

“SO YOU ‘WANNA BE A ‘BALL COACH?’” JOB SATISFACTION AND PERCEIVED ROLE
CONFLICT OF MILLENNIAL GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES IN DIVISION I-FBS
FOOTBALL

Elvin Jarrod James

A thesis submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill
2018

Approved by:

Erianne A. Weight

Robert Malekoff

André L. Williams

© 2018
Elvin Jarrod James
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Elvin Jarrod James: “*So You ‘Wanna be a ‘Ball Coach?’*” Job Satisfaction and Perceived Role Conflict of Millennial Graduate Assistant Coaches in Division I-FBS Football
(Under the direction of Erianne Weight)

Researchers modified the *Spector Job Satisfaction Survey* to determine job satisfaction of millennial graduate assistant (GA) football coaches at the Division I-FBS level and gauge role conflict. Researchers analyzed satisfaction using descriptive statistics software. Millennial GAs were overall satisfied with their jobs, but least satisfied with their pay. A leading number of millennial GAs found being able to coach football most rewarding about their job (31%). Ninety-three percent of GAs reported that obtaining a Master’s degree was important. Only 61% believed they could complete their graduate program. This research suggests the NCAA and membership institution administrators should review its compensation and educational policies to ensure GAs are compensated and protected in their roles as both a student and a coach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my Mom, Dad, and Sister for constantly instilling in me the importance of my education. I am sincerely grateful to Coach Larry Fedora, Coach Chris Kapilovic, and the entire Carolina Football Family for supporting my academic and professional endeavors. I would like to express my immense gratitude to the professors and cohorts of the Sport Administration Graduate Program in the department of Exercise and Sport Science for investing in my growth as a scholar, coach, and human being. In conclusion, I am grateful to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where I have been blessed to call home for seven years of my life as a student, for the lessons it has taught me that have shaped the course of my life forever. Go Heels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER 1	1
Statement of Purpose	2
Research Question	2
Assumption	3
Definition of Terms	3
CHAPTER 2	5
The Business of Division I-FBS Football	5
Job Satisfaction in College Athletic Coaches	7
The Millennial Demographic	9
Graduate Assistant Football Coaches in Intercollegiate Athletics	12
Theoretical Framework	16
Gaps in Literature	18

CHAPTER 3	20
Participants	20
Instrumentation	21
Reliability and Validity	23
Data Analysis	25
CHAPTER 4	27
Overview	27
Review of Literature	29
<i>The Business of Division I-FBS Football</i>	29
<i>Job Satisfaction in College Athletic Coaches</i>	32
<i>The Millennial Demographic</i>	34
<i>Graduate Assistant Football Coaches in Intercollegiate Athletics</i>	35
Conceptional Rationale	39
Significance of this Study	41
<i>Research Questions</i>	41
Method	42
<i>Instrument Design</i>	42
<i>Data Collection</i>	45
<i>Data Analysis</i>	46
Results	47

Discussion & Implications	52
Limitations & Future Research	54
Conclusion.....	55
APPENDIX 1: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE.....	57
APPENDIX 2: SUB-FACTOR BREAKDOWN AND ANALYSIS.....	61
REFERENCES.....	62

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

D I-FBS	Division I Football Bowl Subdivision
GA	Graduate assistant coach (football)
GAAT	Graduate Assistant Athletic Trainer
NCAA	National Collegiate Athletic Association

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I-Football Bowl Subdivision (DI-FBS) football is a profitable, professional, and hypercompetitive industry in which the stress to perform may interfere with personal well-being. Both head and assistant coaches, offered lucrative contracts despite limited job security, face pressure to win while staying within the realms of NCAA compliance, recruiting talented student-athletes, and ensuring the growth and development of their student-athletes outside of football (Holmes, 2011). Their failure in anyone of these areas could cost them their jobs. Amongst their responsibilities, coaches may not have time to consider the well-being and professional development of the lowest member of their staff, the entry-level graduate assistant coach (GA).

Coaches, who may not see how they could fully maximize their GAs potential for the better of their football program, may assign GAs to roles that seem insignificant to the employee. To the GA, miscellaneous, lengthy, and/or ambiguous tasks could be interpreted as meaningless and disrespectful, affecting the GAs motivation to work (Dunn & Dunn, *The Graduate Assistant Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making*, 1997). For Division I-FBS coaches, demanding millennial GAs to complete such tasks runs the risk of diverting qualified millennials away from the coaching profession (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). In addition, with GAs also having academic responsibilities, assigning GAs with ambiguous work tasks could further increase their perceived role conflict, negatively affecting their job satisfaction (Dunn & Dunn, *The Graduate Assistant*

Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making, 1997). Considering the influx of millennials entering the workforce (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016), monitoring the job satisfaction of millennial GAs could affect the quality and retention of future coaches at the Division I-FBS level. Considering the need for additional football coaches addressed by the NCAA (NCAA, 2017), utilizing GAs by minimizing their role conflict and maximizing their professional development could help intercollegiate football programs create a more productive football staff.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research was to analyze the job satisfaction and perceived role conflict of millennial graduate assistant football coaches on the Division I-FBS level. To achieve this, statistical analyses were completed to determine which factors most influenced millennial GAs job satisfaction. Millennial GAs perception towards a Master's degree was also investigated to further gauge perceived role conflict based on their academic responsibilities.

Research Question

Based on the review of literature, the following research questions guided this study:

- RQ 1.** What is the overall job satisfaction of millennial graduate assistant football coaches across the entire Division I-FBS level?
- RQ 2.** Based on statistical significance, what are millennial Division I-FBS graduate assistant football coaches' satisfaction with sub-factor(s) found within a job satisfaction scale?
- RQ 3.** What are millennial graduate assistant football coaches' perception of a Master's degree based on qualitative and quantitative data?

Assumption

1. The research methods used in this study are valid and reliable.
2. Survey participants answered the survey questions truthfully and completely.

Definition of Terms

1. **Graduate Assistant Coach (GA)** - A graduate assistant coach in Division I-FBS football is as any coach who has received a baccalaureate degree, exhausted their athletics eligibility within the previous seven years, and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of their employing institution (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). GAs are not required to enroll in a specific graduate degree program unless required by their institution. In the event that a GA must take part in a graduate program, the NCAA generally requires at least 50% enrollment of the institution's minimum regular graduate degree program of studies. The NCAA considers GAs failure to complete 50% of the institution's minimum regular program an institutional violation of the NCAA constitution.
2. **Millennial** –Millennials are individuals born between 1977-1995 (The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017).
3. **Job satisfaction** – Based on the functional definition used by Ervin and Cianfrone (2014), “job satisfaction” is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences.
4. **Motivators** – “Motivators” are factors that bring work satisfaction to employees (Chelladurai, 2009).

5. **Dissatisfiers/hygienes** – The terms “dissatisfiers” and “hygienes” describe factors that evoke negative stress and demotivate employees (Chelladurai, 2009; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959)
6. **Role conflict** – Role conflict is the concurrent appearance of two or more incompatible expectations for the behavior of a person (Biddle, 1986).
7. **Role ambiguity** – Role ambiguity is the condition in which expectations are insufficient enough to guide behavior (Biddle, 1986).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Business of Division I-FBS Football

Division I-FBS colleges have reported increased overall spending in their athletic departments, with football accounting for a majority of the increased spending (Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2017). The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2017) reported that the FBS median for football spending per scholarship football player increased by 66% between 2005 and 2015, from \$57,971 to \$126,227 respectively.

Division I-FBS programs, primarily in the Power Five conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten, Big 12, Pacific 12, and Southeastern Conference), generate revenue from media rights contracts with broadcasting companies who televise, stream, or air their games. In a research study analyzing the fees paid by rights holders to broadcast football games, researchers generated a model that determined the most valuable college football programs based on rights fees, as well as predictors for the value of a college football team (Jensen & Turner, 2015). According to Jensen and Turner (2015), the top twenty-five college football programs valued between \$17 million to over \$24 million in media rights fees.

Athletic departments pay substantial amounts to their football coaches for the success of their teams. The Knight Commission (2017) reported that the FBS median for football coaching salaries per athletic scholarship football player increased by 78% from 2005-2015. The number of head coaches earning more than \$1 million per year before receiving their bonuses grew from

forty-one in 2006 to seventy-two in 2014 (Hoffman, 2015). By 2014, more than seventy head coaches out of the 128 Division I-FBS schools earned at least \$1 million. Twenty-one head coaches earned \$1 million, twenty-four earned \$2 million, sixteen made \$3 million, and eleven made \$4-\$7 million. According to USA Today (2016), the highest paid coach in Division I-FBS football, Jim Harbaugh of the University of Michigan, received a total of \$9,004,000. The second highest paid coach that year, Nick Saban of the University of Alabama, received \$6,939,395. Urban Meyer of Ohio State University, the third highest paid coach in 2016, received \$6,094,800. This distribution of wealth was also shared amongst select assistant coaches. The top three highest paid assistant coaches each received annual salaries of more than \$1.3 million (USA Today, 2016).

Research by both Pope and Pope (2009), and Cox and Roden (2010) supported the idea that increased athletic success in major revenue sports resulted in an increase in applications and a higher quality of applicants for a university. According to research conducted by Cox and Roden (2010), the average college ranking from *U.S. News & World Report* for schools two years after winning a national championship in football or basketball increased by approximately seven slots. Analyzing schools that had won a national championship in either football or basketball (both major revenue generating sports), they also saw that schools two years post-winning a national championship in either football or basketball reported an increase in overall applications and quality of applicants. Pope and Pope (2009) also supported a correlation between sports success and increases in student applications. In their research, schools with a top twenty ranking in football each year between 1980 and 2002 had a 2-8% increase in quantity of applicants. Demographically, males, African-Americans, and former high school student-athletes

were more likely to be influenced by sports success when applying to a university compared to their peers.

Money spent and generated in Division I-FBS football and its impact on university metrics (Cox & Roden, 2010; Pope & Pope, 2009) have intensified the stakes of football wins and losses. Research by Holmes (2011) supports the idea that college athletic departments give football coaches approximately four years to establish a successful program before their job is in question. Holmes (2011) found that out of 196 FBS Division I head football coaches from 1983-2006, one-third (68) of all dismissals occurred within the coaches' first four years. Fifty of those head coaches were released after the fifth year of their tenure. Schools that had a standing tradition of success in football were more likely to dismiss their coaches for failing to win games. For the college football coach, winning provides an element of job security.

