated athletes can face difficulties being abroad immediately after they arrive. For instance: "*Foreigners should get ready mentally before they go abroad. Like I said, first one or two months it's very difficult. They should be ready for some challenges*" (IP8); other players add: "*First few weeks, maybe even months were very hard. I didn't know anyone, didn't know where to go, what to do, no one to talk to. It got better after some time, but the beginning was very hard*" (IP16), and: "*When I came my first week was horrible. Everybody would talk and laugh about something, and I was afraid they were*

laughing about me, maybe my hair looks terrible, or whatever" (IP7). Therefore, it is important for coaches, sport psychology practitioners, and other team staff working with immigrated athletes to be aware that the feeling of loneliness, sadness or overall discomfort within new cultural environments can occur right after the player's relocation. It does, however, remain important to recognise that not all players experience this in the same way, as evidenced by the different findings of previous studies (e.g. Schinke et al., 2011).

Another challenge for immigrated players can be the unfamiliarity of the new community they find themselves in. This includes adjusting to a new, locally specific diet, or a lack of basic knowledge in terms of shopping or other everyday logistics (Schinke, Gauthier et al., 2007; Schinke et al., 2011). Immigrated players in this sample confirmed that local food can be problematic in a new country: "*Food is definitely an issue here. You gotta find out certain places serving the things you eat, how to cook, how to even buy what you like in a grocery store. A lot of times I buy something and I think I know what it is, but it's not* "(IP4). General orientation and related logistical issues also proved to be difficult for some players within their new country: "*When I needed to get to the hospital it was hard, firstly I don't speak German. Then they don't have a specific sign, like in America, a big cross. Here I was like I don't know whether I should turn in here or what*" (IP9). Immigrated players living in new social and cultural environments can therefore face difficulties in finding their way around in ways which may seem very obvious for locals, and the fact that they rarely speak the local language proves to be additionally unhelpful in this respect.

As a further complication, the attitude from local people in their new communities can be very different and unexpected for immigrated players, and especially so for Black American players, who often reported being treated differently because of their race. As one such player related: "*Sometimes you feel like you make other people uncomfortable. Just because you're different. I'm Black, they're White*" (IP11), while another told how they were often treated with disrespect: "*In Turkey my team was amazing, but people on the street… they were rude sometimes, stared at me all the time, could say something rude*" (IP2). As another player states, difficulties arising from racial difference can differ from country to country: "*Some countries are more friendly to people of colour then others, you know.* [Which countries didn't you feel comfortable in?] *Here, Germany. Definitely Russia. I didn't play for a Russian team, but I played in Russia. France, but not so much in France. I guess just Germany and Eastern Europe*" (IP10). While several Black players reported having experienced some form of unease, if not openly negative reception on the grounds of their race, not all of the Black players' experiences had been similarly negative, for example:

"*People are very different here, they are more laid back, casual. But definitely good different*" (IP5). The local people's perception of immigrated players is, therefore, reportedly different from one country to another. It is worth noting, however, that while White players are not visibly different from the local population in the host countries of the teams examined in this study, Black players might face more difficulties after their relocation due to culturally-specific forms of racial prejudice.

While the particular experience of Black immigrated athletes has not yet been researched a great deal, studies on Black players or students who try to adapt in new environments within predominantly White institutions, like colleges (e.g. Davis & Bauman, 2008) suggest that Black (and other minority) students can still experience racial discriminations in particular majority-White locations, which can prevent them from integrating within their new environments (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996). Also, the lower representation of the Black community within such new environments can negatively affect Black students' studies and lower their comfort level (Woldoff, Wiggins, & Washington, 2011). Based on these studies, it can be suggested that White players might have easier adjustment and integration into a new culture within predominantly White populations, as is common throughout Central European countries. Conversely, Black players can face racial discrimination in these societies and racial stereotyping from the local population, as well as sometimes from their coaches, which is analysed in subchapter 6.2.2., below.

Regardless of their race, all immigrated players reported finding themselves in awkward situations when they first started to live abroad, as they initially found difficulty in behaving in culturally-appropriate ways within their new settings. One player told how: "*At first I came here and I was waving at the people on the street, asking them how are they doing, but they don't do it here* [laughs]. *They just looked at me and keep walking*" (IP13). According to another player: "*Well, you know, in the 'States everyone is like "Hey, how you doing", smiling… Germans are nice, but they won't smile at you. They are nice in their own way, you gotta get used to it. You know, my wife, she fell on her bicycle, and everyone just stared at her. And in the 'States people would just come and help her*" (IP11). Another noted that: "*The biggest difference with America here, is that in America you can be friendly with everyone, with people you don't know, just if you meet somebody on the street. But here, a lot of time people are just… closed*" (IP12). Such experiences mentioned by American players provide a clear example of cultural differences in communication. While in American culture it is common to smile a lot, even at strangers in the street, this can be interpreted as abnormal

in their new host countries, carrying different connotations which are not directly apparent to the migrated Americans (Hall & Hall, 1990).

Overall, challenges for immigrated athletes outside of the sporting context are connected to broader acculturation processes as they adapt to a new society and culture. This includes feeling of loneliness, which were mentioned by the vast majority of players, and included those players who also travelled with their families who nevertheless faced difficulties in losing their social networks. This acculturation process also involved facing difficulties in everyday life, such as in finding appropriate food that they are used to, or in locating important public facilities around their local areas. Finally, immigrated players can also face difficult reactions from their new local community, which can be particularly negative towards Black players, but nevertheless involves awkwardness and cultural maladjustment among all players when initially relocating.

6.1.3. Challenges inside the sport context

Challenges for immigrated players within the context of sport are also connected to the broader acculturation process. Here, athletes' acculturation can be very stressful and challenging, not only for the immigrated athletes themselves, but also for their teammates (local players) and coaches (Schinke & McGannon, 2013), and can therefore influence team dynamics, communication and cohesion. Therefore, this subchapter represents data which is of crucial significance to the main research question of this thesis: **What are the most common challenges that occur in multicultural elite sport teams?** During the thematic analysis, several categories have been coded as representing challenges for players (both immigrated and local) and also for coaches, which are: adaptation in a new team; communication and interaction in the team; and team cohesion.

6.1.3.1. Adaptation in a new team

According to Fiske (2009), adaptation can be seen as a physical and/or psychological response to unfamiliar stressors, which requires active effort in order to return to a state of balance. Adaptation in a new team involves, first of all, a psychological response to a new (stressful) situation for an athlete, and therefore can be particularly difficult for immigrated players: "*This is the hardest thing, to get to a new country. I've played in Greece, Spain,*

Slovakia before, now I'm in Latvia. It's very important to understand a new culture, to know your teammates. Everywhere I go I try to learn a little bit of a language. I don't want to be just in practice. There's a life in that country. My family visits me sometimes, so I wanna show them the country" (IP1). The adaptation within a new team can be difficult not only for the players who have this experience for the first time, but also for more experienced players. Every country and every team has a unique culture and group dynamic, therefore even changing one team for another within the same country can bring new challenges: *"This is my second team here* [in Latvia]. *And it's very different from my previous one"* (IP4).

Fiske's (2009) definition of adaptation particularly mentions 'active effort' that is required in order to restore a sense of equilibrium when adapting to new stressors. However, some of the immigrated players, particularly Americans, feel that in order to fit into a new team, they do not have to put in a lot of effort. Statements such as the following were common among this group within the sample: "*But I mean people are people, you go out there and if you are a nice person, people will be nice to you*" (IP9). Meanwhile, local players were often keen to point out that they expected foreign newcomers to make an effort in order to adapt to the team and be a part of it, and to show interest towards the country they play in: "*I would like them* [immigrant players] *to be interested in the country they're playing in. Usually, that's not always the case*" (LP6). Despite hoping for better, several of the local players revealed that they had little expectation that their immigrated teammates would actually make such efforts: "*I don't expect much from foreign players, they just have to come here to help us win the games. It'd be nice if they would learn some language or if they knew something about where they are actually going, but I guess it depends on how important it is for them to stay in the team for longer*" (LP3). It can be assumed that in order to stay in the team longer and be accepted as a part of the team, immigrated players are expected to learn the locals' language to at least a basic level, and be interested in the culture and history of the country (s)he plays in. But given that several local players were openly sceptical of the likeliness of this happening suggests a potential source of conflict within such teams, and is reminiscent of local players' criticism of the 'mercenary' tendencies of migrant players mentioned above.

Further to this point, several of the interviewed immigrated players pointed out that on occasion, they had been made to feel uncomfortable in their new team after relocating, because they were foreigners. According to one immigrated player: *"I don't like players that are… that hate foreign players, just because we are foreigners. They say we don't belong here. I experienced that in Greece last year. You are trying to be a part of the team, but*

sometimes it's just too difficult to shows your teammates that you're a good person, that you want to give your best for the team" (IP8). As such, some of the immigrated athletes can face rejection from the locals, and when an athlete faces with such negative attitude, (s)he does not feel like (s)he belongs to the new team, which is a crucial factor for facilitating their adaptation (Fiske, 2009).

Interestingly, a few of the immigrated players, once again particularly Americans, stated that they felt a clear pressure from the team management on them (as new players) to perform at their best level and to adapt very quickly: *"There's a lot of pressure to perform well. All the time. You get used to it, but for some people I can see how it may be a problem. ...They* [management] *say they care about you, and they will do things for you, but they don't give a shit about you. If you don't play well, you're gone. It doesn't matter how hard you work, it doesn't matter. All that matters is that you do what they brought you here to do. That's kind of a negative sometimes, it's a cold business"* (IP10). The pressure in this case is put on immigrated players to adapt to performing successfully within their new team very quickly, without any kind of mentioned support from the management or coaching staff (Schinke et al., 2013). Another player confirms the pressure he felt from the management staff: *"They* [management] *usually put high pressure on Americans, they want you to be the best, be on your best level all the time. So they kinda treat you with different standards than the other players. They expect more from us, of course"* (IP4). Placing such pressure on immigrated players to perform well has been described in the literature (Maguire & Stead, 1998), especially with the increasing influence of sports media corporations, which need to attract bigger audiences to sell their product, and so require consistently high-level performance from immigrated athletes.

The process of adapting within a new team, which is one of the most common challenges for immigrated athletes, requires active effort from relocated athletes in order to fit in to their new team: *"I try to learn a language, I try to pick up as much as I can while I'm here. I've learnt a little bit of language from every country I've been to"* (IP10). However, some of the immigrated athletes may not feel the importance of actively doing their best to be a part of a group; for instance, they would not learn the local language (or at least basic expressions), although had they done so, such efforts would have received a positive response from their local teammates, who generally remained somewhat cold towards immigrant players. Adaptation in a new team can also be challenging for immigrated players because of the pressure from team management, who reportedly do not give them a lot of time for

adjusting to their new environments and require high performance and successful competitive results almost immediately after the athletes' initial relocation.

6.1.3.2.   Communication and interaction in the team

One of the central themes to emerge out of the data was concerned with communication and interaction in the team, which is recognised as being essential for team dynamics (LaVoi, 2007; Yukelson, 2010). It can be very difficult to make a team work effectively when players do not understand each other or their coach. In multicultural teams, there was reportedly a tendency to adapt to the international nature of their players, adopting English as their main language for communication. As one coach put it: "…*when we have American players we just speak English all the time, because I didn't want us to lose time by translating everything to her and to be quick and sharp, so we try to speak English all the time, because all the players understand English, and she understands it of course… so we said let's speak English*" (CO4). This pragmatic approach can actually be beneficial for the immigrated players and help them to adapt to the team more quickly, because they can use their native language in this sporting context.

Another coach confirms this pragmatic approach to language, stressing situational flexibility to best use the expertise available and suit the needs of the players involved: "*Everyone understands English, but if somebody needs it, I can explain in Russian, or our second coach is Latvian, so he can explain something separately to Latvian players. But the most important thing is not the language but understanding. English is just more comfortable to use. I don't think Americans would have learnt Latvian language; they would've just lost a lot of time. My aim is to make everyone to communicate. I don't say: we all should speak Latvian, or Russian. We communicate in the way that is most comfortable for everyone, so every player can be involved*" (CO1). Yet again, the attitude to the multilingual communication from the coach does not imply that foreign players' acculturation necessarily requires their learning the local language, as long as it comfortable for everyone in the team.

In many such teams, the English language is recognised as an international and widely-used language, of which many people know at least the basics, and therefore English-speaking players might not feel the urge to learn a local language, or not feel the fear that they won't be understood by their teammates. Some coaches prefer to have training sessions

in English, although they don't know the language very well themselves: "*I speak Latvian, Russian, I used to learn German at school, and I'm learning English. If I need to say something to the players very quickly, then players translate it to each other, or our second coach helps us, he's younger and knows the languages*" (CO2).

Athlete-athlete communication, according to Harris and Harris (1984, as cited in Yukelson, 2010, p. 154), is an important determinant of team success, and miscommunication is one of the primary causes of team conflicts and tension between players. And, contrary to the examples of efficient pragmatism outlined above, in the multicultural teams studied in this research project, language barriers could in fact be one of the main points of misunderstanding between players. Particularly, for some of the interviewed local players, speaking in a foreign language (most often, English) was perceived as unfair and could generate feelings of discontent around the presence of immigrated players on their teams. Here, the pragmatic approach towards using English, through a desire for quick and efficient training within a broader 'win-at-all-cost' approach, can be harmful for the team. This is principally because speaking English becomes perceived as primarily beneficial for the immigrated players and generally frustrates the local players, who then resent immigrated players for forcing a difficult and uncomfortable change in their training culture, which indirectly harms their relationships. According to one local player: "*All of us, we have to speak English. They* [immigrant players] *don't have any interest in learning our language, even the basics*" (LP15). Another local player agrees: "*What really irritates me is that they* [immigrated players] *have no interest in learning the language. They don't even try! Imagine, even if there's only one American player in our team, we all would have to communicate in English during the training. Even if we don't know the language that well. It definitely doesn't have good impact on our team*" (LP17).

Such statements align well with the accounts of a few of the immigrated players, who reported not feeling the need to learn the language of the country of their teams: "*I speak very little Czech. But it doesn't matter, most of them speak briefly in English, so there's no point for me to learn the language*" (IP14). This attitude can be very disturbing for local players, which can feel intimidated or uncomfortable as a result: "*We had one player last year, who has played in Germany for many, many years, yet doesn't speak the language at all, is not interested in speaking it. And he would come to practice, go home and not ever go out, not ever socialize with anybody. And sometimes he would blame his problems on the people around here, you know, the Germans or whatever*" (LP6). Therefore, local players generally expect their immigrated teammates to socialize, and to adapt to the team norms by

learning a language as a matter of priority. The majority of the interviewed local payers, especially from the Czech teams, perceived it as obligatory for immigrated players to learn the language and put an effort into adaptation; however, they did not mention any obligations from their side in order to possibly help new players to adapt, placing all responsibility for acculturation on the immigrated athletes (Schinke & McGannon, 2013).

