



DORDT COLLEGE

Digital Collections @ Dordt

Faculty Work: Comprehensive List


2010

Job Satisfaction of NAIA Head Coaches at Small Faith-Based Colleges: The Teacher-Coach Model

Craig L. Stiemsma

Dordt College, craig.stiemsma@dordt.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/faculty_work

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stiemsma, Craig L., "Job Satisfaction of NAIA Head Coaches at Small Faith-Based Colleges: The Teacher-Coach Model" (2010).

Faculty Work: Comprehensive List. Paper 126.

http://digitalcollections.dordt.edu/faculty_work/126

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Collections @ Dordt. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Work: Comprehensive List by an authorized administrator of Digital Collections @ Dordt. For more information, please contact ingrid.mulder@dordt.edu.

Job Satisfaction of NAIA Head Coaches at Small Faith-Based Colleges: The Teacher-Coach Model

Abstract

The head coaches at smaller colleges usually have other job responsibilities that include teaching, along with the responsibilities of coaching, recruiting, scheduling, and other coaching-related jobs. There is often a dual role involved for these coaches who try to juggle two different jobs that sometimes require different skill sets and involve different responsibilities that may lead to role conflict. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). This study also sought to determine if there were differences in coaches' levels of job satisfaction based on their personal and specific job characteristics. Finally, the study also identified specific job responsibilities that coaches perceived to have enhanced their levels of job satisfaction and which responsibilities coaches perceived were barriers to higher levels of job satisfaction. The Great Plains Conference is an organization of 13 small faith-based colleges in South Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska. The Great Plains Athletic Conference head coaches from 10 different sports were emailed a survey that focused on job satisfaction and personal and job characteristics. The coaches who completed the survey were very satisfied overall with their jobs. The two job characteristics that gave coaches the most job satisfaction were the opportunity to work with young people and the enjoyment that comes from working with a team. There were also many significant differences found based on personal and job characteristics. Non-coaching job responsibilities were the most significant barrier to job satisfaction. The functional role of the teacher-coach model has a long history. College coaches who work at small colleges and universities are required to perform other tasks and have other responsibilities. The economy and college financing determine if the teacher-coach model is necessary at different institutions. Coaches enjoy working at colleges and have a high level of job satisfaction despite having to teach and be responsible for other tasks. History indicates that many smaller colleges cannot afford to hire and pay full-time coaches for many sports. College presidents, athletic directors, and coaches need to understand the aforementioned circumstances. Those administrators involved in hiring college coaches, directing college athletics, and the college coaches themselves may benefit from knowing what characteristics lead to high job satisfaction. The college head coaches in this study drew job satisfaction from working in a faith-based institution. As coaches at small colleges, it is important to them to focus on the things that give them job satisfaction and to realize that coaching positions at smaller colleges will usually require other job responsibilities.

Keywords

college athletics, job satisfaction, athletic coach, role conflict, church related colleges, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics

Disciplines

Christianity | Higher Education | Sports Studies

Comments

- A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty of the University of South Dakota in partial fulfillment for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
- © 2010 Craig L. Stiemsma

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Many head coaches enjoy tremendous success and enjoy their jobs immensely. But there also is a tremendous deal of pressure, which was portrayed by Burns (2009) who reflected,

Recruiting has escalated to the point that it has become a vicious and phony process that steals time and energy from everyone involved. I no longer want to hold myself tensely against the athletic world. The madness of the now year round recruiting process drained me. (p. 14)

Buchanan (2006) claimed that there is now greater pressure on college head coaches resulting in higher turnover for head coaches. The job satisfaction of college head coaches obviously plays a large part in turnover for these coaches. During the past 15 years, there have been many changes in the job descriptions of college head coaches. Jacobson (2002) found that college head coaches at small colleges often are required to do a number of different things besides coaching including teaching, administrative, or other tasks in addition to full-time coaching and recruiting (Jacobson, 2002). The teacher-coach model is defined as a professional educator who has dual roles that involve both teaching and coaching. This model is commonplace in the United States at both the high school and the collegiate levels. From a historical perspective, Frost (1970) noted that the teacher-coach model was more prevalent in smaller colleges.