Understanding the magnitude of Division I-FBS football from a financial and institutional perspective reveals the high-stakes nature of intercollegiate football. Wins on the football field translate into increased financial rewards and greater positive public perception for a university. Losses on the field result in unemployment for the football staff (Holmes, 2011). The prolonged stress of this type of work environment may negatively affect football coaches, which could in turn affect the job satisfaction of the millennial graduate assistant. Millennial graduate assistants must understand the pressurized nature of Division I-FBS football in order to decide if it is a proper work environment for them.

Job Satisfaction in College Athletic Coaches

Empirical research demonstrates that the stressors of college athletics at the Division I-FBS level must be managed by coaches in order to maintain positive job satisfaction

and cope with potential burnout (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Kim (2004) found a statistically significant correlation between job stress and job satisfaction for Division I college coaches in football, basketball, baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball, and tennis; coaches who had high job stress were less satisfied. In a critical review of literature pertaining to stress in sports coaches, Fletcher and Scott (2010) concluded that coaches at the Division I level encountered greater performance-related and organizational-related stressors than those who competed at levels below Division I, such as NAIA. Frey (2007) reported nine themes that arose as sources of stress in Division I coaches in baseball, basketball, diving, softball, swimming, tennis, and volleyball: interpersonal/personal sources; other people; sources that would lead to quitting; task-related sources; recruiting; time demands; being the head coach; outcome of competition; and self-imposed stress. Frey (2007) also found that sources of stress that increased coaches' likeliness to leave the profession included physical hardship, wanting more free time, attraction to alternative activities, interference with family life, losing their passion for coaching, losing consistently, and feeling unhappy. According to Fletcher and Scott (2010), coaches who suffered from chronic stress experienced burnout, defined as a chronic, debilitating form of strain consisting of three core components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. Over prolonged periods, these emotions can drive coaches out of the profession (Fletcher & Scott, 2010).

Fletcher and Scott (2010) separated the coping mechanisms coaches used to deal with stress into two categories: problem-focused, in which attempts were made to deal with the demands of one's environment, and emotion-focused, in which attempts were made to deal with one's emotional responses to stressors. Problem-focused coping strategies involved recognizing and focusing on aspects of their environment that coaches could control. Coaches who utilized

this method focused more on the process of coaching rather than the performance outcomes of their athletes (Frey, 2007; Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Coaches who utilized emotion-focused coping strategies re-focused their attention on intrinsic sources of enjoyment, visualized themselves under pressure, drew on social and psychological support, utilized relaxation training, cognitive restricting, and exercise (Frey, 2007; Fletcher & Scott, 2010; Taylor, 1992). Despite the different coping strategies coaches used, neither was found to be more advantageous than the other (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Overall, coaches who exhibited hardiness, including high levels of commitment or involvement in day-to-day activities, perceived that they had control over life events, and viewed unexpected change as a challenge rather than a threat to their well-being were less susceptible to burnout due to more positive appraisal of environmental demands (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). In addition, Frey (2007), found that coaches who found enjoyment in strategizing, seeing athletes improve, and developing relationships with their athletes were better equipped to cope with the demands of coaching at the Division I-FBS level.

The literature suggested a correlation existed between job stress and job satisfaction for Division I coaches (Kim J. C., 2004). Research by Fletcher and Scott (2010) and Frey (2007) supported this idea. In relation to the millennial demographic, a study of millennial graduate students concluded that graduate students experienced less satisfaction and engagement with their chosen careers when perceiving high degrees of life stress (Schmitt, 2009). One must consider the pressurized nature of college football described earlier, the job stress of being a Division I coach, and coping strategies of millennials to gauge millennial GAs job satisfaction.

The Millennial Demographic

According to the Center for Generational Kinetics (2017), a generation is a group of people born around the same time and raised around the same place. Generations exhibit similar

characteristics – such as communication and motivational preferences – because they have experienced similar trends at approximately the same life stage and through similar channels (e.g., online, TV, mobile, etc.). Millennials are individuals born between 1977 and 1995 (The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017). Given the majority of graduate assistants working in intercollegiate athletics are millennials (Ervin & Cianfrone, 2014), it is important to understand the unique characteristics of this generation relative to job satisfaction.

Millennials' desire to ascend in the work force combined with their access to knowledge and alternatives to full-time employment, such as internships, have geared their focus towards career development (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). While the overall job satisfaction of Baby Boomers, Generation Xers, and Millennials reported at 88% (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016), the SHRM found generational differences in importance of career development. For instance, 88% of millennials found career development to be important compared to 76% of Baby Boomers. These differences could be explained the stage of life and employment position in which these generations are in. For instance, Baby Boomers, individuals born between 1946 and 1964, may not be as concerned with career development as millennials because they may have already reached the pinnacle of their careers.

Millennials' job satisfaction was higher when their supervisors were in open communication with them (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). This research was supported by Morris, Arthur-Banning and McDowell (2014) who found that millennial female coaches place high value on their relationships with other coaches in their network. Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) found millennials expected supervisor-subordinate communication to be more frequent, more positive, and more affirming than that compared to the expectations of generations in the past.

This relationship was key to their commitment and retention. Thompson (2012) concluded that managers who can adopt leadership styles rooted in individual consideration and promote relationships with their employees would most successfully attract, motivate, and retain millennial employees.

Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) determined that millennials' knowledge of alternative job options led to more millennials "job hopping" when a specific line of work did not please them. However, the Society for Human Resource Management (2016) attributed millennials' "job hopping" to their desire for development opportunities and self-improvement, even if it meant leaving their current employer. Research conducted by Morris, Arthur-Banning and McDowell (2014) supported the findings of the Society for Human Resource Management regarding millennials' propensity to job hop. According to Thompson (2012), nearly 60% of employed millennials have changed jobs at least once already in their career. Despite millennials' propensity to leave their jobs, Thompson (2012) concluded that good work-life balance, meaningful work, and sufficient attention/recognition contributed to millennial loyalty and retention.

Given millennials propensity to "job hop," whether out of job dissatisfaction or for career development, and the stressful conditions of coaching intercollegiate athletics, it is important to consider millennials' coping strategies. In a study of the coping mechanisms of millennial-aged college students, Bland, Melton, Welle, and Bigham (2012) determined the coping mechanisms employed by college-aged millennials (i.e. listening to music, sleeping, and engaging in social interaction) were not only ineffective for alleviating stress, but also put millennials at risk for developing lower stress tolerances. The study defined high stress tolerance as the ability to handle heavy stress loads without feeling ill effects. The research suggested that the coping

mechanisms employed by college-aged millennials related to low stress tolerance. This population represents millennials who have entered the workforce, including those comprising the football graduate assistants at Division I-FBS football programs examined in this study.

Despite Bland and colleagues' (2012) generalization of millennials' coping strategies, millennial coaches in the Morris, Arthur-Banning, and McDowell (2014) study identified positive psychology (i.e., high-self efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency) as a key characteristic that helped them succeed in their careers. This aligned with Fletcher and Scott's (2010) research which found college coaches with more positive appraisals of their environment better managed their job stress. GAs qualitative responses regarding job satisfaction in this study could give insight into the coping mechanisms they use manage their job stress and maintain job satisfaction.

Graduate Assistant Football Coaches in Intercollegiate Athletics

Literature regarding graduate assistant coaches in intercollegiate athletics must be updated. A majority of the literature in this study was comprised in the mid-to-late 1990s. This study in itself serves to contribute to modern research regarding the graduate assistant coach, specifically in football at the Division I-FBS level.

A graduate assistant coach (GA) in Division I-FBS football can be any person who has received a baccalaureate degree, is no more than seven years removed from their exhausted athletics eligibility, and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of their employing institution (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). Graduate assistant coaches are not required to enroll in a specific graduate degree program unless required by their institution. In the event that a GA must take part in a graduate program, the NCAA

requires at least 50% enrollment of the institution's minimum regular graduate degree program of studies. Depending on the policies of the university, a graduate assistant coach must serve as both a coach and as a student. It is here that the role of the graduate assistant coach can lead to role conflict and ambiguity, which have been shown to negatively impact GA job satisfaction (Dunn & Dunn, 1997).

Research on the demographics of graduate assistants in athletics outside of coaching (i.e. marketing, sports information, ticketing) conducted by Ervin and Cianfrone (2014) found the GA demographic to be primarily single (96.4%) and with no children (89.3%). Exploring Division I GA coaches of various sports, Dunn and Dunn (1997) found the GA demographic to range between the ages of 22-42 (modal age of 24; median age of 25) with 69% of the respondents reporting having never been married, 28% married, and 3% divorced. Both studies supported the demographic characteristic of millennials entering the workforce observed in Gallup data analytics reporter John Fleming's (2016) analysis of the family and marital status of millennials. An early study conducted by Dunn and Dunn (1992) found that GAs reported a stipend ranging from \$1,400 - \$20,000. Based on the study's survey, 77% of GAs at the time agreed that the financial rewards they received were inadequate for the amount of work that they did. Regarding role conflict – balancing their responsibilities as both a student and coach – 35% of GAs in the study felt their coaching duties allowed them ample time to study for their classes. Regarding role ambiguity, 80% reported feeling that they did not have a great deal of power, with 73% percent perceiving their status as “the person in the middle” between players and full-time coaches. In a later study, Dunn and Dunn (1997) determined that GAs perceived role ambiguity stemmed from the inconsistent and sometimes conflicting demands placed upon them by their

full-time coaches. Over half (53%) considered their position to be very stressful (Dunn & Dunn, 1992).

Analyzing role conflict in 198 male and female graduate assistant coaches at 45 Division I schools, Dunn and Dunn (1997) found that the largest strain came in GAs conflict regarding their roles associated to their educational status. This supported data found in their previous study (Dunn & Dunn, 1992). Seventy percent of GAs indicated that when their sport was in season, they spent over 30 hours per week attending to their coaching responsibilities, with 30% reporting spending more than 75 hours per week attending to their coaching duties (Dunn & Dunn, 1997). Wilson (1987) found that roughly 37% of football GAs in the ACC completed their Master's degree within two years. Ervin and Cianfrone (2014) determined GAs had to be willing to sacrifice their work-life balance to submit to a twelve hour per day, six days per week, and 50 weeks per year schedule, creating conflict between their work and personal lives (Ervin & Cianfrone, 2014).

Role ambiguity was another factor Dunn and Dunn (1997) found to affect GAs work stress. GAs in their study perceived themselves to have an in-between status, existing between the players and the full-time coaches. Their perceived role ambiguity also stemmed from the inconsistent and sometimes conflicting demands placed upon them by their full-time coaches. 80% of GAs in their study did not feel that they had a great deal of power, which could contribute to why over half of the GAs surveyed considered their position "very stressful." The questions asked by Dunn and Dunn ignited responses such as:

“One of the most frustrating aspects of the job is being given responsibility without authority. Since I am older than many of the GAs I have more experience and I hope I am more responsible. I am often upset why I am treated as one of ‘the kids.’ I am a grown woman capable of managing many tasks in the administrative side of athletics. I feel like I am not an integral part of the team. I don’t fit in as a player or a coach” (Dunn & Dunn, 1997, p. 268).