Nevertheless, the majority of interviewed immigrated players were trying to make an effort to learn at least the basic phrases of the local languages. One player stated that: **"*I don't have language problem, I'm learning Latvian pretty fast… I communicate with everyone. And with the coach, he speaks English*"** (IP3). Another player claimed: "*Yeah, I try to learn a language, I try to pick up as much as I can while I'm here. I've learnt a little bit of language from every country I've been to*" (IP10). Meanwhile, some other immigrated players take language learning more seriously and use personal teachers to learn, which they perceive as a positive new challenge associated with their migrant status: "*I'm learning Czech. I can order something to eat in café, they don't speak English, so I have to use my Czech. I have a teacher and I like it, but it's a very difficult language because of the changing of subjects and declension, it's hard to learn. But I like learning it, because it's difficult and it gives me something to look forward to, to learn something new. I like learning*" (IP12). Apart from 'active effort' (Fiske, 2009), which is essential for adaptation as outlined above, players also indirectly mention self-enhancement by learning a new language, which includes hard work and the ongoing learning of new things. This is perceived as an integral part of their status as professional, migrant athletes (Schinke, Gauthier et al., 2007).

Even if the language learning proves to be a difficult process, some of the players try to be friendly and communicative despite their lack of language knowledge: "*I talk to everyone. I gotta be cool, it makes the job easier… If you'll be nice to people and try to speak German, they will try to speak English back to you, they'll try to communicate back to you too. It's about getting comfortable and taking your time*" (IP9). Another international player adds: "*English is an international language, so we can communicate to each other. But I'm trying to learn some German, I try to focus on what they are saying between each other. But it's a normal thing. Whenever you play, you try to learn some language from local players. Local players here try to explain us some things from German history. And we try to meet each other more often, our families to meet, our kids to play together*" (IP8). Such examples, which were not, apparently, the norm among the sample, provide a clear example of shared communication learning (Schinke et al., 2013), which involves overcoming language barriers in the form of active, collaborative work from immigrated athletes, local players, and coaches

in order to improve team communication. This approach is considered to be the most useful for the immigrated players and the team, because in this case both immigrated and local athletes can share their cultural practices and therefore the burden of acculturation is shared by all the members of the team. However, the most common acculturation strategies noted in the research sample positioned acculturation as the immigrant athlete's responsibility, when coaches and local teammates expect athletes to acculturate and learn new languages, cultural practices, and so on, by themselves, with only limited reciprocity.

Although some of the immigrant players in this sample were not very keen on learning new languages, and several of the local players were uncomfortable with their coaches' preferred methods of communication with their immigrated teammates, this research sample had no mention of any failure in improving communication when both sides mutually engaged in shared learning processes. In this respect, the potential for local players to feel alienated by or hostile towards immigrated players could be relatively easily overcome; in this respect, it seemed that any form of effort to communicate or learn about the local players' country was perceived positively: "*When somebody from American asking me about Germany, even if it's about the war, that's fine, at least they're showing that they're interested in*" (LP11). These efforts are essential for building a mutual trust and respect among athletes who can then better function as teammates (Schinke et al., 2013).

In addition to communication among athletes, individual athletes' communication with their coach is an essential factor in studying team communication. According to Harris and Harris (1984, as cited in Yukelson, 2010, p. 154), success of the group cooperation depends on the ability of a leader to share his or her vision of a successful team. Therefore it is important for the coach to be able to transfer his/her vision to the team, without losing context through language barriers. In case the coach doesn't speak the language of the players, it can be solved through collaboration with the players: "*Our coach doesn't speak English, he knows a few words, but he doesn't speak. So a few of our girls translate him*" (LP4); or, as another player states, through the most basic functional vocabulary required to understand the sport of basketball: "*Our coach doesn't speak English, but basketball talking is quite understandable. If we don't understand, we just ask him. But that's alright. In Greece they spoke Greek, in Slovakia – Slovakian. You just catch up and move on*" (IP1).

Efforts on the part of players to translate, or the whole team doing their best to understand a coach speaking in broken English, can both be assumed to slow down or frustrate communication. However, several players noted that English remained a useful choice, given both its centrality to basketball terminology and the shorter sentence and word

structure inherent to the English language: "*...you communicate quicker when it's your mother tongue, of course. The communication is faster, but it doesn't necessarily mean it's more accurate. ...In basketball, most of the things you say are in English. ...if you say "help" or "help side", or something, everyone knows what that means and what it looks like. So… since English is also a faster language, because it doesn't use as much words as German, we also, like almost in every team I played in we used a lot of English because it's just a quicker way of communication, whether there were German players or international players*" (LP12). In this respect, some of the local players do not perceive communication in the English language as a barrier, but rather stress the opposite, noting the benefits of speaking English even if there are no foreign players around.

The universality of the English language, and transcendental 'basketball' language overall, was mentioned by several players (both immigrated and local) and by many of the coaches. Therefore, it seems that professional basketball players should not have issues in understanding the coach's instructions, regardless of how poorly they might be communicated: "*In basketball we speak the same, professional language. It's like in sex; it doesn't matter whether you are Russian or American. We have our own language, standard situations. It's like in chess, where the first 7 moves are standard, doesn't matter who's playing. The same in basketball – if you don't do the first few moves right, you'll lose. So this is our common language*" (CO1).

Overall, the choice of a team language is a very important aspect of team communication (both between athletes, and between athletes and coaches). This sample showed a notable difference between countries regarding the question of whether immigrated players were expected by local players and coaches to have to learn the local language of their current team. While Latvian and German teams did not focus much on encouraging immigrated players to learn their local languages, for Czech teams this was a very important issue. First of all, this can be explained by the amount of foreign players in these teams, as the Czech basketball league doesn't attract as many foreigners as Germany and Latvia, and therefore local players simply do not have much experience in playing and communicating with immigrated players. Therefore, they do not have much language practice themselves, and nor are they likely to be as familiar with the relative necessity and merit of encouraging acculturating migrant players to learn a new language while adjusting to all other aspects of relocation, within a "win-at-all-costs" environment. Secondly, a lot of Czech players do not have experience of playing abroad themselves and therefore, again, lack knowledge about the difficulty of learning new languages. Thirdly, a lot of immigrated players in Czech teams

perceive their teams as a step to a more prestigious job elsewhere, because the Czech basketball league is not perceived to be among the top European leagues. As such, many migrant players within it do not expect to remain in their teams for more than one season, correspondingly having little intention of learning any local language or making any active effort in order to adapt to a new team in such a way. These immigrated players are considered to be 'mercenaries', who are motivated by financial gains and short-term goals (Maguire, 1999), or 'ambitionists' (Magee & Sugden, 2002), who try to migrate to enhance their career or play in higher level competitions.

6.1.3.3.   Team cohesion

In order to analyse the team cohesion within the sampled multicultural teams, the classic conceptual model for cohesion in sport teams proposed by Carron and colleagues (1985) was used. This model divides between task and social dimensions of cohesiveness, and also between individual and group orientations among team members. In order to answer the main and secondary research questions, the social dimension of cohesiveness is foregrounded as the main focus of the discussion within this subsection, and includes players' perceptions about inter-group similarity, closeness and bonding with particular respect to social aspects of group membership, and also players' perceptions about personal involvement and acceptance as team members. However, when accounting for social cohesiveness it is not possible to exclude the task dimensions of cohesiveness, which include players' perceptions about similarity, closeness and bonding within the whole group regarding group tasks, and players' perception about their personal involvement with group tasks, goals and objectives. Therefore, each of these dimensions is considered in the analysis, despite the main focus remaining on social cohesion. Another model that is part of the analysis of this chapter is Schinke & McGannon's (2013) model of acculturation, which describes the influences on team cohesion based on which strategy of acculturation a team has chosen to follow when immigrated athletes become members. These can include acculturation as the athlete's responsibility (immigrated athlete is expected to acculturate and fit in to the new cultural context without any help from teammates or coach); limited reciprocity (teammates and coach support immigrated athlete in his (her) attempts to acculturate); or immersed reciprocity (mutual sharing and learning from immigrated athlete

and his (her) teammates and coach). These strategies are described in more detail in subchapter 2.5.3.

One of the most common phenomena occurring in multicultural teams which has relevance for the issue of team social and task cohesion concerned the formation of **ethnic subgroups**, which were usually formed of the same nationality of players. For many immigrated players, socialising with others from similar cultural/national backgrounds was an important and largely positive experience. According to one player: "*We have that* [subgroups]*, I feel very close to some of the American players. Some days I'd express more to them, than I would say to a German player, just because I know me and him we are more cool, chill in pub more than other guys*" (IP9). Immigrated athletes often seek for connections with immigrant teammates, exchanging experience and looking for social support. Such supporting relationships with 'familiar' others can be especially appreciated and needed during the first days or weeks after an athlete's relocation; as the same player explains: "*The younger guy in the team, he helps me around a lot, with getting a phone, or talking to people when I first came here, told me all the words, made it easier for me*" (IP9). By forming a subgroup, especially with players from similar cultural or ethnic backgrounds, players also fulfil their need of 'belonging' (Fiske, 2009) to a new environment, fitting in the new team and getting social support, which is highly important for immigrated athletes, especially during the first few months after their relocation.

Among the other reasons for forming subgroups is the ability to speak in a common language, which is otherwise often difficult for immigrated athletes. According to one: "*I'm going to dinner with* [American teammate]*, I'm going to lunch with Dennis… Unfortunately, the only people I do speak to are people who speak English. I do say "hi", "bye" and "how are you" to some Czech people when I go to the lunch and stuff like that, but I don't have a conversation with them*" (IP15). Another immigrated player states: "*Sometimes you may feel like the Germans stay together or the Americans, just a little bit. But not this year. In past teams before, I've seen that before. I've seen that, like guys from the same countries stay together more than other guys, but not this team, no. …he* [coach] *tried to solve it a little bit. But we were winning, so it didn't become a problem. On the court we were together and off the court the guys… were separate*" (IP11). This example illustrates that even when task cohesion in teams with ethnic subgroups is high, social cohesion can still be very low. The formation of subgroups is particularly evident among Black American players, and is suggestive of the need to feel a form of collective identity among this group who, as

previously outlined, often feel doubly isolated in cultural settings where locals treat Black players differently to Whites.

Apart from such motives as 'belonging' (Fiske, 2009), the need for trust can play an essential role here. Based on previous studies (Lawrence, 2005; Orbe, 1994), it was suggested that Black Americans prefer to communicate with other people from the same racial background, expecting better understanding from other Black Americans, while also possibly lacking experience in communication with Whites, and so prefer to keep a safe distance from them. The particular impact of Black American players with multicultural basketball teams is returned to within the analysis of coaches' points of view in subchapter 6.2.3, below.

Interestingly, while the majority of subgroups among immigrated players tend to be based on nationality, this is not always the case. Although rare, exclusive cliques within teams could form among players of diverse national backgrounds. As one of the players stated: "[last year] *It was so many groups! It wasn't even like Americans and others, no. It was a mixture. It was everywhere and it was bad. Certain groups wouldn't talk to certain groups... So it was very interesting*" (IP9). What is clear is that even though subgroups could be formed based on a variety of interpersonal similarities (and not always on the basis of nationality), and enhance feelings of social cohesion between the members of particular subgroups, they were always described as having had a negative impact on wider team social cohesion, leaving some players, regardless of their nationality or cultural background, feeling somewhat isolated.

For instance, for some local players, the formation of subgroups that immigrated players make can be a struggle and can be perceived quite negatively. According to one player: "*They* [American teammates] *were together all the time, during the training and after, in their free time. It didn't seem as a problem first, but then they just started to exclude us* [local players]" (LP13). While some other local players try to excuse or understand the formation of these subgroups, this can still leave a significantly negative impression, including feelings of deliberate isolation: "*I can understand that they* [immigrated players] *want to talk in their language, and be together often, but sometimes I think… I feel like they don't want us, the locals, to be a part of their 'team'*" (LP2). Such subgroups can therefore lead local players to feel as though they themselves are being excluded from their team, not being treated like an equal person, and therefore decrease social team cohesion. The exclusion of local teammates by immigrated athletes can be explained in two ways – firstly, according to Schinke & McGannon (2013), immigrated athletes can be opting out of social connections, rejecting cultural practices otherwise normal to the team, remaining silent, and

avoiding interaction outside or inside practice, because they do not feel support from the rest of the team during their acculturation process (particularly when acculturation is seen as the immigrated athlete's responsibility, as discussed above). However, the data gathered here suggest that some of the immigrated players perceive their current team as a temporal job before they transfer to a 'better' team elsewhere, and so limit all of their social interaction in the team in order to concentrate on playing at their best level, believing social cohesion to be less relevant to their individual, professional goals: "*Careers in sport don't last too long. I have to work at my best to reach the best possible level, which is quite hard to do in this league, let's face it there are much higher leagues in Europe. I'm here to work, to help my team win, I didn't come here to make friends*" (IP17). This example illustrates individual attraction to the group in terms of a group's task, which in this case explicitly aims to make the team successful, in order to be perceived as a successful and valuable player.

Some of the local players agree that it must be difficult for immigrated players to be a part of the group and to communicate with the rest of the team, and therefore they try to make this process easier for new players, sharing the burden of the acculturation process. Overtly recognising the usefulness of socialising in order to build a sense of belonging and reduce newly arrived teammates' sense of loneliness (as discussed above), one player told how: "*It can be difficult for the foreigners, so when we have new players, we always try to have a party the first week they are here, so they can communicate and socialise outside of basketball*" (LP4). Another player adds: "*When we have free time we like going to movies, or I like having parties at my place, so everybody can come and hang out. We need to have it, because it's important for everyone to feel good, so we need this communication. We need to know them, they need to know us, so we can just get better together*" (LP2). Without having any theoretical knowledge, these local players were using the concept of 'immersed reciprocity' (Schinke & McGannon, 2013), which includes shared responsibilities in acculturation via mutual learning and sharing, as an acculturation strategy, in order to help their immigrated teammates to adapt in the new team and new cultural environment. This approach, more so than the other two ('acculturation as the athlete's responsibility' and 'limited reciprocity'), requires social integration between migrant and local players; additionally, the majority of immigrated athletes hope for this approach from their teammates (Campbell & Sonn, 2009), and the mutually positive experiences arising from it can lead to the shared learning of cultural norms and a constructive dialogue between players from different cultures: "*It was good that* [local] *guys and our coach talked to me very often, asked*

me about how it worked back home, so I could tell them more about me, about what I'm used to in-game" (IP3).