The teacher-coach model has been especially prevalent in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division III because these colleges and universities are smaller. Since they are smaller in enrollment, the costs are higher, and employees are asked to be more versatile and do a variety of things. Burns

(2009) described the teacher-versus-coach conflict in this story which describes the conflict that exists because of the dual role tension. Burns wrote,

A wise old coach tells his young assistant, "There are two wolves fighting within me. One of them is prideful, burning with ambition, desperate to win and gain honor, the other humane, compassionate, and eager to teach life lessons." Which one will win, my mentor?" The young coach asks. The wise old coach answered "The one I feed." (p. 108)

This story provides a great analogy of the role conflict that exists for the teacher-coach model. There are a number of personal characteristics that have been found to be related to college head coaches' job satisfaction. Kuchler (2006) noted that head coaches with a high job satisfaction are beneficial for the athletes, the athletic programs, the school, the athletic director, and the coach. Miller, Lutz, Shim, Fredenburg, and Miller (2005) explained that the best education for coaches involves the actual coaching of a team and the practical experience gained in doing so. Quinn and Mandilovitch (1980) found a positive relationship between the coaches' level of education and their job satisfaction. However, Klein and Maher (1966) indicated a negative correlation between level of education and job satisfaction. These two contrasting research pieces represent a clear need for more research on this topic.

Years of coaching experience have been found to have a positive relationship to college coaches' job satisfaction (Leblicq, Van Hoeckw, & De Koup, 2002). There has been other research that has supported Leblicq. Hambleton (1989) found that income was the only variable of significance in terms of college coaches' job satisfaction. In addition, Kuchler (2006) found that the biggest variable for female coaching job satisfaction was also income related.

Kieffer (1998) recommended that more information is needed in trying to determine why there is a low percentage of faculty with doctorates teaching physical education courses in

the Christian colleges and universities. Ryan and Sagar (2006) found that coaches who taught at the college level had a lower job satisfaction and a greater intent to leave their institution than those who only coached. Pryor and Daw's (2006) research noted the high cost of searching and recruiting new coaches. There has also been a relationship between program continuity and program success (Pryor & Daw, 2006).

This study examined job satisfaction of head coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). The GPAC is an organization consisting of Midwestern faith-based small liberal arts colleges. The schools in this conference are very similar in that most of them rely on teachers to also coach. The schools are all located in Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota.

Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). This study also sought to determine the differences in coaches' levels of job satisfaction based on their personal and their specific job characteristics. Finally, the study also identified which specific job responsibilities coaches perceive enhance their level of job satisfaction and what coaches perceive are barriers to their higher level of job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study regarding the job satisfaction of small college athletic coaches:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction for Great Plains Athletic Conference college head coaches?
2. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following personal characteristics?
 - a. Highest degree earned

- b. Age
 - c. Gender
 - d. Years of coaching experience
 - e. Semester coached
3. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following job characteristics?
- a. Load credits for coaching
 - b. Load credit for teaching
 - c. Perceived level of success in coaching
 - d. Level of salary
 - e. Support of supervisor
4. What specific job responsibilities do college coaches perceive will help to enhance their job satisfaction?
5. What barriers do college head coaches perceive to hinder their job satisfaction?

Significance of the Study

There have been few studies in the past that showed a correlation between job satisfaction and several different job characteristics. This study focused on job satisfaction of NAIA coaches who often are asked to balance teaching and coaching responsibilities. There is a great deal of evidence that pointed to some significant job characteristics leading to job satisfaction for collegiate coaches. This study was an effort to add more research to the body of research that already existed. The study was an attempt to help gain a clearer understanding of characteristics that enhance job satisfaction. This study was also an attempt to help gain a clearer understanding of job characteristics that inhibit satisfaction for college coaches.

Definition of Terms

This section defines terms that were used in this dissertation.