The firsthand statements reported by the GAs surveyed in Dunn and Dunn’s (1997) study reflected both the role conflict that GAs felt as professional coaches required to perform graduate level classroom work as by the NCAA, and the role ambiguity incited by their interaction with others in the workplace. Considering role conflict, GAs who showed too much concern for their academic endeavors were considered not fully committed to their job as a coach by their superiors. Professors with GAs in their classrooms were not considerate of the GAs coaching responsibilities, which was the primary reason for the GAs employment (Dunn & Dunn, 1997).

Subjectively, the profile of the Division I-FBS football GA is similar to that of the Division I graduate assistant athletic trainer, or GAAT. Division I GAAT’s are at risk for burnout because of the time necessary to complete their work and academic responsibilities (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012). Mazerolle and colleagues (2012) found that Division I GAAT’s reported working an average of almost forty hours per week, equivalent to that of the full-time staff. In addition, GAAT’s were also enrolled in at least ten academic credit hours. Reed and Giacobbi (2004) found time management to be a major source of stress for GAAT’s, being that this population spent long hours attempting to manage their various roles. Making time for other obligations beyond their work duties as an athletic trainer contributed to their role conflict (Seraphin & Bruening, 2004).

All studies regarding GAAT’s analyzed in this literature review found that the long hours worked by this population contributed to their burnout (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch,

2012; Reed & Giacobbi, 2004; Seraphin & Bruening, 2004). Burnout at the career entry stage could lead to attrition (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012). Football GAs and GAAT face similar challenges. For the millennial football GA, information regarding factors attributing to role stress could lead to potential coping strategies and legislation helping the GA.

More research is needed to update the current profile and satisfaction of graduate assistant coaches specifically in Division I-FBS football. If modern research exists examining the stress and job satisfaction of full-time coaches, then it is also important to consider the demands placed on the graduate assistant coach who must balance both work and educational responsibilities along with work-life balance. Disregarding the factors impacting the satisfaction of millennial GAs runs the risk of diverting qualified future football coaches away from the college coaching profession, especially considering millennials unique propensity to “job hop” (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Analyzing factors influencing millennial graduate assistant football coaches’ job satisfaction provides groundwork for the development of coping mechanisms, policy, and legislation to aid this population.

Theoretical Framework

Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory offers a rich lens through which to view millennial GA job satisfaction. According to Herzberg (Chelladurai, 2009; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfiers, or motivators, relate to work content. Work content includes achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or development. Dissatisfiers, or hygienes, relate to contextual factors of work. Contextual factors include company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security.

Supervisors alleviate dissatisfaction by improving hygiene factors. This includes providing adequate salary and wages, ensuring good working conditions, and having effective company policies and quality supervision. Herzberg's theory suggests that only the job and its content can provide motivation (Chelladurai, 2009). For instance, only when jobs offer responsibility, a sense of achievement, and opportunities for growth do employees feel motivated.

Contemporary application of Herzberg's study supports his original findings. Researchers determined that motivators associated with intrinsic drivers (i.e., content factors) outweighed motivation associated extrinsic rewards or results (i.e., context factors) (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). The limitation of Herzberg's study was individuals' interpretations of different hygiene factors and motivators. For instance, what could have been considered a motivator for one individual may not have contributed to the motivation of another (Chelladurai, 2009).

A secondary theory that will be foundational to this research is the theory of role conflict. Role conflict is the concurrent appearance of two or more incompatible expectations for the behavior of a person (Biddle, 1986). A meta-analysis conducted by Ritter, Matthews, Ford and Henderson (2016) demonstrated that role stressors, including role conflict and role ambiguity, negatively predicted job satisfaction. Role conflict in the workplace has been associated with poor job performance, lower commitment to the organization, and higher rates of accidents and resignations. In a study analyzing the role conflict of teacher-coaches in high schools where coaches could not allocate adequate attention to their duties as both a teacher and a coach, individuals tended to focus their attention to their athletic endeavors (Sage, 1987). Failure to win in their role as a coach led to quicker dismissal than failure in their role as a teacher. In the case of millennial GAs, role conflict between their responsibilities as a graduate student and football

coach could cause them to negate their academic responsibilities and simultaneously affect their job satisfaction (Ritter, Matthews, Ford, & Henderson, 2016; Sage, 1987).

Both theories were used to interpret the data in this study. Herzberg's motivation theory gives insight into the particular factors that could motivate and/or dissatisfy the millennial GA in Division I-FBS football given the stressful environment and unique position that the GA is in. Role conflict theory suggests that the varied responsibilities placed upon GAs may negatively affect their job satisfaction. Both theories are highly useful when determining the overall job satisfaction of millennial football graduate assistant coaches at the Division I-FBS level.

Gaps in Literature

No research has been done regarding the millennial graduate assistant football coach. While GAs of the past may have been willing to accept the hardships of their position (Dunn & Dunn, 1997), millennial graduate assistants may now choose to opt out of the profession entirely if they are not satisfied with their roles. Considering the influx of millennials entering the workforce (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016), failure to monitor the job satisfaction of millennial GAs could affect the quality and retention of future coaches at the Division I-FBS level. If the current practice of how GAs are used mirrors that of Dunn and Dunn's (1997) study, it could either serve as a vetting process to see which millennial graduate assistants can handle the stresses of being a Division I-FBS football coach, or deter well-qualified millennials from continuing in the profession.

The comparison between the GAAT and the football GA would lead to the prediction that football GAs are at a high risk of burnout (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Reed & Giacobbi, 2004; Seraphim & Bruening). With millennials' propensity to job hop, head football

coaches could find it difficult retaining quality millennial GAs (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Myers & Sadaghiani 2010; The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016). Reported job satisfaction and role conflict could serve as a base for how full-time coaches could better support their millennial graduate assistants, potentially minimizing role stress and increasing work engagement (Schmitt, 2009). In addition, this study could lay the foundation for the NCAA to review and adjust legislation impacting graduate assistant coaches.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The NCAA permits all 128 FBS schools to have up to four graduate assistant coaches on staff for a total population of up to 512 GAs (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). In order to access a sufficient sample of this population, 111 representatives identified as the Director of Football Operations at a Division I-FBS school were contacted. Their contact information was located using a national directory developed by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. In addition, GAs individual emails were located by searching Division I-FBS athletic websites. The Directors of Football Operations received email correspondence from the head coach of a Division I-FBS university in the southeast region of the United States that included a link for their GAs to take an anonymous, voluntary survey. The correspondence requested the directors to forward the email to the GA coaches on their teams. GAs were invited to take the voluntary survey using an anonymous online survey during the month of June 2017, and were sent a follow up reminder after ten days if they had not yet completed the survey. The survey was closed at the beginning of July 2017. Analyzed surveys in this study had all Likert scale information completed. Completed demographic and qualitative responses were not required for data analysis.

Instrumentation

This study utilized the *Graduate Assistant Coach Job Satisfaction Survey* (GAJSS). The GAJSS was designed for graduate assistant football coaches. It was comprised of elements taken from the *Spector Job Satisfaction Survey*, or JSS (Spector^d, 2011); role characteristic questions used to analyze correlations in employees' role characteristics-outcome relationships (Beehr & Drexler Jr., 1986); and role characteristics questions used to analyze role conflict and role ambiguity in organizational settings (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970).

The *GAJSS* was developed in consultation with a broad panel of content and survey experts including a convenience sample of 10 graduate assistant coaches, three faculty members, a survey methodology expert from the Odum Institute of Social Science, and three former GAs who are current full-time coaches at the Division I-FBS level. The survey development included a preliminary survey that asked GAs to describe the pros and cons of their job, and questions they would like to know about other GAs. Targeted factors and survey questions from the JSS were also reviewed by the entire panel for their applicability to the graduate assistant football coach population. Based upon this review, the JSS "Operating Conditions" and "Nature of Work" sub-factors were removed. These sub-factors were replaced with "Role Conflict" and "Role Ambiguity" derived from Beehr & Drexler (1986) and Rizzo et al. (1970). These factors were deemed critical to the GA experience by the panel of experts and a necessary addition to *GAJSS*.

The number of questions per factor were reduced from four to three, in comparison with the original JSS. This was done to condense the survey in respect of GAs time demands. The targeted factors of the *GAJSS* included pay, advancement/promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, role conflict, coworkers, role ambiguity, and communication.

Factors to be analyzed were then tagged either questions of context or content in order to comply with the theoretical framework of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. According to Herzberg (Chelladurai, 2009), factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfiers, or motivators, relate to work content. Content factors include achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or development. Dissatisfiers, or hygienes, relate to contextual factors of work. Contextual factors include company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security.

All questions in the *GAJSS* were redistributed in a numerically linear fashion based on the organization of the *JSS*. Factors to be analyzed were then tagged either questions of context or content in order to comply with the theoretical framework of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

The questionnaire for the purpose of this study also collected broad demographic information from participants, including birth year, athletic conference, duration of time as a GA (despite employer), and number of institutions worked at. In order to gauge participants' perception of their role conflict, questions regarding their interest in pursuing a graduate degree in addition to their coaching responsibilities were included. The survey also included open-ended questions for participants to describe their satisfiers, dissatisfiers, and opinions regarding their academic responsibilities as a GA, and their general perceptions of being a GA.

Reliability and Validity

A systematic review of the reliability and validity of several job satisfaction instruments conducted by van Saane and colleagues (2003) found the *JSS* to meet the criteria for acceptable internal consistency (standard .80; *JSS* .91); test-retest validity (standard .70; *JSS* .71); convergent validity (.6 – .80 compared to *JDI* job satisfaction scale); and discriminant validity ($\alpha < .50$; *JSS* .19 – .59 compared to *JDI* job satisfaction scale). The review also found the *JSS* satisfactory in addressing important work factors deemed necessary to evaluate job satisfaction based on a meta-analysis (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Fringes-Dresen, 2003). Beehr and Drexler (1986) found that role conflict and role ambiguity did have direct relationships with job satisfaction. Role conflict and role ambiguity questions from their study with the highest loading factors were included in the *GAJSS*. While researchers demonstrated mixed reviews regarding the strength of Rizzo and colleagues' scales in their 1970 study, their role characteristic instrument had an extensive history of use and had been reviewed in previous literature by numerous organizational researchers as a fair scale (Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008; Kim, Murrmann, & Lee, 2009; Smith Tisak, & Schmieder, 1993).