Despite the emergence of ethnic subgroups during training, not every athlete within the sample wanted to spend time together after the training hours. This wasn't always taken to mean that they don't like their teammates, but rather that they were keen to have their own life outside of basketball. Describing socialising with their teammates, one player told how: "*It happens, but rarely, because we spend so much time together already. That it's sometimes harder or sometimes… to get together afterwards because everyone wants to get together with their own family. But it does happen*" (LP5). Another player agrees: "*A lot of times I just can't wait to get home, because we practice together all the time, so I just can't wait to be alone. Sometimes we go out together to eat something, but a lot of times I just want to go back and be with myself, just because I'm around them all the time*" (IP9). Therefore, spending free time outside of practice together is not always necessarily an indicator of a 'good', united team with great social cohesion. Players want to have their privacy and free time outside of the basketball context. Coaches also agree that: "*…sometimes it's important also, that they get away from one another, you know? When they see each other for four or five hours, it's a stressful situation*" (CO3).

Developing this point further, some players do not think that it is useful to spend time together off court, particularly if they didn't like a particular person on their team: "*I suppose if you like someone, you'll just like him more. If you hate someone, you'll just hate him more*" (LP7). However, a few other players disagree: "*I think it helps* [to improve the relationship]. *Once in a while if you do something together off the court, even if you don't like somebody, you don't have to have one on one meeting with him. But if you do it as a whole group it helps I think*" (LP6). Another player adds: "*It helps with the bad times. If you're one on one off court during the bad times it can help go through the bad times faster. Like if something bad happens, and you're not together, that bad can become worse. But if you're together you fight through the bad times. You take a good care of it and you keep going*" (IP11). At the time of writing this thesis, the author could not find any study related specifically to the correlation between spending free time together as a team, and improvements in task or social cohesion (among any sport teams); therefore, a study answering this question would be helpful in order to find or deny the connection between these two factors, as the data gathered here remains somewhat inconclusive.

Another common issue in the multicultural teams emerged surrounding differences in values between **individual and collectivistic approaches**. These constructs were previously

employed by Greenfield and colleagues (2002), in their study of the conflicts in multicultural teams between players from countries which can broadly be described as having either individualistic or collectivistic cultural backgrounds. In culturally diverse teams with the presence of players from both individualistic and collectivistic cultural backgrounds, conflicts occur when behaviour that is valued and promoted in one culture is negatively perceived in another culture. For example, North American cultures are considered to be more individualistic, promoting self-esteem and individual achievement over group achievements. First of all, it was observed that such an attitude can impact upon the game strategies and playing style of the American players within this research sample: "*At home is more like one on one game, more individual. You have a lot of good teams, but mainly it's because you have a lot of good players, a lot of great individual players. Here you have a few really good players, but really good teams, so it's more like a team game here… it's hard to adjust to giving the ball a lot and expect to have back. At home you might give a lot, but you'll never get it back. You gotta figure out how to play, how to take an advantage of it*" (IP12). Some of the American players realised the difference between these culturally-specific playing approaches, acknowledging that the American game style is rather individualistic, while European teams in this sample prefer to concentrate on collective performance and collective goals, although these teams were not from countries noted for having strongly collectivistic orientations (Asghar, Wang, Linde, & Alfermann, 2013; Kolman, Noorderhaven, Hofstede, & Dienes, 2003).

When a player reaches the realisation that their attitude is different from the culture that (s)he currently plays in, this has a positive impact on the team dynamic and social cohesion, although this understanding tends to come only after a longer experience abroad. The individualism of the American players was occasionally pointed out by some other Americans, whose cultural sensitivity had developed over time within the European context. Relating a story about the arrival of a new American teammate, one such player told how "*One* [American] *guy made a PowerPoint presentation about himself, gave us all his resume, 'this what I've done'. He did it in the meeting. Presented the tables, stats about himself. Coach was about to talk, and he was saying, 'Wait a minute coach, I've got something to say'. Stood up, gave his resume to everybody. 'This is where I've been, this is what I've done'. So I was like 'Why did you do that?' – 'They need to know where I came from' – 'But it looks more like you were bragging' – 'No, they needed to know. I'm older, they need to listen to me'. But it worked backwards, because younger guys were like 'Who does he think he is?'. It was funny, but it was also bad. When he finished everybody was just quiet. He was*

like 'Did I say too much?' [laughing]" (IP10). In this case, the immigrated player's self-promotion went to an extreme, and was described by a player from the same cultural background as 'bragging', potentially creating divisions between the player in question and his new teammates.

Meanwhile, some of the immigrated players who are individually-oriented (i.e., North Americans), were seen to cause problems in their new team by their local teammates. Local players were often keen to point out the difficulties that such players' individualistic approaches can bring into the team social cohesion. According to one: *"I think it's important that they are team players, or a good person. When someone comes and they think 'oh, I'm the best and give me the ball, I'm the best one, I don't need somebody else' that's no good for a team"* (LP8); another states that: *"...sometimes you have players that... they have a feeling they need to have a ball, to be the main focus on the team. And they clash if you have many people like that"* (LP10). Also: "*I have a problem with American players. I have met a lot of very good American players, but some of them they are just too arrogant. They were raised thinking they are the best and they expect everyone to treat them like that*" (LP14). In this case, local players often singled-out recently immigrated American teammates, who did not realise that their individualism and self-promoting had a negative impact on their relationship with local players and team social cohesion overall. The majority of local players in this research mentioned that individualistic orientations of immigrated players created tension and were problematic for team relations and therefore team social cohesion, as they were understood to have damaged teams' social cohesion due to a breakdown in relationships and trust between players.

Overall, based on this research sample, all the teams were perceived by both players and coaches to adopt a more collectivistic-oriented approach to performance: "…*Here you have a few really good players, but really good teams, so it's more like a team game here*" (IP12) or "*For the team it's crucial to have team players…*" (CO5), therefore for some of the local players it was hard to accept immigrated players who continued to play and broadly operate on the basis of an individualistic approach. Misunderstandings between players adopting either of these two cultural attitudes resulted in team conflicts. In the following subchapter (6.2), coaches' accounts of their experiences dealing with conflicts based on differences between individualistic and collectivistic approach in their teams are outlined.

Another major subject that was mentioned by players and coaches is the importance of having a shared **team goal**, as a core element of producing and enhancing team cohesiveness (see subchapter 1.2.2). In a team that consists of so many different players from

various countries, along with diverse cultural, social and other backgrounds, team goals can be the only thing which unites them. As one coach outlined: "*I want them to be able to perform to the best of their abilities. Under the idea of our common goal. This can be winning the championship, this can be winning one game, this can be scoring a basket in this possession or stopping an opponent from possession. But this common goal must be the ultimate interest for everybody, that we all strive for, that we all work for*" (CO3). According to previous research, goal setting leads to an increase in the perception of social and task team cohesion, better communication and team bonding (Newin, Bloom & Loughead, 2008).

Related to this point, team building is assumed to be based on the shared vision of group goals (Yukelson, 2010), and the interviewed players, both immigrated and local, confirm this, assuming that: "*You have to make sure everybody has the same goal. Everybody wants the same thing – that's the most important. And then you just go from there. If everyone wants to win, then we all have common goal. But if you have three people with one goal, two people with another goal, then the problem comes*" (LP18). Another player adds: "*I've heard a story about two former Yugoslavian players that were fighting with each other, didn't talk to each other for the whole season. But during the game it was different, they fought for every ball, they gave support to each other. So no one could see that they had problems. Even if we are totally different persons, we are professionals. And on the court you must be like one*" (IP15). Team goals, as evident from the players' accounts, allow players to put their conflicts or difficulties aside and concentrate on their main aim, which is winning the game. As noted by LP18, it is important to make sure that everyone shares the same goal in the team, and that individual goals don't overcome the team goal.

In this sense, it was widely agreed that having a shared team goal helps overcome conflicts on the court, even if during training or free time players have particularly bad relationships, practically meaning that a lack in social cohesion can be overcome by strong task cohesion in a team: "*Last year we had groups and guys hated each other. But on the court we played together and we would look so good. And I think we did good last year. Some people couldn't even tell that we had a problem that at some point guys wouldn't even say "hello" to each other. But sometime on the court it would look like we're one happy family*" (IP9). Even individual goal setting (Carron et al., 2005), such as, for example, focusing on work and training, can be used together with wider team goal setting in order to improve if not social, then task cohesion in the team. As one player put it: "[young players] *should just remember you're there to work. You're there to play basketball and that's it. You're not there to party, you're not there to make friends, you know, work comes first*" (IP10). Therefore, by

prioritising basketball success, or the team's task cohesion, players were able to at least momentarily find a way to overcome the social difficulties experienced on multicultural teams.

Interestingly, while many of the interviewed players believed that all the problems and issues occurring in multicultural teams seem to disappear when the team wins, all of the interpersonal conflicts and misunderstandings become hard to ignore once the team starts losing again. Here, any improvement in social cohesion brought by winning disappears: "*It all depends on winning too! When you win, everybody is like 'heeey, how you doing', when you lose everybody's coming like 'oh, maaan', trying to get each other: 'Hey you, what did you do, what did you do'. And if we win, it's always like 'hey, good job!', you just overlook the small mistakes*" (IP9). Another player adds: "*When you lose, the small mistakes seem to be so big, but when you win you can just brush it under the rug*. [laughs] *Ah, we'll fix it later!*" (IP10). For one immigrated player in particular, the previous season had been difficult, as their team was not successful and there were a lot of conflicts within the team: "*Last season wasn't very good for us, but this season we're trying to have a good relationship in our team. We are teammates, but sometimes we have to fight for ourselves but also for our team in the same time. But everyone in the team knows our goal for the season, as we try to play better and better every day*" (IP8).

Understanding this phenomenon requires recognising the importance of both having and realising team goals as one of the most effective interventions in team-building (Carron et al., 2005; Martin et al., 2009). One of the coaches clearly agrees with this point: "*Usually if you have a successful team, most likely you're going to have a good team chemistry, or people that are willing to all work for the same common goal, rather than pursuing their own individual ones*" (CO3). For all of the teams in this sample – as with all competitive sports teams generally – the overall common team goal is winning. Once this goal has been reached, the social cohesion in the team improves; players are happy with their accomplishment and therefore they forget about misunderstandings or conflicts they had before. However, after unsuccessful games, all of these conveniently hidden conflicts reappear and players may start to blame each other for the loss.

To sum up, the main factors regarding team social and task cohesion in multicultural teams in this sample concerned the formation of ethnic subgroups, differences between individualistic and collectivistic cultural approaches, and the need to form common team goals. Ethnic subgroups were most commonly registered within Czech teams, however all interviewed players from all three sampled countries have experienced this phenomenon at

some point of their international playing careers. Conflicts based on value differences almost exclusively occurred between (in all interviewed teams) American players, as representatives of an individualistic cultural approach, and local European players, who tended to use collectivistic approaches in the team (although being from largely individualistically-oriented cultures themselves), and therefore were largely intent on pursuing team goals instead of individual goals, in order to improve team task and social cohesion.

6.2. Challenges encountered by coaches of multicultural basketball teams

Three main themes were identified in the interviews regarding coaches' work with multicultural teams, and these correspond with many of those outlined above with respect to players' experiences: value differences (i.e. individualistic and collectivistic approaches); the influence of race/ethnicity in coach-athlete relationships; and the formation of ethnic subgroups within teams. Each of these themes contributes towards revealing the coaches' experience in working with immigrated athletes, which was one of the main aims of this research project.

6.2.1. Individualistic and collectivistic approaches

First of all, one of the most common issues identified was the difficulty posed through a difference between individualistic and collectivistic cultural orientations between immigrated and local players. A collectivistic approach, which primarily involved players cooperating to a high degree during plays, sharing possession of the ball, and generally avoiding reliance on single, stand-out performers, was preferred by all of the interviewed coaches. These coaches admitted that while having a strong leader is good for a sports team, this should not negatively impact on the feelings of enfranchisement and inclusion among other players, or disrupt the idealised collective team atmosphere and playing style. However, the behaviour of immigrated players from North America, for whom an individualistic pre-occupation with being their team's 'most valuable player' stood at odds with this otherwise normative, collectivistic framework shared by the coaches and, quite typically, the majority of 'local' European players, could pose problems within their teams. According to one coach: "*For the team it's crucial to have team players. Americans can lead the team very good, but very often they just forget about the team and try to play the whole game as there is no other*

players [in their team]. *That makes the others* [teammates] *quite angry, it's not what they are used to"* (CO5). Another coaches suggested that: *"It takes some time for them* [American players] *to realise that they need to pass the ball. They want to have it all the time, sometimes just for the sake of having a ball, to be the main focus of the team"* (CO2); and another noted that: *"When the individual goals take over, then the problems start to begin. If someone is not playing for the team, but for themselves"* (CO3).

The tendency for migrant American players in particular to hold a strongly individualistic outlook, wanting to be the 'stars' of their teams within cultural contexts (i.e. Central and Northern Europe) where local players and coaches in this sample adopt more collectivistic approaches, was widely reported. According to one coach, having several players all performing in this way could prove particularly problematic: *"For many Americans it's important to have that feeling of… they matter, or they are very important, they are almost the star, without the bad connotation. So in our case, I've sometimes felt like it's not a good thing to have too many Americans on the team. Last year we had seven, too many, yet now we still have six or five at this point. But that can be a problem because they tend to want to play that first violin. They want to be in the driver's seat sometimes"* (CO3).

Broadly speaking, coaches perceived problems arising from individualism and collectivism as being based on players' national cultural backgrounds. Such discussions often began with reference to the way immigrated players from America had been trained or educated in basketball in their homeland in ways which differed from European players: *"It is different if you have a Serbian player or American player, just how they have learnt the game, you know. The former Yugoslavian school of basketball is very well known, very successful in the world and they tend to have different experience, how they have learned the game of basketball… In the States, of course, it's completely different… So when these players come together, you have to find of course a common ground and common language to be successful, eventually"* (CO3).

When working with culturally diverse teams, the coaches tended to use two strategies in order to deal with the differences in immigrated (which most often referred to American) players' approaches, working towards better team unity. The first strategy involved recognition of the individualism of American players, and taking steps to support their self-esteem and desire for importance in order to maintain their commitment to teams. For instance, many individualistically-oriented players wanted to either begin games in their team's starting line-up, or feature heavily in the team throughout the game, in order to feel a greater degree of 'role efficacy' (Bray, Brawley and Carron, 2002). One of the coaches

described using this approach when he had to leave some of his team's American players outside of the starting line-up and use them as a substitute "*...is very important with Americans too, to start, to be in the starting line-up of a game, instead of coming off the bench. I have one player who understood by now, that even though he comes off the bench, he still is gonna play thirty minutes, even thirty-five minutes, out of the forty minutes of one game. So this is still helpful, very helpful for the team, even though he doesn't start off in the game*" (CO5).