The work factors in which the *JSS* originally analyzed included pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication. Because “operating conditions” and “nature of work” were removed, it does lessen the scope of important work factors reviewed which may alter overall reliability and validity measures.

Condensing the questions asked per factor may have affected the internal consistency reliability of the factors examined in the *GAJSS* compared to the original *JSS*. However, this was to be expected. Table 2 presents the original coefficient alphas of internal consistency based on a

sample size of 2,870 individuals who completed the original *JSS* (Spector^a, 1997). Considering that the accepted minimum standard for internal consistency is .70, eliminating a question from each sub-factor scale would have decreased the coefficient alpha even more, leaving it at a higher risk of error. In addition to eliminating thirteen original questions from the original 36 questions of the *JSS*, eliminating the “operating procedures” and “nature of work” sub-factors risked lowering the .91 coefficient alpha of internal consistency for the entire *JSS*.

Table 1

Internal consistency reliability of the original JSS. Test-retest reliability assessed over 18-month time span (Spector^a, 1997).

Factor	Coefficient Alpha	Test-Retest Reliability
Pay	0.75	0.45
Promotion	0.73	0.62
Supervision	0.82	0.55
Benefits	0.73	0.37
Contingent Rewards	0.76	0.59
Operating Procedures	0.62	0.74
Coworkers	0.6	0.64
Nature of Work	0.78	0.54
Communication	0.71	0.65
Total	0.91	0.71
N	2,870	

After considering the qualitative congruency between the removed factors and the added role characteristic factors, it was doubtful that the exchanged factors would drop the internal consistency reliability of the total test below the .70 standard. **Table 2** compares the coefficient alphas of sub-factors in both the *JSS* and *GAJSS*. Individually, five of the nine sub-factors within *GAJSS* fell below the standard of $\alpha = .70$. While this is not ideal for the individual sub-factors, the coefficient alpha for the total reliability of *GAJSS* was .01 below that of the *JSS*. This

signified that even though some sub-factors in the *GAJSS* were at a greater risk of error compared to the *JSS*, both tests still comparably measured the participants' total job satisfaction.

Table 2
Comparing the reliability of the JSS to the GAJSS

Factor	JSS Coefficient Alpha	GAJSS Coefficient Alpha
Pay	0.75	0.64
Promotion	0.73	0.78
Supervision	0.82	0.61
Benefits	0.73	0.66
Contingent Rewards	0.76	0.79
Role Conflict	n/a	0.62
Coworkers	0.60	0.72
Role Ambiguity	n/a	0.28
Communication	0.71	0.76
Total	0.91	0.90
<i>N</i>	2,870	94

Data Analysis

Participants completed all qualitative and quantitative responses using Qualtrics surveying software. Upon completion of data collection from all respondents, MAXQDA 12 software was used to code participants' qualitative responses. Participants' responses were categorized based on themes that arose in response to select questions. To ensure intercoder reliability, a second researcher coded the same responses as the primary researcher for agreement. The primary and secondary coders achieved 96% agreement.

SPSS Statistics 24 was used to analyze all quantitative data. Reliability analyses were executed to determine the reliability coefficient for all individual sub-factors tested, including total satisfaction. A descriptive statistics analysis was executed to determine participants' mean

satisfaction with each sub-factor presented in the GAJSS as well as their total satisfaction with being a graduate assistant football coach. A one sample t-test was then run to determine if the mean score of the sub-factor was statistically significant. When analyzing participants' perception of a graduate degree, a chi-square analysis was ran to determine the statistical significance of the data found.

CHAPTER 4

MANUSCRIPT

“SO YOU ‘WANNA BE A ‘BALL COACH?” JOB SATISFACTION AND PERCEIVED ROLE CONFLICT OF MILLENNIAL GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES IN DIVISION I-FBS FOOTBALL

Overview

Researchers modified the *Spector Job Satisfaction Survey* to determine job satisfaction of millennial graduate assistant (GA) football coaches at the Division I-FBS level and gauge role conflict. Researchers analyzed satisfaction using descriptive statistics software. Millennial GAs were overall satisfied with their jobs, but least satisfied with their pay. A leading number of millennial GAs found being able to coach football most rewarding about their job (31%). Ninety-three percent of GAs reported that obtaining a Master’s degree was important. Only 61% believed they could complete their graduate program. This research suggests the NCAA and membership institution administrators should review its compensation and educational policies to ensure GAs are compensated and protected in their roles as both a student and a coach.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I-Football Bowl Subdivision (DI-FBS) football is a profitable, professional, and hypercompetitive industry in which the stress to perform may interfere with personal well-being. Both head and assistant coaches, offered lucrative contracts despite limited job security, face pressure to win while staying within the realms of NCAA compliance, recruiting talented student-athletes, and ensuring the growth and

development of their student-athletes outside of football (Holmes, 2011). Their failure in anyone of these areas could cost them their jobs. Amongst their responsibilities, coaches may not have time to consider the well-being and professional development of the lowest member of their staff, the entry-level graduate assistant coach (GA).

Coaches, who may not see how they could fully maximize their GAs potential for the better of their football program, may assign GAs to roles that seem insignificant to the employee. To the GA, miscellaneous, lengthy, and/or ambiguous tasks could be interpreted as meaningless and disrespectful, affecting the GAs motivation to work (Dunn & Dunn, *The Graduate Assistant Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making*, 1997). For Division I-FBS coaches, demanding millennial GAs to complete such tasks runs the risk of diverting qualified millennials away from the coaching profession (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). In addition, with GAs also having academic responsibilities, assigning GAs with ambiguous work tasks could further increase their perceived role conflict, negatively affecting their job satisfaction (Dunn & Dunn, *The Graduate Assistant Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making*, 1997). Considering the influx of millennials entering the workforce (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016), monitoring the job satisfaction of millennial GAs could affect the quality and retention of future coaches at the Division I-FBS level. In addition, considering the need for additional football coaches addressed by the NCAA (NCAA, 2017), utilizing GAs by minimizing their role conflict and maximizing their professional development could help intercollegiate football programs create a more productive football staff.

The purpose of this research was to analyze the job satisfaction and perceived role conflict of millennial graduate assistant football coaches on the Division I-FBS level. To achieve this, statistical analyses were completed to determine which factors most influenced millennial GAs

job satisfaction. Millennial GAs perception towards a Master's degree was also investigated to further gauge perceived role conflict based on their academic responsibilities. GAs perception of whether or not they could complete their Master's degree within a two-year period could indicate the compatibility of their roles as a student and coach. Participants gave both qualitative and quantitative responses. Based on the review of literature, the following research questions guided this study:

RQ 1. What is the overall job satisfaction of millennial graduate assistant football coaches across the entire Division I-FBS level?

RQ 2. Based on statistical significance, what are millennial Division I-FBS graduate assistant football coaches' satisfaction with sub-factor(s) found within a job satisfaction scale?

RQ 3. What are millennial graduate assistant football coaches' perception of a Master's degree based on qualitative and quantitative data?

Review of Literature

The Business of Division I-FBS Football

Division I-FBS colleges have reported increased overall spending in their athletic departments, with football accounting for a majority of the increased spending (Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2017). The Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2017) reported that the FBS median for football spending per scholarship football player increased by 66% between 2005 and 2015, from \$57,971 to \$126,227 respectively.

Division I-FBS programs, primarily in the Power Five conferences (Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten, Big 12, Pacific 12, and Southeastern Conference), generate revenue from media rights contracts with broadcasting companies who televise, stream, or air their games. In a

research study analyzing the fees paid by rights holders to broadcast football games, researchers generated a model that determined the most valuable college football programs based on rights fees, as well as predictors for the value of a college football team (Jensen & Turner, 2015). According to Jensen and Turner (2015), the top twenty-five college football programs valued between \$17 million to over \$24 million in media rights fees.

Athletic departments pay substantial amounts to their football coaches for the success of their teams. The Knight Commission (2017) reported that the FBS median for football coaching salaries per athletic scholarship football player increased by 78% from 2005-2015. The number of head coaches earning more than \$1 million per year before receiving their bonuses grew from forty-one in 2006 to seventy-two in 2014 (Hoffman, 2015). By 2014, more than seventy head coaches out of the 128 Division I-FBS schools earned at least \$1 million. Twenty-one head coaches earned \$1 million, twenty-four earned \$2 million, sixteen made \$3 million, and eleven made between \$4 and \$7 million. According to USA Today (2016), the highest paid coach in Division I-FBS football in 2016 earned \$9,004,000. The second highest paid coach that year received \$6,939,395.

Research by both Pope and Pope (2009), and Cox and Roden (2010) supported the idea that increased athletic success in major revenue sports resulted in an increase in applications and a higher quality of applicants for a university. According to research conducted by Cox and Roden (2010), the average college ranking from *U.S. News & World Report* for schools two years after winning a national championship in football or basketball increased by approximately seven slots. Analyzing schools that had won a national championship in either football or basketball (both major revenue generating sports), they also saw that schools two years post-winning a national championship in either football or basketball reported an increase in overall

applications and quality of applicants. Pope and Pope (2009) also supported a correlation between sports success and increases in student applications. In their research, schools with a top twenty ranking in football each year between 1980 and 2002 had a 2-8% increase in quantity of applicants. Demographically, males, African-Americans, and former high school student-athletes were more likely to be influenced by sports success when applying to a university compared to their peers.

Money spent and generated in Division I-FBS football and its impact on university metrics (Cox & Roden, 2010; Pope & Pope, 2009) have intensified the stakes of football wins and losses. Research by Holmes (2011) supports the idea that college athletic departments give football coaches approximately four years to establish a successful program before their job is in question. Holmes (2011) found that out of 196 FBS Division I head football coaches from 1983-2006, one-third (68) of all dismissals occurred within the coaches' first four years. Fifty of those head coaches were released after the fifth year of their tenure. Schools that had a standing tradition of success in football were more likely to dismiss their coaches for failing to win games. For the college football coach, winning provides an element of job security.

Understanding the magnitude of Division I-FBS football from a financial and institutional perspective reveals the high-stakes nature of intercollegiate football. Wins on the football field translate into increased financial rewards and greater positive public perception for a university. Losses on the field result in unemployment for the football staff (Holmes, 2011). The prolonged stress of this type of work environment may negatively affect football coaches, which could in turn affect the job satisfaction of the millennial graduate assistant. Millennial graduate assistants must understand the pressurized nature of Division I-FBS football in order to decide if it is a proper work environment for them.