The clear explanation to such players of their significant role within the team was considered to be successful in improving overall team cohesion in culturally diverse teams, by diffusing the potential for, in particular, migrant American players to feel isolated or unused. This is an example of the communication process of the role responsibilities according to Carron and colleagues (2005), which was presented verbally by the coach to the athlete, perceived and responded accordingly by the athlete, and afterwards was positively judged by the coach, who claimed that "*It is very important to talk with players, to teach new guys* [Americans] *to respect our team culture. But also to teach local players, especially if they have never played abroad, that they* [foreigners] *came here to make us stronger. Very often* [local] *guys feel that Americans come here and dominate the team, so everyone has to play by their* [Americans] *rules now. Yes, it happens, but it's my job to make all of them play by my rules as a coach*" (CO6).

Aside from taking steps to accommodate the playing styles and ambitions of immigrated players with an individualistic orientation, another strategy used by the coaches involved trying to reduce the extent of cultural difference between these and local players, who tended to hold a more collectivistic approach. Typically, this involved trying to change the attitudes of individualistically-oriented migrant players. By explaining to them the importance of the team game and being a part of a successful team, such coaches aimed to re-orient their migrant players to place less importance on their personal roles and successes: "*I was telling them* [American players] *that when we are just a bunch of individual players, then it's very easy to break us, one by one. But if we are a team, then we are all together, and it will be difficult to break us. I thought they knew this story, but it was new to them. So I told it again, so they can remember*" (CO6).

Only one coach mentioned a positive side about the individual approach of American players, when one of the players started to take more initiative and helped to effectively lead the team, saying "*The American player helped us a lot, because she had this experience and patience. She was trying to build the others' confidence up, make them respond... she took*

responsibility and made some team meetings and talked about the practice situations so that
everyone had more energy, she was really caring" (CO4). In this case, it is possible that the
gender of the immigrant player has an important role in this case; while the present research
sample is not big enough to establish generalizable trends, this does remain a possibility
which might make for further research in the area. Nevertheless, based on the research
sample, it can be suggested that coaching teams composed of players with different cultural
backgrounds can be a challenge for coaches, as players' cultural value orientations differ in
ways which are likely to lead to tension among teammates, or feelings of dissatisfaction for
individuals.

6.2.2. Working with Black players

Another factor mentioned by all interview coaches was working with Black players.
With a significant number of their migrant players coming from the United States, and a large
proportion of those players being African-American, several coaches mentioned the special
impact of working with Black players in a predominantly White social context. Ethnic
background is an important factor in coach-athlete relationships; for example, according to
some of the previous studies in this area, Black players bond better with Black coaches, and
expect to receive a higher degree of empathy from the coaches of the same race (Jowett &
Frost, 2007), and also are more likely to experience incivility from White head coaches
(Cunningham, Miner, & McDonald, 2013). In this respect, it was not uncommon for the
interviewed coaches to point out that concerns over race/ethnicity could interfere with coach-
athlete relationships, as well as team cohesion overall, as race became an important factor
alongside cultural differences in framing the experience of working with a multicultural team.
According to one coach, "*I think the Black* [American] *players just have a different attitude,*
they think they're much better than everyone else but they don't always train very hard, and
it can be quite difficult to work with them if you don't know what they are like beforehand"
(CO6).

Racial stereotyping regarding the 'laziness' of black players has been described
elsewhere in the literature, among other stereotypical expectations, such that black players
have 'natural' athletic talent (Burley & Fleming, 1997; Jones, 2002), which can lead to Black
players being perceived by coaches as performers rather than rounded individuals (Anshel,
1990). These stereotypical attitudes were reflected in another coach's account of working
with Black players, claiming that "*Black players can be very good for the team, quickly bring*

results, raise the attractiveness for the team among the fans, but they [Black players] *lose the interest to the training very quickly, thinking that they already know better how to play, or even that they are too good to train hard"* (CO5).

While many coaches generally saw American players' individualism as a problem for European teams, regardless of race (as outlined above), a perceived difference between Black and White players nevertheless created an assumption that Blacks were more difficult to work with. Difficulties in working with Black players can also be discussed through the communication process that can be different for athletes from the Black community. As discussed briefly above, there is an assumed need for Black Americans to communicate with other Black Americans, who are expected to have better understanding of their particular problems or situations (see Lawrence, 2005; Orbe, 1994). Also, some Black American players can lack experience of interaction with non-Black populations, and have to learn how to integrate within a majority-White group by "trying different strategies, learning from past mistakes, and constantly putting themselves in risky and awkward positions" (Orbe, 1994, p. 291). Orbe also noted that Black Americans prefer to keep a 'safe distance' from non-Black Americans, especially when that person is male and/or in authority, which can be perceived as intimidating. Keeping a distance from the White coach and being intimidated can be negatively perceived by the coach who is not aware of this particular cultural attribute.

In contrary to Anshel's earlier (1990) interviews with Black players, which claimed that coaches are largely not interested in their players' free time, some of the coaches were actually worried about the free time activities that Black players might choose, and explained how it can influence the appointment of the potential player to the team: "*We specifically select American players to have a good character. It's a coach's job. Whether he* [a player] *likes to go out, is he married and has kids. Because usually Black players come to Europe and go out to bars, having lots of attention from girls. We don't need that"* (CO1).

This finding connects with Solomon and colleagues' (1996) study regarding the different expectations that coaches have of athletes from diverse ethnic backgrounds, and how this can influence coaches' instructions and support to the players. Overall, the present study revealed that coaches still remain under the influence of certain racial stereotypes, and sometimes they lack sensitivity to the sociocultural and individual needs of Black players. Therefore, educational programs focused on understanding diversity would be useful for coaches working in such circumstances.

6.2.3. Formation of ethnic subgroups

A further finding of this study concerns the formation of subgroups within multicultural teams, which was reported to adversely impact on wider group communication and team relationships (see Panteli & Davison, 2005) as outlined above. After his appointment to a culturally diverse basketball team, one of the coaches found that the team consisted of several, hierarchically-arranged ethnic subgroups (Greenfield et al., 2002), which had a fairly negative impact on team relationships, with almost no constructive communication between members of each group: *"In one team in Poland I had four Americans, two Lithuanians, one player from Montenegro, one from Macedonia, two Serbians and around four to five Poles. I came to the club in the mid-season, and they had groups in the teams. Poles hated Americans, because they couldn't speak their language. Americans hated Poles, thought they can't play basketball. Two Lithuanians were aside, they didn't know what to do. Serbians made their own Balkan gang of all the players from former Yugoslavia"* (CO1).

Within this particular example, American players were convinced of their superiority to other players, while members of the various different groups often failed to constructively work together. Their perception of unequal status led to conflicts in the team between the immigrated and local (Polish) players, as well as wider inter-group tension which, according to the coach, drastically undermined team cohesiveness and resulted in the team constantly losing games.

Similar problems were reported by other coaches, and in order to deal with the issues posed by the formation of ethnic subgroups within their teams, some chose to isolate or remove certain players as a way of overcoming the divisive consequences of such social fragmentation. One coach, who had a problem with an insular and uncooperative subgroup formed by players, chose to break up this group by taking one of the players off the team: *"I had it few years ago, they* [players of this nationality] *spent all of their time together, during the training and after it … I kicked one out* [of the team] *to break their group, and it all got better"* (CO6).

A similar strategy saw coaches pre-emptively preventing the formation of subgroups while selecting and appointing new players. Some of the coaches described working through background checks of potential new migrant players before signing a contract, in order to find better-suited players that would fit within their current team: *"Before selecting a new* [foreign] *player, we always try to find out about personal side of the player. It can be very*

strong individual player, but I always collect information about how did the player communicate with other teammates. And if there were any problems, then we don't need such player. We'd rather take a player who is maybe slightly worse technically but will be good for the team" (CO2).

Removing potentially problematic players, whilst taking care to only employ team-oriented, sociable and cooperative newcomers from abroad, was thought by such coaches as these to be a successful strategy for preventing divisive subgroups from forming. Meanwhile, other coaches dealt with this problem differently, with strategies emerging around attempts to find some common ground or common goals for all the players, in order to build a more integrated team with a stronger mutual identity and greater social and task cohesion. One coach explicitly discussed the need for diverse groups of players to learn to communicate with one-another, rather than isolate themselves within their own exclusive, ethnic clusters: *"...you have Germans, Americans, Serbian, we had a Polish player here, and then it's... it does start to become difficult, but it becomes also more challenging for the players themselves, especially when they keep to themselves and don't talk to their other teammates... And then when you try to* [make them] *communicate, you have to find common ground there, so this is really an obstacle also for them, or a big challenge that they have to master. And I believe that's a very important thing"* (CO3).

In order to help their players find such 'common ground', several coaches suggested that encouraging their team to socialise together outside of training was an effective method for helping establish positive relationships between players of various national backgrounds – something which, as outlined previously, was also identified by several players as being important. It was broadly considered that building greater social bonds within their teams would ultimately improve cohesiveness overall: *"Foreigners always keep together. Not only on the training, but in their free time. Often happens, that Americans stay aside... I give my captain a task to gather the team and go to watch a movie or do something else together. Things like that help to keep the team's chemistry"* (CO2). Another coach follows: *"[During] pre-season, when we prepare for the first game and we usually have a span of seven weeks, or we bring the players in earlier before their first game, so they get to know each other. They get to know the coach, the philosophy, tactics and all that, but also very importantly each other. We do certain things like practice camp, where they're sitting on top of each other for eight days and no family, no friends, so they're really forced to interact"* (CO3).

Additionally, team goal setting was seen to be important for establishing stronger task cohesion among multicultural teams. As outlined above, team goal setting is considered to be

one of the most effective interventions for team-building in any team, and was seen by the interviewed coaches as a particularly important means of overcoming divisions between players of differing ethnicities. As the coaches worked on finding common goals for their teams as a means of bridging the apparent divides between their players, they reported witnessing positive changes in team task cohesion. For example, coach CO1, who was appointed to a team with several, hierarchically-arranged subgroups, had experience of playing abroad in several teams inside and outside Europe, and had started to work towards building effective rapport with each group in his current team by stressing each player's positive contribution and unique role within the team. This included, for instance, stressing the importance of the American players in the team, and setting them the goal of inspiring their teammates: "*When I came to the team, the first thing I had to do is to make a team out of them. I've spoken with Americans a lot, telling them that we play here to win, that maybe all the other players are not that good, but that's the reason we bought you, so you can teach everyone to play better, not to humiliate them. It worked, and after a month or two we started to win*" (CO1).

Therefore, while hierarchally-arranged ethnic subgroups could potentially cause rifts within teams and lead to a lack of communication and cohesiveness, the coaches reported various strategies as being successful in overcoming this problem. By removing particular players as a way of disbanding exclusive 'in-groups', or avoiding appointing players who might exert a divisive influence, coaches could solve such problems by managing their team personnel. Alternatively, efforts aimed at building greater social bonds between players, as well as the use of goal-setting techniques, could help them to establish greater cohesion without the need for altering team rosters.

6.3. Recommendations for practising cultural sport psychologists

Based on the extensive research in the field of multicultural teams, which the author has been engaged in since 2006, the author would like to summarise her experience in order to offer several recommendations for psychologists and researchers in the field of cultural sport psychology. The origin of some of the recommendations is based on the research provided in this area (see Butryn, 2002; Martens, 2000; Schinke, 2010; Roper, 2002; Yambor & Connelly, 1991), and was adapted by the author to the practical aspects of her particular field.

First of all, the most important recommendation in this field is to avoid generalisation. As has been mentioned in Chapter 2, based on the analysis of genetics, like DNA samples, it was concluded that differences within 'racial' groups are more essential than between 'racial' groups (American Anthropological Association, 1998), which can also be applied to other groups of individuals based on their gender, religion, culture etc. (Hanrahan, 2011; Lloyd, 1987). Therefore, while a practitioner should be aware of specific reactions and outcomes that people of a particular cultural or ethnic background might have to any given situation or intervention strategy, they should remain mindful of the possibility for individuals to break with observed trends and behave unexpectedly. That is to say that not every representative of a given cultural or ethnic group will always behave in ways which conform to the apparent norms of said group and practitioners who are building up their cultural sensitivity should remain aware of this fact.

Secondly, it is important to constantly engage in critical introspection, asking oneself about possible biases, especially if one is from the dominant (White) cultural background, and is working with clients from otherwise marginalised or under-represented cultures. The cultural background of a sport psychology practitioner can put him or her into an assumed dominant position, and have an impact on clients' attitude, potentially leading to a possible alienation of the client if the right degree of cultural sensitivity is missing.

Keeping personal borders and respecting borders of clients is the next recommendation. As was discussed in detail in subchapter 2.5.1, which focused on common cross-cultural issues, different cultures have their own rules regarding personal borders, usage of gestures, non-verbal communication and so on. What is acceptable in one culture may not be acceptable (or can even be perceived to be rude) in another. Respecting one's clients' cultural norms is an essential basis of effective cooperation in this respect. It can even help to establish the connection and communication with a client – sharing practices that are very common in one culture and asking the client to share those of his/hers. Such mutual sharing will not only help to establish a new social connection, but will also teach the practitioner about new things and expand their knowledge about other cultures.

Further to this point, keeping personal borders is very important when the practitioner is female and the client (or research participant) is male, or vice versa. Female practitioners can be perceived differently in various cultures, wherein some can perceive female practitioners as unprofessional or inappropriate, particularly as the applied domain of sport psychology continues to consist of mainly White, middle-class males (Gill, 1994; Roper, 2002). Therefore, female practitioners can be perceived as less competent than male

practitioners, and as an object for flirtation among male athletes. Keeping professional boundaries in this case is essential for successful applied practice.

That leads to another recommendation, which is developing cultural competence, that can be achieve by direct contact with the representative of other cultures, as has been mentioned in previous recommendations. Another way of developing one's cultural competence is reading literature focused on other cultures, such as books, newspapers, and so on, knowing what is going on in the client's world.

Supervised applied experience, which is the next recommendation, is always good and necessary for all practitioners who are just beginning their professional career. However, in the case of sport psychologists working in culturally diverse contexts, this might be even more beneficial. This will allow practitioners to analyse their relationship with culturally diverse athletes better, evaluating their attitude, position and effectiveness of their help in a multicultural context, wherein athletes face additional burdens and challenges, as outlined throughout this thesis.