Job Satisfaction in College Athletic Coaches

Empirical research demonstrates that the stressors of college athletics at the Division I-FBS level must be managed by coaches in order to maintain positive job satisfaction and cope with potential burnout (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Kim (2004) found a statistically significant correlation between job stress and job satisfaction for Division I college coaches in football, basketball, baseball, softball, soccer, volleyball, and tennis; coaches who had high job stress were less satisfied. In a critical review of literature pertaining to stress in sports coaches, Fletcher and Scott (2010) concluded that coaches at the Division I level encountered greater performance-related and organizational-related stressors than those who competed at levels below Division I, such as NAIA. Frey (2007) reported nine themes that arose as sources of stress in Division I coaches in baseball, basketball, diving, softball, swimming, tennis, and volleyball: interpersonal/personal sources; other people; sources that would lead to quitting; task-related sources; recruiting; time demands; being the head coach; outcome of competition; and self-imposed stress. Frey (2007) also found that sources of stress that increased coaches' likeliness to leave the profession included physical hardship, wanting more free time, attraction to alternative activities, interference with family life, losing their passion for coaching, losing consistently, and feeling unhappy. According to Fletcher and Scott (2010), coaches who suffered from chronic stress experienced burnout, defined as a chronic, debilitating form of strain consisting of three core components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. Over prolonged periods, these emotions can drive coaches out of the profession (Fletcher & Scott, 2010).

Fletcher and Scott (2010) separated the coping mechanisms coaches used to deal with stress into two categories: problem-focused, in which attempts were made to deal with the

demands of one's environment, and emotion-focused, in which attempts were made to deal with one's emotional responses to stressors. Problem-focused coping strategies involved recognizing and focusing on aspects of their environment that coaches could control. Coaches who utilized this method focused more on the process of coaching rather than the performance outcomes of their athletes (Frey, 2007; Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Coaches who utilized emotion-focused coping strategies re-focused their attention on intrinsic sources of enjoyment, visualized themselves under pressure, drew on social and psychological support, utilized relaxation training, cognitive restricting, and exercise (Frey, 2007; Fletcher & Scott, 2010; Taylor, 1992). Despite the different coping strategies coaches used, neither was found to be more advantageous than the other (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). Overall, coaches who exhibited hardiness, including high levels of commitment or involvement in day-to-day activities, perceived that they had control over life events, and viewed unexpected change as a challenge rather than a threat to their well-being were less susceptible to burnout due to more positive appraisal of environmental demands (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). In addition, Frey (2007), found that coaches who found enjoyment in strategizing, seeing athletes improve, and developing relationships with their athletes were better equipped to cope with the demands of coaching at the Division I-FBS level.

The literature suggested a correlation existed between job stress and job satisfaction for Division I coaches (Kim J. C., 2004). A study of millennial graduate students supported this theme, concluding that graduate students experienced less satisfaction and engagement with their chosen careers when perceiving high degrees of life stress (Schmitt, 2009). One must consider the pressurized nature of college football described earlier, the job stress of being a Division I coach, and coping strategies of millennials to gauge millennial GAs job satisfaction.

The Millennial Demographic

Millennials are individuals born between 1977 and 1995 (The Center for Generational Kinetics, 2017). Given the majority of graduate assistants working in intercollegiate athletics are millennials (Ervin & Cianfrone, 2014), it is important to understand the unique characteristics of this generation relative to job satisfaction. Millennials' desire to ascend in the work force combined with their access to knowledge and alternatives to full-time employment, such as internships, have geared their focus towards career development (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). In addition, millennials' job satisfaction was higher when their supervisors were in open communication with them (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). This research was supported by Morris, Arthur-Banning and McDowell (2014) who found that millennial female coaches place high value on their relationships with other coaches in their network.

Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) determined that millennials' knowledge of alternative job options led to more millennials "job hopping" when a specific line of work did not please them. However, the Society for Human Resource Management (2016) attributed millennials' "job hopping" to their desire for development opportunities and self-improvement, even if it meant leaving their current employer. Research conducted by Morris, Arthur-Banning and McDowell (2014) supported the findings of the Society for Human Resource Management regarding millennials' propensity to job hop. According to Thompson (2012), nearly 60% of employed millennials have changed jobs at least once already in their career. Despite millennials' propensity to leave their jobs, Thompson (2012) concluded that good work-life balance, meaningful work, and sufficient attention/recognition contributed to millennial loyalty and retention.

Given millennials propensity to “job hop,” whether out of job dissatisfaction or for career development, and the stressful conditions of coaching intercollegiate athletics, it is important to consider millennials’ coping strategies. In a study of the coping mechanisms of millennial-aged college students, Bland, Melton, Welle, and Bigham (2012) determined the coping mechanisms employed by college-aged millennials (i.e. listening to music, sleeping, and engaging in social interaction) were not only ineffective for alleviating stress, but also put millennials at risk for developing lower stress tolerances. The study defined high stress tolerance as the ability to handle heavy stress loads without feeling ill effects. The research suggested that the coping mechanisms employed by college-aged millennials related to low stress tolerance. This population represents millennials who have entered the workforce, including those comprising the football graduate assistants at Division I-FBS football programs examined in this study.

Despite Bland and colleagues’ (2012) generalization of millennials’ coping strategies, millennial coaches in the Morris, Arthur-Banning, and McDowell (2014) study identified positive psychology (i.e., high-self efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency) as a key characteristic that helped them succeed in their careers. This aligned with Fletcher and Scott’s (2010) research which found college coaches with more positive appraisals of their environment better managed their job stress. GAs qualitative responses regarding job satisfaction in this study could give insight into the coping mechanisms they use manage their job stress and maintain job satisfaction.

Graduate Assistant Football Coaches in Intercollegiate Athletics

Literature regarding graduate assistant coaches in intercollegiate athletics must be updated. A majority of the literature in this study was comprised in the mid-to-late 1990s. This

study in itself serves to contribute to modern research regarding the graduate assistant coach, specifically in football at the Division I-FBS level.

A graduate assistant coach (GA) in Division I-FBS football can be any person who has received a baccalaureate degree, is no more than seven years removed from their exhausted athletics eligibility, and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of their employing institution (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). Graduate assistant coaches are not required to enroll in a specific graduate degree program unless required by their institution. In the event that a GA must take part in a graduate program, the NCAA requires at least 50% enrollment of the institution's minimum regular graduate degree program of studies. Depending on the policies of the university, a graduate assistant coach must serve as both a coach and as a student. It is here that the role of the graduate assistant coach can lead to role conflict and ambiguity, which have been shown to negatively impact GA job satisfaction (Dunn & Dunn, *The Graduate Assistant Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making*, 1997).

Research on the demographics of graduate assistants in athletics outside of coaching (i.e. marketing, sports information, ticketing) conducted by Ervin and Cianfrone (2014) found the GA demographic to be primarily single (96.4%) and with no children (89.3%). Exploring Division I GA coaches of various sports, Dunn and Dunn (1997) found the GA demographic to range between the ages of 22-42 (modal age of 24; median age of 25) with 69% of the respondents reporting having never been married, 28% married, and 3% divorced. Both studies supported the demographic characteristic of millennials entering the workforce observed in Gallup data analytics reporter John Fleming's (2016) analysis of the family and marital status of millennials.

An early study conducted by Dunn and Dunn (1992) found that GAs reported a stipend ranging from \$1,400 - \$20,000. Based on the study's survey, 77% of GAs at the time agreed that the financial rewards they received were inadequate for the amount of work that they did. Regarding role conflict – balancing their responsibilities as both a student and coach – 35% of GAs in the study felt their coaching duties allowed them ample time to study for their classes. Regarding role ambiguity, 80% reported feeling that they did not have a great deal of power, with 73% percent perceiving their status as “the person in the middle” between players and full-time coaches. In a later study, Dunn and Dunn (1997) determined that GAs perceived role ambiguity stemmed from the inconsistent and sometimes conflicting demands placed upon them by their full-time coaches. Over half (53%) considered their position to be very stressful (Dunn & Dunn, 1992).

Analyzing role conflict in 198 male and female graduate assistant coaches at 45 Division I schools, Dunn and Dunn (1997) found that the largest strain came in GAs conflict regarding their roles associated to their educational status. This supported data found in their previous study (Dunn & Dunn, 1992). Seventy percent of GAs indicated that when their sport was in season, they spent over 30 hours per week attending to their coaching responsibilities, with 30% reporting spending more than 75 hours per week attending to their coaching duties (Dunn & Dunn, 1997). Wilson (1987) found that roughly 37% of football GAs in the ACC completed their Master's degree within two years. Ervin and Cianfrone (2014) determined GAs had to be willing to sacrifice their work-life balance to submit to a twelve hour per day, six days per week, and 50 weeks per year schedule, creating conflict between their work and personal lives (Ervin & Cianfrone, 2014).

Subjectively, the profile of the Division I-FBS football GA is similar to that of the Division I graduate assistant athletic trainer, or GAAT. Division I GAAT's are at risk for burnout because of the time necessary to complete their work and academic responsibilities (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012). Mazerolle and colleagues (2012) found that Division I GAAT's reported working an average of almost forty hours per week, equivalent to that of the full-time staff. In addition, GAAT's were also enrolled in at least ten academic credit hours. Reed and Giacobbi (2004) found time management to be a major source of stress for GAAT's, being that this population spent long hours attempting to manage their various roles. Making time for other obligations beyond their work duties as an athletic trainer contributed to their role conflict (Seraphin & Bruening, 2004).

All studies regarding GAAT's analyzed in this literature review found that the long hours worked by this population contributed to their burnout (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Reed & Giacobbi, 2004; Seraphin & Bruening, 2004). Burnout at the career entry stage could lead to attrition (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012). Football GAs and GAAT face similar challenges. For the millennial football GA, information regarding factors attributing to role stress could lead to potential coping strategies and legislation helping the GA.

More research is needed to update the current profile and satisfaction of graduate assistant coaches specifically in Division I-FBS football. If modern research exists examining the stress and job satisfaction of full-time coaches, then it is also important to consider the demands placed on the graduate assistant coach who must balance both work and educational responsibilities along with work-life balance. Disregarding the factors impacting the satisfaction of millennial GAs runs the risk of diverting qualified future football coaches away from the college coaching profession, especially considering millennials unique propensity to "job hop"

(Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Analyzing factors influencing millennial graduate assistant football coaches' job satisfaction provides groundwork for the development of coping mechanisms, policy, and legislation to aid this population.

Conceptional Rationale

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory offers a rich lens through which to view millennial GA job satisfaction. According to Herzberg (Chelladurai, 2009; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959), factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfiers, or motivators, relate to work content. Work content includes achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or development. Dissatisfiers, or hygienes, relate to contextual factors of work. Contextual factors include company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security.

Supervisors alleviate dissatisfaction by improving hygiene factors. This includes providing adequate salary and wages, ensuring good working conditions, and having effective company policies and quality supervision. Herzberg's theory suggests that only the job and its content can provide motivation (Chelladurai, 2009). For instance, only when jobs offer responsibility, a sense of achievement, and opportunities for growth do employees feel motivated.

Contemporary application of Herzberg's study supports his original findings. Researchers determined that motivators associated with intrinsic drivers (i.e., content factors) outweighed motivation associated extrinsic rewards or results (i.e., context factors) (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005). The limitation of Herzberg's study was individuals' interpretations of different hygiene

factors and motivators. For instance, what could have been considered a motivator for one individual may not have contributed to the motivation of another (Chelladurai, 2009).

A secondary theory that will be foundational to this research is the theory of role conflict. Role conflict is the concurrent appearance of two or more incompatible expectations for the behavior of a person (Biddle, 1986). A meta-analysis conducted by Ritter, Matthews, Ford and Henderson (2016) demonstrated that role stressors, including role conflict and role ambiguity, negatively predicted job satisfaction. Role conflict in the workplace has been associated with poor job performance, lower commitment to the organization, and higher rates of accidents and resignations. In a study analyzing the role conflict of teacher-coaches in high schools where coaches could not allocate adequate attention to their duties as both a teacher and a coach, individuals tended to focus their attention to their athletic endeavors (Sage, 1987). Failure to win in their role as a coach led to quicker dismissal than failure in their role as a teacher. In the case of millennial GAs, role conflict between their responsibilities as a graduate student and football coach could cause them to negate their academic responsibilities and simultaneously affect their job satisfaction (Ritter, Matthews, Ford, & Henderson, 2016; Sage, 1987).

Both theories were used to interpret the data in this study. Herzberg's motivation theory gives insight into the particular factors that could motivate and/or dissatisfy the millennial GA in Division I-FBS football given the stressful environment and unique position that the GA is in. Role conflict theory suggests that the varied responsibilities placed upon GAs may negatively affect their job satisfaction. Both theories are highly useful when determining the overall job satisfaction of millennial football graduate assistant coaches at the Division I-FBS level.

Significance of this Study

No research has been done regarding the millennial graduate assistant football coach. The graduate assistant position, an entry-level position in the college football coaching hierarchy, is perhaps the most realistic way for millennials to enter the college football coaching occupation at the Division I-FBS level. Considering the influx of millennials entering the workforce (The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016), failure to monitor the job satisfaction of millennial GAs could affect the quality and retention of future coaches at the Division I-FBS level. The comparison between the GAAT and the football GA would lead to the prediction that football GAs are at a high risk of burnout (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Reed & Giacobbi, 2004; Seraphim & Bruening). With millennials' propensity to job hop, head football coaches could find it difficult retaining quality millennial GAs (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Myers & Sadaghiani 2010; The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016). This study could lay the foundation for the NCAA to review and adjust legislation impacting graduate assistant coaches.

Research Questions

[RQ 1] What is the overall job satisfaction of millennial graduate assistant football coaches across the entire Division I-FBS level?

[RQ 2] Based on statistical significance, what are millennial Division I-FBS graduate assistant football coaches' satisfaction with sub-factor(s) found within a job satisfaction scale?

[RQ 3] What are millennial graduate assistant football coaches' perceptions of a Master's degree based on qualitative and quantitative data?

Method

Instrument Design

This study utilized the *Graduate Assistant Coach Job Satisfaction Survey* (GAJSS). The GAJSS was designed for graduate assistant football coaches. It was comprised of elements taken from the *Spector Job Satisfaction Survey*, or JSS (Spector^d, 2011); role characteristic questions used to analyze correlations in employees' role characteristics-outcome relationships (Beehr & Drexler Jr., 1986); and role characteristics questions used to analyze role conflict and role ambiguity in organizational settings (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Researchers deemed that the JSS met the quality criteria for reliability and validity (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Fringes-Dresen, 2003). Beehr and Drexler (1986) found that role conflict and role ambiguity did have direct relationships with job satisfaction, thus, the role conflict and role ambiguity questions with the highest loading factors were included in the GAJSS. While researchers demonstrated mixed reviews regarding the strength of Rizzo and colleagues' scales in their 1970 study, their role characteristic instrument had an extensive history of use and had been reviewed in previous literature by numerous organizational researchers as a fair scale (Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008; Kim, Murrmann, & Lee, 2009; Smith Tisak, & Schmieder, 1993).

The GAJSS was developed in consultation with a broad panel of content and survey experts including a convenience sample of 10 graduate assistant coaches, three faculty members, a survey methodology expert from the Odum Institute of Social Science, and three former GAs who are current full-time coaches at the Division I-FBS level. The survey development included a preliminary survey that asked GAs to describe the pros and cons of their job, and questions they would like to know about other GAs. Targeted factors and survey questions from the JSS were also reviewed by the entire panel for their applicability to the graduate assistant football

coach population. Based upon this review, the JSS “Operating Conditions” and “Nature of Work” sub-factors were removed. These sub-factors were replaced with “Role Conflict” and “Role Ambiguity” derived from Beehr & Drexler (1986) and Rizzo et al. (1970). These factors were deemed critical to the GA experience by the panel of experts and a necessary addition to *GAJSS*.

The number of questions per factor were reduced from four to three, in comparison with the original JSS. This was done to condense the survey in respect of GAs time demands. The targeted factors of the *GAJSS* included pay, advancement/promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, role conflict, coworkers, role ambiguity, and communication. Factors to be analyzed were then tagged either questions of context or content in order to comply with the theoretical framework of Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory. According to Herzberg (Chelladurai, 2009), factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfiers, or motivators, relate to work content. Content factors include achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or development. Dissatisfiers, or hygienes, relate to contextual factors of work. Contextual factors include company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security. **Table 3** presents the sub-factors included in the *GAJSS* along with their Herzberg classification.

Table 3*Survey Question Classification Based on Sub-Factor*

Sub-factor	Question Number	Herzberg Classification
Pay	1, 10, 19	Context
Promotion	2, 11, 20	Content
Supervision	3, 12, 21	Context
Fringe Benefits	4, 13, 22	Context
Contingent Rewards	5, 14, 23	Content
Role Conflict	6, 15, 24	Content
Coworkers	7, 16, 25	Context
Role Ambiguity	8, 17, 26	Content
Communication	9, 18, 27	Context

Condensing the questions asked per factor may have affected the internal consistency reliability of the factors examined in the *GAJSS* compared to the original *JSS*. However, this was to be expected. Considering that the accepted minimum standard for internal consistency is .70, eliminating a question from each sub-factor scale would have decreased the coefficient alpha even more, leaving it at a higher risk of error. In addition to eliminating thirteen original questions from the original 36 questions of the *JSS*, eliminating the “operating procedures” and “nature of work” sub-factors also risked lowering the .91 coefficient alpha of internal consistency for the entire *JSS*. However, after considering the qualitative congruency between the removed factors and the added role characteristic factors, it was doubtful that the exchanged factors would drop the internal consistency reliability of the total test below the .70 standard. **Table 4** compares the coefficient alphas of sub-factors in both the *JSS* and *GAJSS*. Individually, five of the nine sub-factors within *GAJSS* fell below the standard of $\alpha = .70$. While this is not ideal for the individual sub-factors, the coefficient alpha for the total reliability of *GAJSS* was .01 below that of the *JSS*. This signified that even though some sub-factors in the *GAJSS* were at a

greater risk of error compared to the JSS, both tests still comparably measured the participants' total job satisfaction.

Table 4
Comparing the reliability of the JSS to the GAJSS

Factor	JSS Coefficient Alpha	GAJSS Coefficient Alpha
Pay	0.75	0.64
Promotion	0.73	0.78
Supervision	0.82	0.61
Benefits	0.73	0.66
Contingent Rewards	0.76	0.79
Role Conflict	n/a	0.62
Coworkers	0.60	0.72
Role Ambiguity	n/a	0.28
Communication	0.71	0.76
Total	0.91	0.90
<i>N</i>	2,870	94

Data Collection

The National Collegiate Athletic Association, or NCAA, permits all 128 FBS schools to have up to four graduate assistant coaches on staff for a total population of up to 512 GAs (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). In order to access a sufficient sample of this population, 111 representatives identified as the Director of Football Operations at Division I-FBS schools were contacted. Their contact information was located using a national directory developed by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. In addition, GAs individual emails were located by searching Division I-FBS athletic websites. The Directors of Football Operations received email correspondence from the head coach of a Division I-FBS university in the southeast region of the United States that included a link for their GAs to take an anonymous, voluntary survey. The correspondence requested the directors to forward the email to the GA coaches on their teams. GAs were invited to take the voluntary survey using an

anonymous online survey during the month of June 2017, and were sent a follow up reminder after ten days if they had not yet completed the survey. The survey was closed at the beginning of July 2017. Analyzed surveys in this study had all Likert scale information completed. Completed demographic and qualitative responses were not required for data analysis.

Data Analysis

Participants completed all qualitative and quantitative responses using Qualtrics surveying software. Upon completion of data collection from all respondents, MAXQDA 12 software was used to code participants' qualitative responses. Participants' responses were categorized based on themes that arose in response to select questions. To ensure intercoder reliability, a second researcher coded the same responses as the primary researcher for agreement. The primary and secondary coders achieved 96% agreement.

SPSS Statistics 24 was used to analyze all quantitative data. Reliability analyses were executed to determine the reliability coefficient for all individual sub-factors tested, including total satisfaction. A descriptive statistics analysis was executed to determine participants' mean satisfaction with each sub-factor presented in the GAJSS as well as their total satisfaction with being a graduate assistant football coach. A one sample t-test was then run to determine if the mean score of the sub-factor was statistically significant. When analyzing participants' perceptions of a graduate degree, a chi-square analysis was run to determine the statistical significance of the data found.

Results

A total of $n = 94$ responses were analyzed. Considering estimated potential number of Division I-FBS GAs, 512, the response rate was 18%. Responses by GAs outside of the millennial age range were not analyzed. Surveys without complete demographic data were still analyzed so long as the Likert information was completed. There was not a significant number of GAs outside of the millennial age range to make any sort of comparisons ($n = 4$). **Table 5** presents participants' demographic information.

Table 5
Demographic information of graduate assistants

	%	<i>n</i>
Conference		
Atlantic Coast Conference	16%	15
Pac-12	14%	13
Mid-American Conference	12%	11
Big Ten	11%	10
American Athletic Conference	10%	9
Conference USA	10%	9
Mountain West	10%	9
Big 12	7%	7
Sun Belt	4%	4
Independent	4%	4
Southeastern Conference	3%	3
Length of time as GA in years*		
2.00	37%	34
1.00	23%	21
0.00 (Less than a year)	12%	11
3.00	12%	11
4.00	9%	8
5.00	5%	5
6.00	2%	2
7.00	1%	1
Number of schools worked at as GA*		
1	64%	54
2	21%	18
3	10%	8

$N = 94$

Note: * depicts incomplete demographic information. Valid percentages were recorded.