A further recommendation (which might be perceived by some as unnecessary but has proven instrumental in the author's research experience) involves knowing the language of one's clients, which can definitely be beneficial for applied work. Learning a new language can be a difficult task and usually continues throughout one's whole life. However, if the practitioner knows at least the basics of their client's or research participant's language, then this has a good possibility to help in establishing good relationships. Especially if a client or research participant is from an otherwise marginalised cultural background (and particularly so when this differs from one's own), one's efforts in talking in their language or at least in knowing a little background of his/her culture, will be appreciated.

Finally, the last, but not the least, recommendation for practitioners in cultural sport psychology is to stay open-minded. Every culture is different, but every representative of each culture makes it unique. While practitioners may disagree with some practices of some particular cultures, one can always try to understand them. Every encounter with other cultures can enrich one's own personality and can help to develop greater cultural competence, resulting in being more sensitive, reflective and empathetic practitioners.

6.4. Summary of results

In order to answer and analyse the main question from several angles, the main question was divided into two secondary questions, based on the experience of immigrated and local players ("*What challenges do immigrated elite athletes encounter in multicultural basketball teams?*") and experience of the coaches ("*What are the main aspects of coaching multicultural basketball teams*?").

Based on semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, challenges for immigrated players were divided into 3 categories: (a) motivation for migration and expectation of a new country; (b) challenges outside the sport context; and (c) challenges inside the sport context. Category (a) included 4 main categories of immigrated players in this sample ('mercenaries', 'nomads', 'settlers' and 'ambitionists'), while expectation of a new country varied based on immigrated players' age, experience and marital status. Category (b) included adjustment process to a new culture, including loneliness, homesickness, language barriers, and many others aspects. Particularly, Black players also focused on racial discrimination or tension that they faced while adjusting to a predominantly White environment in Europe. Category (c) was divided into 3 subcategories: adaptation in a new team; communication and interaction in the team; and team cohesion (which was influenced by formation of ethnic subgroups, differences between individualistic and collectivistic approaches, and team goal).

Coaches' experience in working with multicultural teams was divided into three categories. Two of them (formation of ethnic subgroups and differences between individualistic and collectivistic approaches) have been previously mentioned by immigrated and local players. The third category was focused on special aspects in working with Black players.

7. Conclusion

This study contributes to the emergent body of research in cultural sport psychology, focusing on the functioning of multicultural teams and coach-athlete relationships (Duchesne et al., 2011; Jowett & Frost, 2007; Schinke et al., 2013). The aim of the study was to explore the most common challenges that occur in multicultural elite basketball teams. In order to answer and analyse the main question from several angles, the main question was divided into two secondary questions, based on the experience of immigrated and local players ("What challenges do immigrated elite athletes encounter in multicultural basketball teams?") and experience of the coaches ("What are the main aspects of coaching multicultural basketball teams?"). Semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis allowed describing athletes' and coaches' experience in playing and working with multicultural teams and the most common problems they faced.

Based on semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, the findings regarding challenges facing immigrated players were divided into 3 categories: (a) motivation for migration and expectations of a new country; (b) challenges outside of the sport context; and (c) challenges inside the sport context.

Category (a), regarding immigrated players' motivation and expectations from a new country showed that in this sample players were divided into 4 categories – 'mercenaries' (Maguire, 1999), whose motivation was purely financial, with no particular attachment to the team or country they had moved to. Another category of players was 'nomads' (Maguire, 1999), which describes cosmopolitan players who were motivated by new experiences and challenges. The third category of immigrated players was 'settlers' (Maguire, 1999), who migrate to a new country to secure a stable, financially strong base for themselves and their families, who often travel with them. The last category was 'ambitionists', which describes players who are motivated by pursuing their career in a better (than their current league) level of competition (Magee & Sugden, 2002). The majority of immigrated players hadn't formed coherent expectations of the countries they were moving to, taking advice to move there from their agents or friends who used to play in particular a team or country. For mature players with families, it was important to have comfortable conditions for their families that were travelling along with them, and therefore these players were more careful with choosing their next destination of work and were more likely to seek better information before moving.

The next two categories (challenges facing immigrated players outside and inside the sport context) were analysed from the points of view of both local and immigrated players, in

order to describe the phenomena from various angles, especially because local players are often excluded from research samples as researchers give preference to the experience of immigrated athletes only (Schinke et al., 2011; 2013).

The main challenges outside of the sport context for immigrated players involved the acculturation process, which included dealing with loneliness, homesickness, new and unfamiliar cultural norms and the pressure to learn a new language (Schinke et al., 2011). Feelings of loneliness were described by all of the interviewed migrant players, even those travelling with their families. Players described homesickness and loss of their social networks, although those feelings were not as strong among players who had played abroad for several seasons. Another challenge for immigrated athletes concerned new dietary regimes and problems with day-to-day life logistics. Players, all of whom did not know the local language, were not able to identify some food in stores or restaurants, were having troubles with locating required facilities like hospitals, and frequently had trouble adjusting to new weather conditions and cultural norms (for instance, not greeting and smiling to strangers on the streets in Germany, which several American players mentioned). Among other challenges in this category was the negative attitudes of the local population, which was particularly mentioned by Black American immigrated players, especially those who were recalling times they had played in or visited Eastern Europe or Turkey.

The subchapter focusing on challenges inside the sport context represent the answer to the main research question: "*What are the most common challenges that occur in multicultural elite basketball teams?*". Challenges within the sport context were divided into the following themes: adaptation in a new team; communication and interaction in the team; and team cohesion.

In order to assess the adaptation process in multicultural teams, Fiske's model (2009) of adaptation and Schinke and McGannon's (2013) model of acculturation strategies were used. The adaptation process was easier for immigrated players who made an active effort of adjusting to a new situation, which according to Fiske (2009) is the essential condition for achieving 'balance'. This also corresponds with Schinke and McGannon's (2013) account of the acculturation experience of immigrated players, which assumes better acculturation within a new cultural environment and a new team particularly for players/teams using the immersed reciprocity strategy, which involves the mutual sharing of and learning about cultural practices, norm and values between immigrated athletes, local teammates and coaches. That approach implies the whole integration of immigrated players to the new cultural environment, allows them to understand team norms, roles and hierarchy, and at the

same time allows their local teammates and coaches to understand their (immigrated players) culture, beliefs and values. This approach is especially beneficial for cultures that do not encounter multiculturalism very often, which can otherwise lead local players and coaching staff to have stereotypical thinking, prejudices or negative attitudes towards immigrated players whose cultural origin is different from theirs.

Communication and interaction inside sport teams is essential for establishing positive and constructive team dynamics (Lavoi, 2007; Yukelson, 2010). In multicultural teams, communication is influenced by the variety of languages that players use. All teams reported the adoption of the English language as their team's main language, because it is faster, more comfortable to use and understandable for all players, and owing to the fact that the majority of 'basketball language' has its origin in English. This approach was registered even in teams where the main coach or the majority of local players didn't speak English. In this case, coaches used the help of their assistants for translation; however, for some local players (particularly in the Czech teams) this presented difficulties and resulted in a degree of negativity towards immigrated players. That feeling was reinforced by the attitude of immigrated players in the Czech teams, who did not show any intention of learning the local language for communication.

Team social and task cohesion was analysed using the classic conceptual model for cohesion in sport teams, proposed by Carron, Widmeyer & Brawley (1985). Based on the results, team social cohesion was largely influenced by the formation of ethnic subgroups, and by differences between individual and collectivistic cultural approaches. Subgroups were largely formed by immigrated players from the same cultural or ethnic background, excluding local players from their in-group. This led to low social cohesion, misunderstandings and conflicts based on national backgrounds, especially because the majority of in-groups were formed by Black American players, excluding their White European teammates. Another type of problem occurred in teams based on the differences between individualistic approaches from immigrated (mainly American) players, and the collectivistic approach to playing basketball adopted by the European teams. In order to overcome the differences between these cultural values, a common team goal was used as a team-building approach by players and coaches in order to improve both task and social cohesion.

Finally, this study focused on the coaches' experience in working with multicultural teams. Coaches' work experience with culturally diverse athletes has recently been examined in a small number of studies (Duchesne et al., 2011; Schinke, 2011; Schinke et al., 2013).

These studies demonstrated that coaches working with these types of athletes should adopt several culturally-relevant considerations, including sensitivity towards immigrated athletes' degree of acculturation within their new country of residence; differences in physical space and time perception among culturally diverse groups of athletes; individual or collectivistic value orientations; and normative understandings of gender roles (Schinke, 2011). Although it has been suggested that coaches may struggle to understand some athletes' cultural practices (Schinke et al., 2013), coaches, who were aware of cultural differences overall, were able to help their international athletes to develop in sport, as well as in their academic and personal lives (Duchesne et al., 2011). Based on the thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with coaches, several challenges in working with multicultural teams were defined.

Firstly, coaches' responses indicated the importance of the differences between players drawn from individualistic and collectivistic cultural backgrounds (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), which largely emerged as issues arising when coaching individualistically-oriented American players on teams in Europe composed predominantly of local players with a collectivistic approach to basketball, which was broadly shared and supported by the coaches. This difference led to some conflicts in teams between local players and coaches on one side, and immigrated players on another side. The interviewed coaches used two strategies in order to improve the situation in their respective teams: strategies to reduce the effects of those differences, and strategies to reduce the differences themselves.

The second theme concerned the (White) coaches' experience in working with Black players. Results confirmed the persistence of racial stereotypes among some of the coaches, including coaches' specific expectations of Black athletes (see Solomon et al., 1996) and perception of Black players as being lazy (Burley & Fleming, 1997). Coaches did not identify using any specific strategies to overcome the perceived difficulties of working across a racial divide, apart from preventing problems through not appointing a player that had a negative reputation in previous teams – a strategy which was applied to all players, but with a particular emphasis on the assumption of potential 'bad' behaviour from Black Americans.

The third finding of this study concerned the formation of ethnic subgroups within teams, which supported the suggestion of Greenfield and colleagues (2002) that the presence of these types of subgroups can lead to cross-cultural conflicts within teams. Again, coaches used two strategies in order to deal with such issues; firstly, removing/avoiding bad influences, such as firing particular players; or secondly, working to overcome differences through team-building strategies, such as encouraging players to socialise together.

This study had several limitations. First of all, the sample size is particularly small, and is based on the very exclusive nature of elite, professional teams, which are generally closed off to the public and other external parties, including sport psychology researchers (Baillie & Ogilvie, 1996). Another limitation would be the language barrier, which is an almost inevitable difficulty of doing cultural sport psychology research overall, owing to the multilingual makeup of culturally diverse sports teams. Although the author was able to communicate with some coaches and players in their native language, and is fully fluent in each language used (Czech, English and Russian) in the study, during some interviews a language barrier potentially influenced the openness, trust and flow of the conversation - especially when the coaches and players were not speaking their native language.

Due to the small sample and sensitivity of the subject, any generalizations should be avoided when discussing cultural differences, and therefore these findings are not universally applicable, pointing to common trends within the sample rather than general truths. In this respect, one of the interviewed coaches stated: "*We don't have* [problems based on] *nationalities; we have a group of people who do mutual work – basketball. There are conflicts, but it's always personal, not because somebody is Polish or Russian, but because somebody is a bad person*" (CO1). It is therefore important to note that such issues do not always occur within similar situations. Finally, the gender differences (as both female and male teams were included in the research sample) were not considered as a variable in this research, as the author wanted to concentrate on the phenomena of multicultural teams overall without stressing apparent differences between men and women. Nevertheless, it is recommended for future studies in this area to include gender as a variable as it may lead to some interesting observations.

The implications of the study include the importance of educational programs or workshops, first of all among coaches, which might be focused on raising cultural awareness with particular respect to racial stereotypes towards Black American players. Such educational training programmes have already been suggested elsewhere (Hanrahan, 2004; Schinke et al., 2006), and the results of this study reveal the on-going importance of such interventions, particularly in settings where coaches have not been otherwise exposed to multiculturalism or worked with non-White athletes before. As the result of such training, coaches might also better understand and be aware of the time that is required for immigrated athletes to adapt to new cultural expectations and value orientations after relocation, and "through ongoing reflective practice, informed by culturally sensitive education, effective coaching strategies can be facilitated" (Schinke et al., 2006, p. 447). Also, it is important to

prevent interracial conflicts in culturally diverse teams by also educating players (both local and immigrated) about cultural differences and their influence on team relationships, so efforts to improve the various problems identified within this study can be registered from all sides – including coaches, immigrated players and local players. Finally, a further implication lies in developing team-building techniques in culturally diverse teams in order to improve team cohesion among heterogeneous and potentially divided groups of athletes.

Meanwhile, further studies in this area may expand the sample into other team sports, and also explore the impact of mediating variables, such as gender, which to date remains relatively under-analysed with respect to issues arising within multicultural sports teams. As the research base in this relatively young academic area continues to expand, practitioners and scholars alike will better understand the unique problems immigrated athletes face while relocating to a new country, as well as those which local players face while having to adapt to a multicultural environment on their teams, and those which coaches face when working in these diverse environments. Such renewed understandings will help sport psychology experts to become better placed to assist players and coaches through recommendations for best practice.

8. Summary

This thesis is focused on the area of cultural sport psychology that has been recently developing very rapidly (Schinke, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009). The main focus of this dissertation is multicultural basketball teams, specifically interpersonal relations in culturally diverse teams, and potential issues and problems that can occur in such environments. With the increasing globalisation of professional sport, and a concurrent, rapidly growing pattern of elite sport labour migration all over the world, people from various cultures that have never encountered one-another before now have contact on a daily basis within the context of top-level competitive sport. Among the others aspects, cultural sport psychology focuses on the potential issues that can occur when immigrated athletes relocate to a new country, along with challenges that working within or coaching culturally diverse teams and athletes may bring, seeking to identify how best to counsel, train, or integrate within multicultural groups of athletes, along with many other, related subjects.

In order to introduce the theoretical background for studying culturally diverse teams, which is the main focus of this thesis, the literature review (Chapter 1) starts with an overview of general team dynamics research in the field of sport psychology, including analyses of team development, several models of team cohesion, team roles and norms, and communication. At the beginning of the following Chapter 2, which is dedicated to the phenomenon of globalisation in sport and sport labour migration, an explanation is provided as to the cultural turn within sport psychology. This theoretical overview ends with an analysis of multicultural sport teams, including potential issues that can occur in such environments as identified in recent studies, including coaching aspects in working with such teams and problems that immigrated athletes face during their adjustment to a new environment. Chapter 3 is dedicated to a discussion of the qualitative research paradigm, which forms the philosophical basis of the research presented in this thesis, and particularly focuses on theoretical issues surrounding sampling, data collection and analysis.