In response to [RQ 1], millennial graduate assistant football coaches were satisfied with their jobs ($M = 4.02$, $SD = .75$). **Table 6** shows the mean scores of each sub-factor.

Table 6
Participant sub-factor satisfaction analysis

	Overall				
	Mean	SD	Coefficient Alpha	t	p
Supervision*	5.02	1.00	0.61	9.93	.000
Coworkers*	4.76	0.88	0.72	8.42	.000
Lack of Role Ambiguity*	4.36	0.84	0.28	4.16	.000
Communication	4.18	1.25	0.76	1.43	.157
Contingent Rewards	4.00	1.21	0.79	-.03	.977
Lack of Role Conflict	3.82	1.09	0.62	-1.64	.106
Promotion	3.73	1.22	0.78	-2.16	.033
Benefits	3.72	1.37	0.66	-1.98	.051
Pay**	2.63	1.18	0.64	-11.22	.000
Total Satisfaction	4.02	0.75	0.90	.321	.749

Note: Scale from (1) disagree very much to (6) agree very much

* $p < .001$ ($\mu > 4$)

** $p < .001$ ($\mu < 3$)

In response to [RQ 2] supervision, coworkers, lack of role ambiguity, and pay were found to have statistically significant impacts. There was a significant effect for supervision, $t(93) = 9.92$, $p < .001$. Coworkers reported a statistical significance with $t(93) = 8.42$, $p < .001$. Lack of role ambiguity reported a statistical significance of $t(93) = 4.16$, $p < .001$. Pay reported a statistical significance of $t(93) = -11.22$, $p < .001$. Participants were most satisfied with the

supervision they received from full-time coaches ($M = 5.02$, $SD = 1.00$), and least satisfied with their pay ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.18$). In addition, **Table 7** presents GAs qualitative responses regarding their position.

Table 7
GAs qualitative responses regarding occupation and position

	<i>n</i>	%
Most rewarding about being a Division I-FBS graduate assistant football coach		
Being able to coach football	28	31%
Building relationships with players/coaches	25	28%
Learning more about football	18	20%
Being around the game	10	11%
Opportunity for professional advancement	7	8%
Other	2	2%
N = 90		
Most disliked about being a Division I-FBS graduate assistant football coach		
Lack of pay	33	37%
Treatment from others	10	11%
Role conflict	9	10%
Role ambiguity	8	9%
Lack of benefits	7	8%
Workload	6	7%
Job stability	5	6%
Nothing	5	6%
Class	5	6%
Being away from home and family	2	2%
N = 90		

In response to [RQ 3], GAs perception of a graduate level degree was used to gauge potential role conflict. Millennial GAs were ambivalent regarding the amount of overall role conflict in their jobs ($M = 3.82$; $SD = 1.09$). **Table 8** presents GAs quantitative perception towards a Master's degree. **Table 9** presents the statistical significance of the quantitative percentages found in **Table 8**. **Table 10** presents GAs qualitative perception towards a Master's

degree. While GAs may be ambivalent regarding the amount of role conflict present in their job, GAs perception of their ability to manage both their coaching and academic responsibilities appear to influence whether or not they believe they can obtain their Master’s degree within a two-year period at their university. More research is needed to support this finding.

Table 8

GAs quantitative perception towards Master's degree

	%	<i>n</i>
Is obtaining your Master's degree as part of your current graduate assistantship important to you?		
Yes	62%	58
No	38%	36
Did you have your Master's degree before being hired as a graduate assistant coach at your current university?		
Yes	22%	21
No	78%	73
Are you pursuing a Master's degree as part of your current graduate assistantship?		
Yes	93%	87
No	7%	7
Do you believe you will be able to complete a Master's degree program in your two years as a GA?		
Yes	61%	57
No	39%	37

N = 94

Table 9*Comparison of millennial graduate assistant coaches' perception of Master's degree*

	Yes		No		X ²
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Is obtaining your Master's degree as part of your current graduate assistantship important to you?	58	62	36	38	5.149*
Did you have your Master's degree before being hired as a graduate assistant coach at your current university?	21	22	73	78	28.766***
Are you pursuing a Master's degree as part of your current graduate assistantship?	87	93	7	7	68.085***
Do you believe you will be able to complete a Master's degree program in your two years as a GA?	57	61	37	39	4.255*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 10*GAs qualitative perception towards Master's degree*

	%	n
Reason able to complete Master's degree within two-year period as graduate assistant coach		
Program is completable within two-year period	53%	29
Desire	29%	16
Daily time management skills	18%	10
<hr/>		
<i>n</i> = 55		
Reason not able to complete Master's degree within two-year period as graduate assistant coach		
Not enough time to complete Master's program	49%	17
Role conflict	46%	16
Lack desire	6%	2
<hr/>		
<i>N</i> = 35		

Discussion & Implications

Based on the quantitative and qualitative responses in this study, millennial GAs were least satisfied with their pay considering the amount of responsibilities. In summary of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Chelladurai, 2009), improving context factors such as pay would alleviate job dissatisfaction. However, this would not improve job satisfaction. Based on the qualitative results, millennial GAs in this study placed more value on content factors rather than contextual factors. This would lead to the assumption that millennial GAs were adequately satisfied with the job itself.

Pay, with which a significant number of GAs were dissatisfied, could be changed via NCAA legislation. According to the NCAA, GAs may not be paid in excess of full grant-in-aid, which includes individuals' needed supplies, transportation, and other attendance related expenses at that particular university (i.e., cost of attendance) (The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2016). However, it is not mandated that graduate assistants receive this value as

payment, only that their pay may not exceed that calculated value. Because of this legislation, GAs face limitations with their compensation received compared to hours worked. While they could be paid up to the full grant-in-aid, it is not mandated that universities do so, despite their hours worked and responsibilities held. The NCAA should re-visit its compensation protocol to ensure that GAs are compensated and/or benefited fairly for their roles as both a student and a coach in regards to their hours worked. Considering GAs roles as students and coaches, the award of a full grant-in-aid could be proper compensation for GAs responsibilities with their football program, as their academic and athletic responsibilities mirrors that of their players.

Athletic and academic administrators should review the responsibilities of their graduate assistant coaches to ensure job and academic efficiency and feasibility. Developing summer semester programs for GAs to take graduate coursework reserved for the fall semester could aid graduate program feasibility and GAs academic success. Considering full-time coaches' job stress in Division I-FBS football (Frey, 2007; Holmes, 2011), they may not concern themselves with the role conflict their GAs face, only that their GAs produce high quality work as a football coach. However, the academic stress GAs may face could prevent them from producing such work, impacting their work engagement (Schmitt, 2009).

According to Wilson's study of GAs in the Atlantic Coast Conference (1987), about 38% of GAs completed their Master's degree in a two-year period. In this study, 93% of GAs surveyed were pursuing a Master's degree while only 61% believed they could actually complete their graduate program. The NCAA (2016) does permit GAs to utilize a third year at their university to complete their graduate coursework. However, GAs in this study who did not believe it possible to complete a Master's degree at their current university (39%) attributed it to not having enough time to complete their Master's degree for various reasons, and the role

conflict they faced regarding their coaching responsibilities. No GAs in this study, including those who completed their Master's degree, mentioned utilizing a third year in order to complete their graduate coursework in their qualitative responses. In fairness to the full-time coaches, graduate professors, and GAs, athletic and academic administrators should collaborate to develop feasible and flexible policies that would allow GAs the opportunity to complete graduate coursework within a two-year period while being mindful of their coaching responsibilities in the fall.

Limitations & Future Research

A limitation of this study lies within its instrument design and implementation. Participants in this study were not required to answer all demographic and qualitative questions. Requiring participants who agree to participate in the study to answer all questions could give greater insight into conference demographics as well as reasoning into their job satisfaction and perceptions of a Master's degree as part of their graduate assistantship at their current university. GAs were not asked the amount of time spent engaging in football and/or academic activities, as this could give insight to the amount of time per week GAs dedicated to their roles.

Burnout in millennial GAs in Division I-FBS football is another important factor to assess. The profiles of Division I GAAT's were considered similar to football GAs based on time spent managing occupational and academic responsibilities within an intercollegiate athletics setting. Indication of burnout was high in GAAT's (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Reed & Giacobbi, 2004; Seraphim & Bruening). With millennials' propensity to job hop, head football coaches could find it difficult retaining quality millennial GAs (Mazerolle, Monsma, Dixon, & Mensch, 2012; Myers & Sadaghiani; The Society for Human Resource Management, 2016). Head and assistant coaches' perceptions of GAs would too serve purposeful

for coaches to find ways to efficiently enhance the production and engagement of their GAs on staff. Managing GAs role stress could enhance their production (Schmitt, 2009). A study of burnout, intent to leave the profession, and full-time coaches' perception of GAs could be beneficial to discovering methods to enhance the retention and efficiency of the millennial GA population in Division I-FBS football.

Considering that no GA in this study mentioned utilizing the NCAA's (2016) third year policy regarding degree completion for graduate assistant coaches, the utilization and effectiveness of this policy should be reviewed. Considering that the NCAA permits member institutions to manage the academic endeavors of their football GAs as they please, within certain NCAA legislation, the responsibility to graduate may rest upon athletic department, graduate program, and GA rather than the NCAA.

Conclusion

Millennial graduate assistant football coaches at the Division I-FBS level are satisfied overall with their jobs. Participants in this study were most satisfied with their supervision (i.e., the full-time coaches for whom they worked). Based on the literature reviewed in this study, it was important for millennials to have a relationship with their supervisors, as this positively influenced millennials' job satisfaction (Morris, Arthur-Banning and McDowell, 2014; Myers and Sadaghiani, 2010). Role conflict was not a factor in which GAs were dissatisfied. However, role conflict could potentially determine whether or not millennial GAs completed their Master's degree within a two-year time period. Millennial GAs were most dissatisfied with their pay. A majority of GAs (93%) reported that obtaining a Master's degree was important to them while only 61% believed they could actually complete their graduate program. GAs who deemed it not

possible to complete their Master's degree within a two-year time period attributed it to "not having enough time" (49%) and "role conflict" (46%).