The aim of this thesis is then presented in Chapter 4, which includes clear statements of the main and secondary research questions. The research in this thesis is focused on the functioning of multicultural basketball teams, with a particular focus on interpersonal relations, including relations between local and immigrated athletes, and coach-athlete relationships. Immigrated athletes, as with any other type of migrants, undergo a cultural shock and have to adjust to a new environment in order to perform on their best level in a very short period of time, all the while being constantly being pressured by their management

and local fans/media to perform at a high level. Local athletes, on the other hand, can feel threatened by new teammates and be afraid of losing their place in a team because of the presence of imported players. Coaches can also experience difficulties when working with culturally diverse teams and athletes, especially if they have never had this experience previously and are not aware of the impact that cultural diversity can have on team dynamics and personal relationships. Chapter 5 presents the methods used in the research, introduces the sample, and describes how the research process was managed and how the data were analysed. Quality indicators in this research, along with a discussion of research ethics and limitations are also presented in Chapter 5.

In order to answer the main research question (*"What are the most common challenges that occur in multicultural, elite, professional basketball teams?"*), the project explored two secondary questions (*"What challenges do immigrated elite athletes encounter in multicultural basketball teams?"* and *"What are the main problems involved with coaching multicultural basketball teams?"*) which complement each other and provide a fuller answer from different viewpoints. Six basketball teams from three Central European countries (Czech Republic, Germany and Latvia) participated in this research, with an eventual sample which included 6 coaches, 17 immigrated and 18 local players. Such qualitative methods as semi-structured interviews and observations were used in this research in order to assess the main question. Thematic analysis was used to understand the interview data, which allowed the author to define, code, and analyse several reoccurring themes in the interviews. Interviews were conducted and analysed during 2010-2012.

Data analysis, presented in Chapter 6, showed that immigrated athletes were motivated to relocate by a combination of financial gain, career aspirations, and seeking out new challenges as players. Immigrated athletes faced difficulties inside and outside of the sport context after relocation to a new country. Outside the sport context, they were struggling with language barriers, inability to find food they were used to, having troubles with locating facilities they would require (like hospitals), and occasional negative attitudes from local (majority White) populations - which was mainly directed to Black athletes. Inside the sport context, from the point of view of both local and immigrated players, there were issues with acculturation and adjustment to a new cultural environment and team structure. Local players particularly mentioned the negative impact on social team cohesion arising from the formation of exclusive ethnic subgroups among immigrated players. Also, both categories of players mentioned the differences between cultural approaches that sometimes interfere with team dynamics; while American players were used to a highly individualistic

approach towards basketball, players in European teams adapted a more collectivistic approach, which was generally supported by their coaches.

Analysis of coaches' interview showed that coaches struggle with the same issues as local players did: managing the ethnic subgroups and differences between individualistic and collectivistic approaches among American and European players. Coaches also shared their strategies on how to deal with these events in order to improve team cohesion. Another challenge that coaches mentioned was the specific impact of Black players on the coach-athlete relationship. The interview analysis confirmed a persistence of stereotypical thinking among White coaches towards Black athletes. This chapter 6 is complete with recommendations for practicing cultural sport psychologists based on the findings, as well as the literature review and the experience of the researcher.

Chapter 7 presents conclusion of the thesis, as well as the main limitations of the study, which include the relatively small size of the sample, language difficulties, exclusion of gender as a variable, and possible researcher biases during interviews and analysis, as the researcher is a White female interviewing mostly male athletes, several of whom were Black. It is thereby advised to avoid any generalisations of the result, because of the relatively small sample and sensitivity of the subject. The major implications of the study include the importance of educational program for coaches, local players and immigrant players, with a specific focus on the awareness of cultural differences in order to prevent potential conflicts in culturally diverse teams. This thesis also provides a theoretical and practical background for further research in this relatively new and under-examined area.

9. Souhrn

Tato disertační práce se zaměřuje na oblast kulturní psychologie sportu, která se v poslední době dynamicky rozvíjí (Schinke, 2010; Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009). Hlavním tématem práce jsou pak multikulturní basketbalové týmy, zejména mezilidské vztahy v kulturně různorodých družstvech a potenciální problémy, které mohou v tomto prostředí vznikat.

S postupující globalizací profesionálního sportu a zároveň vlivem rychlého nárůstu množství elitních sportovních migrantů po celém světě, mají dnes lidé pocházející z různých kultur, kteří se dříve nikdy nesetkávali, každodenní kontakt v rámci sportovní soutěže nejvyšší úrovně. Spolu s dalšími aspekty, kulturní sportovní psychologie se také zaměřuje na potenciální problémy, které mohou nastat, když se zahraniční hráči přestěhují do nové země. Dalším tématem jsou problémy nebo výzvy, které s koučováním kulturně různorodých týmů a sportovců souvisí. Proto se tato práce, vedle mnoha dalších otázek, snaží odpovědět na to, jak nejlépe v multikulturních týmech pracovat, trénovat a jak zahraniční sportovce do skupiny integrovat.

Teoretickým základem pro studium kulturně různorodých týmů, což je hlavní náplní této práce, se zabývá první kapitola, která předkládá přehled výzkumu obecné týmové dynamiky v oblasti psychologie sportu, včetně analýz týmového vývoje, několika modelů týmové soudržnosti, týmových rolí, norem a skupinové komunikace. Na začátku druhé kapitoly, která se věnuje globalizaci ve sportu a oblasti sportovní pracovní migrace, je vysvětlen fenomén kulturního obratu ve sportovní psychologii. Teoretický přehled končí analýzou multikulturních sportovních týmů, včetně náhledu na potenciální problémy, které mohou v takovém prostředí dle výzkumů nastat. Práce se také zabývá aspekty koučování takových týmů a problémy, kterým sportovní migranti musí čelit během procesu přizpůsobování se novému prostředí. Kapitola 3 je věnována diskusi o kvalitativním výzkumu, který je filozofickým základem výzkumných metod použitých v této práci, se zaměřením na teoretické otázky týkající se výběru vzorku, sběru a analýzy dat.

Cíle této práce jsou pak uvedené ve čtvrté kapitole, která představuje hlavní a vedlejší výzkumné otázky. Výzkum této dizertační práce se zabývá fungováním multikulturních basketbalových týmů se zaměřením na mezilidské vztahy, včetně vztahů mezi domácími sportovci a migranty a vztahů trenér-sportovec. Sportovní migranti, stejně jako jakýkoli jiný typ migrantů, jsou vystaveni kulturnímu šoku a jsou nuceni se novému prostředí přizpůsobit ve velmi krátké době, aby mohli hrát, jak nejlépe umí. Zároveň jsou neustále pod tlakem ze

strany vedení týmu, místních fanoušků a médií. Domácí sportovci se na druhou stranu mohou cítit ohroženi novými spoluhráči a mít obavy, že ztratí svou pozici v konkurenci se zahraničními hráči. Trenéři mohou čelit problémům při práci s kulturně rozmanitými týmy a sportovci, zejména v případě, kdy je to jejich první zkušenost a nejsou si vědomi toho, jak kulturní rozmanitost může týmovou dynamiku a osobní vztahy ovlivňovat.

Kapitola 5 předkládá metody použité při výzkumu; přestavuje vzorek a popisuje proces výzkumu a analýzy údajů. Ukazatelé kvality tohoto výzkumu, spolu s diskusí o vědecké etice a limitech výzkumu jsou rovněž v této části uvedené.

Aby bylo možné odpovědět na hlavní výzkumnou otázku („Jaké jsou nejčastější problémy, které se vyskytují v multikulturních, elitních, profesionálních basketbalových týmech?“), výzkumná analýza se zaměřila na dvě vedlejší otázky, které se vzájemně doplňují a poskytují úplnější odpověď z různých hledisek („Jakým problémům čelí elitní sportovní migranti v multikulturních basketbalových týmech?“ a „Jaké jsou hlavní problémy a výzvy, se kterými se trenéři multikulturních basketbalových týmů setkávají?“). Výzkumu se zúčastnilo šest basketbalových týmů ze tří zemí střední Evropy (Česká Republika, Německo a Lotyšsko). Vzorek zahrnoval šest trenérů, 17 zahraničních a 18 domácích hráčů. K nalezení odpovědi na hlavní výzkumnou otázku se použily kvalitativní metody semi-strukturované rozhovory a pozorování. Tematická analýza byla použita k pochopení dat získaných z rozhovorů, což autorce umožnilo definovat kód a analyzovat několik stále se objevujících témat. Rozhovory byly provedeny a analyzovány během let 2010 až 2012.

Analýza dat předložená v šesté kapitole ukázala, že motivací k migraci u zahraničních sportovců byla kombinace finančního zisku, profesní aspirace a hledání nové výzvy v profesní kariéře. Po přestěhování do nové země čelili zahraniční sportovci obtížím uvnitř i mimo sportovní kontext. Potýkali se například s jazykovou bariérou, nemožností najít známé potraviny nebo zajistit si potřebné služby (např. lékaře). Občas ale čelili i negativním postojům ze strany místní (většinou bílé) populace – které bylo především namířeny na černé sportovce. Ve sportovním kontextu, z hlediska místních i zahraničních hráčů, se vyskytovaly problémy s akulturací a adaptací na nové kulturní prostředí a na týmové struktury. Domácí hráči zejména uváděli negativní dopad na sociální kohezi týmu vlivem vytvoření exkluzivních etnických podskupin u zahraničních hráčů. Obě kategorie hráčů zmínily rozdíly mezi kulturními přístupy, které občas ovlivňovaly týmovou dynamiku – zatímco američtí hráči byli zvyklí na velmi individualistický přístup k basketbalu, hráči v evropských týmech používali více kolektivistický přístup, který jejich trenéři obecně podporovali.

Analýza rozhovorů s trenéry ukázala, že trenéři bojovali se stejnými problémy jako místní hráči: etnické podskupiny a rozdíly mezi individualistickým a kolektivistickým přístupem mezi americkými a evropskými hráči. Trenéři také uváděli své strategie, které používali na to, aby se s těmito věcmi vypořádali s cílem zlepšit týmovou soudržnost. Dalším problémem, který trenéři zmiňovali, byl vliv černých hráčů na vztah trenér-sportovec. Analýza rozhovoru potvrdila přetrvávající stereotypní myšlení mezi bílými trenéry směrem k černým sportovcům. Kapitola 6 také nabízí doporučení pro praxi kulturních sportovních psychologů na základě této studie, literární rešerše a zkušeností autorky práce.

Kapitola 7 shrnuje závěry disertační práce a uvádí hlavní limity výzkumu, jimiž je relativně malý vzorek, problémy s jazykem, vyloučení pohlaví jako proměnné, a případná zaujatost řešitelky při rozhovorech a analýzách. Řešitelkou je totiž bílá žena, která ve většině případů vedla rozhovory se sportovci mužského pohlaví, z nichž bylo několik černé pleti. Je proto třeba doporučit nezobecňovat výsledky práce, vzhledem k relativně malému vzorku a citlivému tématu.

K hlavním závěrům této studie patří důležitost vzdělávacího programu pro trenéry, místní hráče a zahraniční hráče, se zvláštním zaměřením na uvědomění si existujících kulturních rozdílů, aby se zabránilo případným konfliktům v kulturně různorodých týmech. Disertační práce poskytuje teoretické a praktické zázemí pro další výzkum v této poměrně nové a nedostatečně zkoumané oblasti.

References

Allen, J. T., Drane, D. D., Byon, K. K., & Mohn, R. S. (2010). Sport as a vehicle for socialization and maintenance of cultural identity: international students attending American universities. *Sport Management Review, 13*(4), 421–434.

American Anthropological Association (1998, May 17). *Statement on "race".* Retrieved 2.3.2014 from http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm

American Psychological Association (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377–402.

Andersen, M. B. (1993). Questionable sensitivity: a comment on Lee and Rotella. *The Sport Psychologist, 7*(1), 1–3.

Andersen, P. A. (2000). The basis of cultural differences in nonverbal communication. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel, *Intercultural communication: a reader* (pp. 293–313). Stamford, USA: Cengage Learning.

Andrews, D. L. (2013). Reflections on communication and sport: on celebrity and race. *Communication & Sport, 1*(1-2), 151–163.

Anshel, M. H. (1990). Perceptions of black intercollegiate football players: implications for the sport psychology consultant. *The Sport Psychologist, 4*(3), 235–248.

Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory Culture Society, 7*(2), 295–310.

Arrow, H., Poole, M. S., Henry, K. B., Wheelan, S., & Moreland, R. (2004). Time, change, and development: the temporal perspective on groups. *Small Group Research, 35*(1), 73–105.

Asghar, E., Wang, X., Linde, K., & Alfermann, D. (2013). Comparisons between Asian and German male adolescent athletes on goal orientation, physical self-concept, and competitive anxiety. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*(3), 229–243.

Atkinson, M. (2012). *Key concepts in sport and exercise research methods*. London: SAGE.

Baillie P. H. & Ogilvie, B. C. (2002). Working with elite athletes. In J. L. Van Raalte, & B. W. Brewer (Eds.), *Exploring Sport and Exercise Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 395–415). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bale, J., & Maguire, J. (Eds.). (1994).*The global sports arena: athletic talent migration in an interdependent world*. London: F. Cass.

Bass, B. M. (1960). *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior*. New York: Harper.

Beal, D. J., Cohen, R. R., Burke, M. J., & McLendon, C. L. (2003). Cohesion and performance in groups: a meta-analytic clarification of construct relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(6), 989–1004.

Beilock, S. L., & McConnell, A. R. (2004). Stereotype threat and sport: can athletic performance be threatened? *Journal Of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 26*(4), 597–609.

Berger, M. (1996). *Cross-cultural team building. Guidelines for more effective communication and negotiation*. London: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*(1), 5–68.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: thematic analysis and code development.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Brawley, L. R., Carron, A. V., & Widmeyer, W. N. (1992). The nature of group goals in sport teams: a phenomenological analysis. *The Sport Psychologist, 6*(4), 323–333.

Bray, S. R., Brawley, L. R., & Carron, A. V. (2002). Efficacy for interdependent role functions evidence from the sport domain. *Small Group Research, 33*(6), 644–666.

Brown, R. (2001). *Group processes: dynamics within and between groups* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brown, R., Hinkle, S., Ely, P. G., Fox-Cardamone, L., Maras, P., & Taylor, L.A. (1992). Recognizing group diversity: Individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social

orientations and their implications for intergroup processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 31*(4), 327–342.

Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.

Burley, M., & Fleming, S. (1997). Racism and regionalism in Welsh soccer. *European Physical Education Review, 3*(2), 183–194.

Butryn, T. M. (2002). Critically Examining White Racial Identity and Privilege in Sport Psychology Consulting. *The Sport Psychologist, 16*, 316–336.

Butryn, T. M. (2009). (Re)examining whiteness in sport psychology through autonarrative excavation. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 7*(3), 323–341.

Campbell, E. E., & Sonn, C. C. (2009). Transitioning into the AFL: indigenous football players' perspectives. *Athletic Insight, 11*(3). Retrieved 12.12.2013 from http://www.athleticinsight.com/Vol11Iss3/Feature.htm

Carless, S. A. & De Paola, C. (2000). The measurement of cohesion in work teams. *Small Group Research, 31*(1), 71–88.

Carron A. V., Eys M. A., & Burke, S. M. (2007). Team cohesion: nature, correlates, and development. In S. Jowett, & D. Lavallee (Ed.), *Social Psychology in Sport (*pp. 91–102). Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeller, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport: a meta analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 24*(2)*, 168–188.

Carron, A. V., Hausenblas, H. A., & Eys, M. A. (2005). *Group dynamics in sport* (3rd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: the group environment questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 7*(3), 244–266.

CIES Observatory (2013). *International Basketball Migration Report*. Retrieved 21.02.2014 from www.fiba.com/asp_scripts/downMana.asp?fileID=4240.

Cohen, S. G., & Bailey, D. E. (1997). What makes teams work: group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of management, 23*(3), 239–290.

Collins, T. (2000). From Bondi to Batley: Australian players in British rugby league 1907–1995. *Sporting Traditions, 16*(2), 71–86.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, A. C. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Cota, A. A., Evans, C. R., Dion, K. L., Kilik, L., & Longman, R. S. (1995). The structure of group cohesion. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*(6), 572–580.

Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries? *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 26*(3), 623–630.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design. Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2009) *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach.* Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into practice, 39*(3), 124–130.

Cunningham, G. B., Miner, K., & McDonald, J. (2013). Being different and suffering the consequences: the influence of head coach–player racial dissimilarity on experienced incivility. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 48*(6), 689–705.

Darby, P. (2007). African football labour migration to Portugal: colonial and neo-colonial resource. *Soccer & Society, 8*(4), 495–509.

Davis, J. W., & Bauman, K. J. (2008). *School enrollment in the United States: 2006.* Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

D'Innocenzo, M., & Sirefman, J. P. (1992). *Immigration and ethnicity: American society, "melting pot" or "salat bowl"?* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Duchesne, C., Bloom, G. A., & Sabiston, C. M. (2011). Intercollegiate coaches' experiences with elite international athletes in an American sport context. *International Journal of Coaching Science, 5*(2), 1–20.

Duda, J. L., & Allison, M. T. (1990). Cross-cultural analysis in exercise and sport psychology: a void in the field. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 12*(2), 114–131.

Eastman, S. T., & Billings, A. C. (2001). Biased voices of sports: racial and gender stereotyping in college basketball announcing. *Howard Journal of Communications, 12*(4), 183–201.

Elliott, R. (2012). New Europe, new chances? The migration of professional footballers to Poland's Ekstraklasa. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 48*(6), 736–750.

Elliott, R., & Weedon, G. (2010). Foreign players in the English Premier Academy League: 'Feet-drain' or 'feet-exchange'? *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 46*(1), 61–75.

Evans, C. R., & Dion, K. L. (1991). Group cohesion and performance: a meta-analysis. *Small Group Research, 22*(2), 175–186.

Eys, M. A., & Carron, A. V. (2001). Role ambiguity, task cohesion, and task self-efficacy. *Small Group Research, 32*(3), 356–373.

Eys, M. A., Burke, S. M., Carron, A. V., & Dennis, P. W. (2010). The sport team as an effective group. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (6th ed., pp. 132–148). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eys, M. A., Carron, A. V., Beauchamp, M. R., & Bray, S. R. (2003). Role Ambiguity in Sport Teams. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 25*, 534–550.

Eys, M. A., Carron, A. V., Bray, S. R., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2003). Role ambiguity and athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 21*(5), 391–401.

Fallon, A. (1990). Culture in the mirror: sociocultural determinants of body image. In T.F. Cash, & T. Pruzinsky (Eds.), *Body images: Development, deviance, and change* (pp. 80-109). New York: Guilford Press.

Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Feldman, D. C. (1984). The Development and Enforcement of Group Norms. *The Academy of Management Review, 9*(1), 47–53.

Fiske, S. T. (2009). *Social Beings. Core motives in social psychology* (2nd ed.). NJ: Wiley.

Flick, U. (2014). *An Introduction to qualitative research* (5th ed.). London: SAGE.

Gelfand, M. J., & Realo, A. (1999). Individualism-collectivism and accountability in intergroup negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(5), 721–736.

Gersick, C. J. G. (1988). Time and transition in work teams: toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*(1), 9–41.

Gibbs, R. G. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Gienow-Hecht, J. C. E. (2006). A European considers the influence of American culture. *Global Issues: The Challenges of Globalization, 11*(1), 30–33. Retrieved 20.4.2013 from http://seoul.usembassy.gov/uploads/lm/1R/lm1RIU_wiNwj9G5Ylaevyg/The-Challenges-of-Globalization.pdf

Gill, D. L. (2000). *Psychological dynamics of sport and exercise* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Gill, D. L., & Williams, L. (2008). *Psychological Dynamics of Sport and Exercise* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The qualitative report, 8*(4), 597–607.

Granito V. J., & Rainey, D. W. (1988). Differences in cohesion between high school and college football teams and starters and nonstarters. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 66*(2), 471–477.

Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2010). *Research methods for sport studies*. London: Routledge.

Greenfield, P. M., Davis, H. M., Suzuki, L., & Boutakidis, I. (2002). Understanding intercultural relations on multiethnic high school sports teams. In M. Gatz, M. A. Messner, S. Ball-Rokeach (Eds.), *Paradoxes of Youth and Sport* (pp. 141–157). New York: Albany.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Culture and interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park: SAGE.

Gundlach, M., Zivnuska, S., & Stoner, J. (2006). Understanding the relationship between individualism–collectivism and team performance through an integration of social identity theory and the social relations model. *Human Relations, 59*(12), 1603–1632.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Gorden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life. The Other Dimension of Time*. NY: Ancor books.

Hall, E. T. (1997). *Beyond Culture*. NY: Ancor books.

Hall, E. T. (2010). Monochronic and polycronic time. In L. Samovar, R. Porter, & E. McDaniel *"Intercultural Communication: A Reader"* (pp. 313–319). Stamford, USA: Cengage Learning.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences: Germans, French and Americans*. Boston: Intercultural Press.

Hall, R. E. (2002). The bell curve: Implications for the performance of Black/White athletes. *The Social Science Journal. 39*(1), 113–118.

Hanin, Y. L., (1992). Social psychology and sport: communication processes in top performance teams. *Sport Science Review, 1*(2), 13–28.

Hannerz, U. (1990) Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture & Society, 7*(2)*, 237–251.

Hanrahan, S. (2011). Sport psychology services are multicultural encounters: differences as strengths in therapeutic relationships. In D. Gilbourne, & M. Andersen (Eds.), *Critical essays in applied sport psychology* (pp. 145–156). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hendl, J. (2005). *Úvod do kvalitativního výzkumu*. Praha: Portál.

Hogenová, A. (2001). *K problematice jinakosti: sport, olympismus, nacionalismus a sjednocení Evropy.* Praha: Olympijská knihovnička.

Horne, J., Tomlinson, A., Whannel, G., & Woodward, K. (2013). *Understanding sport: a socio-cultural analysis.* London: Routledge.

Howitt, D. (2010). *Introduction to qualitative methods in psychology*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

Ito, E., Nogawa, H., Kitamura, K., & Walker, G. J. (2011). 'The role of leisure in the assimilation of Brazilian immigrants into Japanese society: acculturation and structural assimilation through judo participation'. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science, 9,* 8–14.

Jarvie, G. (2006). *Sport, Culture and Society*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, D. L., Hallinan, C. J., & Westerfield, R. C. (1999). Picturing success: photographs and stereotyping in men's collegiate basketball. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*(1), 45–53.

Jones, I., Brown, L., & Holloway, I. (2013). *Qualitative research in sport and physical activity.* London: SAGE.

Jones, R. L. (2002). The black experience within English semiprofessional soccer. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 26*(1), 47–65.

Jowett, S., & Frost, T. (2007). Race/ethnicity in the all-male coach-athlete relationship: black footballers' narratives. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 5*(3), 255–269.

Kalman, Y. M., Ravid, G., Raban, D. R., & Rafaeli, S. (2006). Pauses and response latencies: a chronemic analysis of asynchronous cmc. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 12*(1), 1–23.

Kassing, J. W., & Infante, D. A. (1999). Aggressive communication in the coach-athlete relationship. *Communication Research Reports, 16*(2), 110–120.

Katz, N., & Koenig, G. (2001). Sports teams as a model for workplace teams: lessons and liabilities / executive commentary. *The Academy of Management Executive, 15*(3), 56–69.

Kernan, C. L., & Greenfiled, P. M. (2005). Becoming a team - individualism, collectivism, ethnicity, and group socialization. *Ethos, 33*(4), 542–566.

Khomutova, A. (2009). Cizinec ve sportovním týmu. Diplomová práce, Univerzita Palackého, Filozofická fakulta, Olomouc.

Kolman, L., Noorderhaven, N. G., Hofstede, G., & Dienes, E. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in Central Europe. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18*(1), 76–88.

Kontos, A. P. (2009). Multicultural psychology in the United States. In R. J. Schinke, & S. J. Hanrahan (Eds.), *Cultural Sport Psychology* (pp. 103–116). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kontos, A. P., & Arguello, E. (2005). Sport psychology consulting with Latin American athletes. *Athletic Insight, 7*(3), 36–49.

Kontos, A. P., & Breland-Noble, A. M. (2002). Racial/ethnic diversity in applied sport psychology: a multicultural introduction to working with athletes of color. *The Sport Psychologist, 16*(3), 296–315.

Krueger, J. (1996). Personal beliefs and cultural stereotypes about racial characteristics. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 71*(3), 536–548.

Lake, A. J., Staiger, P. K., & Glowinski, H. (2000). Effect of western culture on women's attitudes to eating and perceptions of body shape. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 27*(1), 83–89.

Lapchik, R. (2012). *The 2012 racial and gender report card: national basketball association.* Retrieved 12.2.2014 from http://www.tidesport.org/RGRC/2012/2012_NBA_RGRC%5B1%5D.pdf

Lapchik, R. (2013). *The 2013 racial and gender report card: national basketball association*. Retrieved 12.2.2014 from http://www.tidesport.org/RGRC/2013/2013_NFL_RGRC.pdf

Lavallee, D., Kremer, J., Moran, K., & Williams, M. (2012). *Sport psychology. Contemporary themes* (2nd ed.). Basingstocke: Palgrave Macmillan.

LaVoi, N. M. (2007). Interpersonal communication and conflict in the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett, & D. Lavallee (Ed.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 29–40). Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Lawrence, S. M. (2005). African American athletes' experiences of race in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 40*(1), 99–110.

Lee, C. C., & Rotella, R. J. (1991). Special concerns and considerations for sport psychology consulting with black student athletes. *The Sport Psychologist, 5*(4), 365–369.

Lewis, R. (1999). *Cross-cultural communication – a visual approach*. London: Axis Europe Limited.

Lloyd, A. P. (1987). Multicultural counseling: does it belong in a counselor education program? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 26*(3), 164–167.

Locke, E. A., Frederick, E., Lee, C., Bobko, P. (1984). Effect of self-efficacy, goals, and task strategies on task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*(2), 241–251.

Locke, E. A., Shaw, K. N., Saari, L. M., & Latham, G. P. (1981). Goal setting and task performance: 1969–1980. *Psychological Bulletin, 90*(1), 125–152.

Mabry, E. A., & Barnes, R. E. (1980). *The dynamics of small group communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Magee J., & Sugden, J. (2002). "The world at their feet". Professional football and international labor migration. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 26*(4), 421–437.

Maguire, J. A. (1988). Race and position assignment in English soccer: a preliminary analysis of ethnicity and sport in Britain. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 5*(3), 257–269.

Maguire, J. (1990). More than a sporting touchdown: the making of American football in England 1982–1990. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 7*(3), 213–237.

Maguire, J. (1994). Preliminary observations on globalisation and the migration of sport labour. *The Sociological Review, 42*(3), 452–480.

Maguire, J. (1996). Blade runners: canadian migrants, ice hockey and the global sports process. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 21*(3), 335–360.

Maguire, J. (1999). *Global sport: identities, societies, civilizations*. Cambridge: Polity.

Maguire, J., & Stead, D. (1996). Far pavilions?: Cricket migrants, foreign sojourns and contested identities. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 31*(1), 1–23.

Maguire, J., & Stead, D. (1998). Border crossings: soccer labour migration and the European Union. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 33*(1), 59–73.

Malcolm, D. (2008). *The SAGE Dictionary of Sports Studies*. London: SAGE.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224–253.

Marshall, M. N. (1996). Sampling for qualitative research. *Family Practice, 13*(6), 522–525.

Martens, M. P., Mobley, M., & Zizzi, S. J. (2000). Multicultural training in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist, 14*(1), 81–97.

Martin, L. J., Carron, A. V., & Burke, S. M. (2009). Team building interventions in sport: a meta-analysis. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review, 5*(2), 3–18.

Martin, L. J., Paradis, K. F., Eys, M. A., & Evans, B. (2013). Cohesion in sport: new directions for practitioners. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 4*(1), 14–25.

Massey, D., & Taylor, J. (Eds.). (2004). *International imigration*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Matveev, A. V., & Nelson, P. E. (2004). Cross cultural communication competence and multicultural team performance perceptions of American and Russian managers. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 4*(2), 253–270.

McGovern, P. (2000). The Irish brawn drain: English league clubs and Irish footballers, 1946–1995. *The British Journal of Sociology, 51*(3), 401–418.

Mezřícký, V. (Ed.). (2003). *Globalizace*. Praha: Portál.

Miovský, M. (2006). *Kvalitativní přístup a metody v psychologickém výzkumu*. Praha: Grada.

Møller, J., & Andersen, J. S. (1998). *Society's watchdog or showbiz' pet?: Inspiration for a better sports journalism.* Vingsted, Denmark: Danish Gymnastics and Sports Associations.

Molnar, G. (2006). Mapping migrations: Hungary related migrations of professional footballers after the collapse of communism. *Soccer & Society, 7*(4), 463–485.

Moran, R. T., Harris, P. R., & Moran, S. V. (2010). *Managing cultural differences: global leadership strategies for cross-cultural business success*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Newin, J., Bloom, G. A., & Loughead, T. M. (2008). Youth ice hockey coaches' perceptions of a team-building intervention program. *The Sport Psychologist, 22*(1), 54–72.

NHL international (2013). Retrieved 2.09.2013 from http://www.nhl.com/ice/page.htm?id=26372

Orbe, M. P. (1994). "Remember, it's always whites' ball": descriptions of African American male communication. *Communication Quarterly, 42*(3), 287–300.

Panteli, N., & Davison, R. N. (2005). The role of subgroups in the communication patterns of global virtual teams. *Professional Communication, IEEE Transactions on*, 48(2), 191–200.

Pedersen, P. (1995). *The five stages of culture shock: critical incidents around the world*. Westport: Praeger.

Pells, R. (2006). Is American culture "American"? *Global Issues: The Challenges of Globalization, 11*(1), 25–30. Retrieved 20.4.2013 from http://seoul.usembassy.gov/uploads/lm/1R/lm1RIU_wiNwj9G5Ylaevyg/The-Challenges-of-Globalization.pdf

Pfister, G. (2003). Cultural confrontations: German Turnen, Swedish Gymnastics and English sport–European diversity in physical activities from a historical perspective. *Culture, Sport, Society*, 6(1), 61–91.

Poli, R. (2007). The Denationalization of sport: de-ethnicization of the nation and identity deterritorialization. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 10(4), 646–661.

Poli, R., Ravenel, L., & Besson, R. (2013) *Cies Football Observatory. Annual Review*. Retrieved 3.3.2014 from http://www.football-observatory.com/IMG/pdf/AR2013_exc-3.pdf

Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Analysing qualitative data. *Qualitative research in health care, 320*(7227), 114–116.

Powell, J., & Lovelock, R. (1991). Negotiating with agencies. In G. Allan & C. Skinner (Eds.), *Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences* (pp. 128–139). London: Falmer.

Prapavesiss, H., & Carron, A. V. (1997). Sacrifice, cohesion, and conformity to norms in sport teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1*(3), 231–240.

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (Eds.). (1999). *Cultural divides. Understanding and overcoming group conflict.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rail, G. (1987). Perceived role characteristics and executive satisfaction in voluntary sport associations. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 9*(4), 376–384.

Ram, N., Starek, J., & Johnson, J. (2004). Race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation: still a void in sport and exercise psychology? *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 26*(2), 250–268.

Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., & Lee, H. K. (1996). Variations in collectivism and individualism by ingroup and culture: Confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 1037–1054.

Robinson T. T., & Carron, A. V. (1982) Personal and situational factors associated with dropping out versus maintaining participation in competitive sport. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 4,* 364–378.

Robinson, W.I. (2007). Theories of globalization. In G. Ritzer, *The Blackwell companion to globalization* (pp. 125–143). New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Roper, E. (2002). Women working in applied domain: Examining the gender bias in applied sport psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14*(1), 53–66.

Rowe, D. (2003). Sport and the repudiation of the global. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 38*(3), 281–294.

Ryba, T. V., Schinke, R. J., & Tenenbaum, G. (Eds.).(2010). *The cultural turn in sport psychology*. West Virginia University: Fitness Information Technology.

Ryba, T. V., Stambulova, N., Si, G., & Schinke, R. J. (2013). ISSP Position Stand: culturally competent research and practice in sport and exercise psychology. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*(2), 123–142.

Ryba, T. V., & Wright, H. K. (2005). From mental game to cultural praxis: a cultural studies model's implications for the future of sport psychology. *Quest, 57*(2), 192–212.

Schinke, R. J. (Ed.). (2010). *Contemporary sport psychology*. New York: Nova Science Pub Inc.

Schinke, R. J. (2011). Consideration for culturally relevant coaching practice. *Coaches Plan, 18*(1), 44–47.

Schinke, R. J., & Hanrahan, S. J. (2009). *Cultural sport psychology*. Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Schinke, R. J., Gauthier, A. P., Dubuc, N. J., & Crowder, T. (2007). Understanding athlete adaptation in the National Hockey League through an archival data source. *The Sport Psychologist, 21*(3), 277–287.

Schinke, R. J., & McGannon, K. R. (2013). The acculturation experiences of (and with) immigrant athletes. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 12*(1), 64–75.

Schinke, R. J., McGannon, K. R., Battochio, R. C., & Wells, G. D. (2013). Acculturation in elite sport: a thematic analysis of immigrant athletes and coaches. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 31*(15), 1676–1686.

Schinke, R. J., Michel, G., Gauthier, A. P., Pickard, P., Danielson, R., Peltier, D., Pheasant, C., Enosse, L., & Peltier, M. (2006). The adaptation to the mainstream in elite sport: a Canadian Aboriginal perspective. *The Sport Psychologist, 20*(4), 435–448.

Schinke, R. J., Ryba, T. V., Danielson, R., Michel, G., Pickard, P., Peltier, D., Enosse, L., Pheasant, C., & Peltier, M. (2007). Canadian aboriginal elite athletes: the experiences of being coached in mainstream cultures. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 5*(2), 123–141.

Schinke, R. J., Yukelson, D., Bartolacci, G., Battochio, R. C., & Johnstone, K. (2011). The challenges encountered by immigrated elite athletes. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 2*(1), 10–20.

Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization: a critical introduction*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan Limited.

Schutz, W. C. (1961). On group composition. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*(2), 275–281.

Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 5(4), 465–478.

Sekot. A. (2008). *Sociologické problémy sportu*. Praha: Grada.

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (Rev. ed.). (1956). *An outline of social psychology.* New York: Harper & Row.

Sidanius, J., Levin, S., Rabinowitz, J. L., & Federico, C. M. (1999). Peering into the jaws of the beast: the integrative dynamics of social identity, symbolic racism, and social dominance. In D. A. Prentice, & D. T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural Divides. Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 80–132). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Slepička, P., Hošek, V., & Hátlová, B. (2006). *Psychologie sportu.* Praha: Karolinum.

Smith, B. (2010). Narrative inquiry: ongoing conversations and questions for sport and exercise psychology research. *International review of sport and exercise psychology, 3*(1), 87–107.

Solomon, G. B., Wiegardt, P. A., Yusuf, F. R., Kosmitzki, C., Williams, J., Stevens, C. E., & Wayda, V. K. (1996). Expectancies and ethnicity: the self-fulfilling prophecy in college basketball. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18*(1), 83–88.

Sparkes, A. C., & Smith, B. (2009). Judging the quality of qualitative inquiry: criteriology and relativism in action. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*(5), 491–497.

Stodolska, M., & Alexandris, K. (2004). The role of recreational sport in the adaptation of first generation immigrants in the United States. *Journal of Leisure Research, 36*(3), 379–413.

Stone, J., Perry, Z. W., & Darley, J. M. (1997). "White men can't jump": evidence for the perceptual confirmation of racial stereotypes following a basketball game. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 19*(3), 291–306.

Sullivan, P., & Feltz, D. L. (2003). The preliminary development of the Scale for Effective Communication in Team Sports (SECTS). *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*(8), 1693–1715.

Sullivan, P. (2004). Communication differences between male and female team sport athletes. *Communication Reports, 17*(2), 121–128.

Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: applications and effectiveness. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 120–133.

Taylor, M. (2006). Global players? Football, migration and globalization, c. 1930-2000. *Historical Social Research, 31*(1), 7–30.

Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist, 51*(4), 407–415.

Válek, J. (2011). Specifika emigračních vln československých vrcholových sportovců v letech 1948–1989. *Česká kinantropologie, 15*(4), 29–38.

Walseth, K. (2008). Bridging and bonding social capital in sport—experiences of young women with an immigrant background. *Sport, Education and Society, 13*(1), 1–17.

Walther, J. B., & Tidwell, L. C. (1995). Nonverbal cues in computer-mediated communication, and the effect of chronemics on relational communication. *Journal of Organizational Computing, 5*(4), 355–378.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization.* London: Routledge.

Widmeyer, W. N., Brawley, L. R., & Carron, A. V. (1985). *The measurement of cohesion in sports teams: the group environment questionnaire*. London, Ontario: Sports Dynamics.

Wiese, D. M., Weiss, M. R., & Yukelson, D. P. (1991). Sport psychology in the training room: a survey of athletic trainers. *Sport Psychologist, 5*(1), 15–24.

Williams, G. (1994). The road to Wigan Pier revisited: the migration of Welsh rugby talent since 1918. In J. Bale & J. Maguire (Eds.), *The global sports arena: athletic talent migration in an interdependent world* (pp. 25–38). London: Frank Cass.

Williams, R. L., & Youssef, Z. I. (1979). Race and position assignment in high school, college and professional football. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 10*(4), 252–258.

Woldoff, R. A., Wiggins, Y. M., & Washington, H. M. (2011). Black collegians at a rural predominantly white institution: toward a place-based understanding of black students' adjustment to college. *Journal of Black Studies, 42*(7) 1047–1079.

Yambor, J., & Connelly, D. (1991). Issues confronting female sport psychology consultants working with male student-athletes. *The Sport Psychologist, 5*(4), 304–312.

Yardley, L. (2000). Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychology & Health, 15*(2), 215–228.

Young, K., & Atkinson, M. (Eds.) (2012). *Qualitative research on sport and physical culture*. Emerald: Bingley, UK.

Yukelson, D. (1997). Principles of effective team building interventions in sport: a direct services approach at Penn State University. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 9*(1), 73–96.

Yukelson, D. (2010). Communicating effectively. In Williams, J. (Ed.) *Applied sport psychology. Personal growth to peak performance* (6th ed., pp. 149–165). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix 1 - Participants

Participant	Age	Sex	Nationality	Current country
CO1	N/A	male	N/A	Latvia
CO2	N/A	male	N/A	Latvia
CO3	N/A	male	N/A	Germany
CO4	N/A	male	N/A	Germany
CO5	N/A	male	N/A	Czech Republic
CO6	N/A	male	N/A	Czech Republic
IP1	28	female	American (Black)	Latvia
IP2	24	female	American (Black)	Latvia
IP3	18	male	American (Black)	Latvia
IP4	25	male	American (Black)	Latvia
IP5	22	male	American (Black)	Latvia
IP6	23	male	Belorussian	Latvia
IP7	24	female	American (Black)	Germany
IP8	30	male	Serbian	Germany
IP9	24	male	American (Black)	Germany
IP10	31	male	American (Black)	Germany
IP11	35	male	American (Black)	Germany
IP12	20	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
IP13	25	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
IP14	27	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
IP15	25	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
IP16	33	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
IP17	28	male	American (Black)	Czech Republic
LP1	20	male	Latvian	Latvia
LP2	23	male	Latvian	Latvia
LP3	24	male	Latvian	Latvia
LP4	27	female	Latvian	Latvia
LP5	24	female	Latvian	Latvia
LP6	27	male	German	Germany
LP7	25	male	German	Germany

LP8	19	male	German	Germany
LP9	18	male	German	Germany
LP10	28	female	German	Germany
LP11	25	female	German	Germany
LP12	31	female	German	Germany
LP13	21	male	Czech	Czech Republic
LP14	30	male	Czech	Czech Republic
LP15	24	male	Czech	Czech Republic
LP16	23	male	Czech	Czech Republic
LP17	25	male	Czech	Czech Republic
LP18	25	male	Czech	Czech Republic

Legend:

CO – coach

IP – immigrated player

LP – local player

Appendix 2 - Example of questions for semi-structured interviews with immigrated players

How long have you been playing basketball?

Can you describe your previous team experience (domestic and foreign)?

Why did you move to another country to play basketball?

Can you compare this experience with your current team?

What were the obstacles that you have faced in a new country? How did you overcome them?

How close do you feel to your teammates and coach?

Which players are the most close to you? Why?

With which players do you have the least contact?

What do you appreciate about your teammates / coach?

Is there anything you dislike about your teammates / coach?

Do you spend time with team after the training?

Do you feel like a member of the team?

Are there any small groups inside the team? What does connect people there?

Is it important for you to have a close relationship with your teammates / coach?

Do you perceive your team as a unit?

Do you think the atmosphere in the team can be improved? How?

Is there is anything missing in the team which can improve the efficacy?

How would you describe the atmosphere in your current team? Can it be improved?

What is the most common cause of the conflicts in the team?

Do you think the attitude towards you is based upon your nationality?

In which language do you communicate inside the team?

Do you prefer to communicate with the players of your own nationality?

How the communication between the players / players and the coach can be improved?

Do you think the knowledge of the language of the country you play in is important?

Appendix 3 - Example of questions for semi-structured interviews with local players

How long have you been playing basketball?

Can you describe your previous team experience (domestic and foreign)?

Can you compare this experience with your current team?

What can foreign players bring to the team?

What obstacles do you think foreign players can face in a new country?

Do you help foreign players to integrate to the team?

What can foreign players do in order to fit in more?

How close do you feel to your teammates and coach?

Which players are the most close to you? Why?

With which players do you have the least contact?

Is there anything you dislike about your teammates / coach?

Do you spend time with team after the training?

Are there any small groups inside the team? What does connect people there?

Is it important for you to have a close relationship with your teammates / coach?

Do you perceive your team as a unit?

Do you think the atmosphere in the team can be improved? How?

Is there is anything missing in the team which can improve the efficacy?

Do you think your team is successful?

How would you describe the atmosphere in your current team? Can it be improved?

Do you prefer to communicate with the players of your own nationality?

What is the most common cause of the conflicts in the team?

How are the conflicts solved in your team?

Do you think the attitude towards foreign players is based upon their nationality?

In which language do you communicate inside the team?

Appendix 4 - Example of questions for semi-structured interviews with coaches

How long have you been coaching?

Have you ever played or coached abroad?

What can foreign players bring to the team?

What obstacles do you think foreign players can face in a new country?

Do you help foreign players to integrate to the team?

What can foreign players do in order to integrate more?

Which players are the most close to you? Why?

With which players do you have the least contact?

Does your team spend time together after the training?

Are there any small groups inside the team? What does connect people there?

Do you try to prevent these small teams?

Do you perceive your team as a unit?

Do you think the atmosphere in the team can be improved? How?

Is there is anything missing in the team which can improve the efficacy?

Do you think your team is successful?

What is the most common cause of the conflicts in the team?

How are the conflicts solved in your team?

In which language do you communicate inside the team?