The NCAA should re-visit its compensation protocol to ensure that GAs are compensated and/or benefited fairly for their roles as both a student and a coach in regards to their hours worked. Considering GAs roles as students and coaches, the award of a full grant-in-aid could be proper compensation for GAs responsibilities with their football program, as their academic and athletic responsibilities mirrors that of their players. In fairness to the full-time coaches, graduate professors, and GAs, athletic and academic administrators should collaborate to develop feasible and flexible policies that would allow GAs the opportunity to complete graduate coursework within a two-year period while being mindful of their coaching responsibilities in the fall. Developing summer semester programs for GAs to take graduate coursework reserved for the fall semester could aid graduate program feasibility and academic success for GAs.

A limitation of this study lies within its instrument design and implementation. Participants in this study were not required to answer all demographic and qualitative questions. GAs were not asked the amount of time spent engaging in football and/or academic activities, as this could give insight to the amount of time per week GAs dedicated to their roles. A study of burnout, intent to leave the profession, and full-time coaches' perception of GAs could be beneficial to discovering coping methods to enhance the efficiency and retention of the millennial GA population in Division I-FBS football.

APPENDIX 1: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Which conference is your school in for football?
 - a. American Athletic Conference
 - b. ACC
 - c. Big 12
 - d. Big Ten
 - e. Conference USA
 - f. MAC
 - g. Mountain West
 - h. Pac-12
 - i. SEC
 - j. Sun Belt
 - k. Independent

2. Indicate the period in which you were born.
 - a. Before 1976 or below
 - b. Born between 1977-1995
 - c. Born after 1995

3. Use the slider to indicate how long you have held the role of “Graduate Assistant Coach.”
 - a. 1-10 years (Sliding scale indicator on Qualtrics)

4. Use the slider to indicate how many schools have you worked at as a “Graduate Assistant Coach.”
 - a. 1-10 schools (Sliding scale indicator on Qualtrics)

5. Is obtaining your Master’s degree as part of your current graduate assistantship important to you?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

6. (If Yes) Please explain why obtaining your Master’s degree as part of your current graduate assistantship is important to you.

7. (If No) Please explain why obtaining your Master’s degree as part of your current graduate assistantship is not important to you.

8. Did you have your Master's degree before being hired as a graduate assistant coach at your current university?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

9. Are you pursuing a Master's degree as part of your current graduate assistantship?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

10. Considering the time demands placed upon you as a graduate assistant coach at your current university, do you believe you will be (or would be) able to complete a Master's degree program within your two years as a graduate assistant coach?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

11. (If No) Why do you believe you would not be able to complete a Master's degree during the two years of your current graduate assistantship?

12. (If Yes) Why do you believe you would be able to complete a Master's degree during the two years of your current graduate assistantship?

13. Please rank your agreement or disagreement with the following statements. All responses are anonymous.

		Disagree very much Disagree moderately Disagree slightly Agree slightly Agree moderately Agree very much
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being hired for a full-time position at either this university or another.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor (e.g., the position coach I work under) is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive (team clothing received, meals, travel, privileges and access, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	I work on unnecessary things.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I feel certain about how much authority I have.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	I am confident with my chances of being hired for a full-time position at either this university or another once I complete my GA at this school.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	I like my supervisor (e.g., the position coach I work under).	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other universities offer (team clothing received, meals, travel, special privileges and access, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I know that I divide my time properly at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization/team are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
19	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20	People get jobs once they leave here as fast as they do in other places.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21	My supervisor (e.g., the position coach I work under) shows little interest in the feelings of other GAs and support staff.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22	There are benefits we do not have which we should have (team clothing received, meals, travel, special privileges and access, etc.).	1 2 3 4 5 6
23	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24	To satisfy some people in my role as a GA, I have to upset others.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26	I know exactly what is expected of me on a daily basis.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27	My work assignments are not fully explained.	1 2 3 4 5 6

14. In general, what have you found most rewarding about your role as a Graduate Assistant football coach?

15. In general, what have you disliked about being a Graduate Assistant football coach?

16. What other information would you like others to know about your experience as a Graduate Assistant football coach?

APPENDIX 2: SUB-FACTOR BREAKDOWN AND ANALYSIS

<i>Survey Question Classification Based on Sub-Factor</i>		
Subscale	Question Number	Herzberg Classification
Pay	1, 10, 19	Context
Advancement/Promotion	2, 11, 20	Content
Supervision	3, 12, 21	Context
Fringe Benefits	4, 13, 22	Context
Contingent Rewards	5, 14, 23	Content
Role Conflict	6, 15, 24	Content
Coworkers	7, 16, 25	Context
Role Ambiguity	8, 17, 26	Content
Communication	9, 18, 27	Context

<i>Conversion for negatively worded survey questions</i>	
Negatively Worded Score	Converted Score
1	6
2	5
3	4
4	3
5	2
6	1

REFERENCES

- Beehr, T., & Drexler Jr., J. (1986). Social support, autonomy, and hierarchical level as moderators of the role characteristics-outcome relationship. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 207-214.
- Biddle, B. (1986). Recent Developments in Role-Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 67-92.
- Bland, H. W., Melton, B. F., Welle, P., & Bigham, L. (2012). Stress Tolerance: New Challenges for Millennial College Students. *College Student Journal*, 362-375.
- Chelladurai, P. (2009). *Managing Organizations for Sport and Physical Activity: A Systems Perspective*. Scottsdale: Holcomb Hathaway, Publishers.
- Cox, S., & Roden, D. (2010). Quality Perception and the Championship Effect: Do Collegiate Sports Influence Academic Rankings? *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 1-11.
- Dunn, T. P., & Dunn, S. L. (1992). The graduate assistant coach: A preliminary profile of an endangered species. *Physical Educator*, 189-194.
- Dunn, T. P., & Dunn, S. L. (1997). The Graduate Assistant Coach: Role Conflicts in the Making. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 260-271.
- Ervin, S., & Cianfrone, B. A. (2014). Exploring the Work-Life Balance of Intercollegiate Athletic Graduate Assistants: A Preliminary Study of Work-Extracurricular Conflict. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 197-215.
- Fleming, J. (2016, May 19). *Gallup Analysis: Millennials, Marriage and Family*. Retrieved from Gallup: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/191462/gallup-analysis-millennials-marriage-family.aspx>
- Fletcher, D., & Scott, M. (2010). Psychological Stress in Sports Coaches: A Review of Concepts, Research and Practice. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 127-137.
- Frey, M. (2007). College Coaches' Experiences with Stress - "Problem Solvers" Have Problems Too. *The Sport Psychologist*, 38-57.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hoffman, J. L. (2015). Playoffs and Payoffs: The College Football Coaching Carousel. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 37-42.
- Holmes, P. (2011). Win or Go Home: Why College Football Coaches Get Fired. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 157-178.

- Jensen, J., & Turner, B. (2015). Resource valuation of non-profit organizations: the case of the intercollegiate athletics industry. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, 169-187.
- Kim, B., Murrmann, S., & Lee, G. (2009). Moderating Effects of Gender and Organizational level Between Role Stress and Job Satisfaction among Hotel Employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 612-619.
- Kim, J. C. (2004). The Effects of Work Experiences and Institutional Support on Job Satisfaction Among NCAA Coaches (master's thesis). Texas A&M University, Texas, United States of America.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2017). *Athletic & Academic Spending Database for NCAA Division I*. Retrieved from Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics: <http://spendingdatabase.knightcommission.org/reports/24a5f316>
- Mazerolle, S. M., Monsma, E., Dixon, C., & Mensch, J. (2012). An assessment of burnout in graduate assistant certified athletic trainers. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 320-328.
- Morris, E., Arthur-Banning, S., & McDowell, J. (2014). Career Strategies of Millennial Generation Female Assistant Coaches. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 175-197.
- Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the Workplace: A Communication Perspective on Millennials' Organizational Relationships and Performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 225-238.
- NCAA. (2017, April 14). *DI Council Adopts New Football Recruiting Model*. Retrieved from NCAA: <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/di-council-adopts-new-football-recruiting-model>
- Pope, D., & Pope, J. (2009). The Impact of College Sports Success on the Quantity and Quality of Student Applications. *Southern Economic Journal*, 750-780.
- Ritter, K.-J., Matthews, R., Ford, M., & Henderson, A. (2016). Understanding Role Stressors and Job Satisfaction Over Time Using Adaptation Theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1655-1669.
- Rizzo, J., House, R., & Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Complex Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 150-163.
- Sage, G. (1987). The social world of high school athletic coaches: multiple role demands and their consequences. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 213-228.
- Schmitt, E. (2009, June 21). A Study on Graduate Students: Perceptions of Stress, Job Engagement, Satisfaction, and the Buffering Effects of Social Support and Coping style

- (doctoral dissertation). The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Chicago, United States of America.
- Seraphin, L., & Bruening, J. (2004). Role conflict in athletic department graduate assistants: a case study. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 363-386.
- Smith, C., Tisak, J., & Schmieder, R. (1993). The Measurement Properties of the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Scales: A Review and Extension of the Empirical Research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37-48.
- Spector, P.^a (1997). The assessment of job satisfaction. In P. Spector, *Advanced Topics in Organization Behavior: Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (pp. 5-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Spector, P.^b (2011, July 11). *Instructions for Scoring the Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS*. Retrieved from Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS Page: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssscore.html>
- Spector, P.^c (2011, July 11). *Interpreting Satisfaction Scores with the Job Satisfaction Survey*. Retrieved from Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS Page: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jssinterpretation.html>
- Spector, P.^d (2011, July 10). *Job Satisfaction Survey*. Retrieved from Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS Page: <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html>
- The Center for Generational Kinetics. (2017, April 15). *Generational Breakdown: Info About All of the Generations*. Retrieved from The Center for Generational Kinetics: <http://genhq.com/faq-info-about-generations/>
- The National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2016). *NCAA Division I Manual: August 2016-2017*. Indianapolis: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- The Society for Human Resource Management. (2016). *Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement: Revitalizing a Changing Workforce*. Alexandria: The Society for Human Resource Management.
- The Society for Human Resource Management. (2016). *Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement: Revitalizing a Changing Workforce*. Alexandria: The Society for Human Resource Management.
- Thompson, C. (2012). Managing Millennials: A Framework for Improving Attraction, Motivation, and Retention. *The Psychologist Manager Journal*, 237-246.
- USA Today. (2016, October 25). *NCAA Salaries*. Retrieved from USA Today: <http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/salaries/>

van Saane, N., Sluiter, J., Verbeek, J., & Frings-Dresen, M. (2003). Reliability and Validity of Instruments Measuring Job Satisfaction - A Systematic Review. *Occupational Medicine*, 191-200.

Wilson, K. (1987). Graduation percentages and job perceptions of graduate assistant football coaches in the Atlantic Coast Conference. North Carolina (master's thesis). The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina, United States of America.