CIT-Coaching interfering with teaching (Ryan & Sagar, 2006)

Coaching-A person who trains and gives instruction or leadership to an athletic team or other group.

GPAC-Great Plains athletic Conference

Load credits-The percentage of credits a coach is given for coaching responsibilities and athletic program management responsibilities.

NAIA-National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics

NCAA-National Collegiate Athletic Association

Small College-a college or institution of higher education with a smaller enrollment; unlike a larger university or state institution of higher education.

Teacher-coach mode-A dual job combination in which part of the job description is teaching and part is coaching.

TIC-Teaching interfering with coaching (Ryan & Sagar, 2006)

Delimitations of the Study

This study delimited to the coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference in the fall of 2009. This study focused on coaches from ten different sports. The study was delimited to the coaches' perceptions and did not directly study their job responsibilities.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 has presented the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, and delimitations of the study. Chapter 2 includes a review of literature and current research regarding college head coaches and job satisfaction. Chapter 3 contains the study design, rationale, and methodology.

An analysis of reported data and findings is presented in Chapter 4. Finally, a summary of the findings, conclusions, as well as discussion, and recommendations for practice and future research are presented in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature related to college coaches and job satisfaction. The literature review includes three areas of research. The first area focuses on college faculty job satisfaction and the teacher-coach model. The second area of literature review focuses on current trends and job descriptions for college head coaches. The third area of review examines the coaches' job satisfaction in relation to personal and job characteristics. The final area of the literature review focuses on other positive and negative characteristics of coaches' job satisfaction.

Overall Faculty Job Satisfaction and the Teacher-Coach Model

This section of the literature review focuses on the overall job satisfaction of faculty and introduces the teacher-coach model. The overall job satisfaction of faculty in higher education represents an important framework with which to examine the teacher-coaches that represent only a small fraction of the overall faculty in higher education. The teacher-coach model involves faculty in higher education who also have responsibilities to coach college athletic teams and oversee athletic programs.

Rosser and Townsend (2006) noted that faculty turnover is expensive to colleges and universities. Terpstra and Honoree (2006) found that job satisfaction in higher education is a factor in turnover, absenteeism, and job motivation. According to Kingston-Mann and Sieber (2001), factors such as added professional responsibilities, increased class load, and research responsibilities have overwhelmed faculty and increased decisions by faculty to leave institutions of higher education. There is evidence that less than 30% of faculty departures were due to retirement (Daly & Dee, 2006). These writers also pointed out that increased job satisfaction enhanced faculty intention to stay with the institution. Johnsrud and Rosser (2002)

showed that workplace stress led to decisions to leave both the school as well as the occupation. Johnsrud and Rossner (2002) also pointed out that the faculty that chose to leave were often the ones the institution would have preferred to keep. Rosser and Townsend (2006) noted that the most important dimension of all the factors that were involved in faculty retention was support from the administration. Turner (2000) found that increased success for all students and educational quality is enhanced when the faculty is more diverse. Thomas and Asunka (1995) revealed that the turnover rates for faculty of color were higher than they were for White faculty.

Richardson (1981) noted that the problem facing athletic directors is finding qualified teacher-coaches. Colleges have a hard time finding qualified coaches that also teach, or qualified teachers that can meet the needs of the student athletes and find success as a coach. Aldridge (1975) noted a lack of a specific minimum preparation level for coaches. Aldridge also stated that there is no consensus in requirements when it comes to competency in coaching and coaching preparation levels.

Teachers and coaches have long been linked together. The teacher-coach model has been defined as a professional educator who has dual roles that involve both teaching and coaching. There has been a common misunderstanding on the relationship between coaching and teaching (Vanderzwaag, 1969). Though they can be completely separate jobs, they are commonly seen as interwoven and coupled with each other. Although there are many similarities and parallels to teaching and coaching, they are two distinctly different jobs with distinctly different goals. Teaching and coaching have very different job expectations (Ryan & Sagar, 2006).

Darst and Pangrazi (1996) also raised concerns about the teacher-coach model. They mentioned the role conflict that often accompanied completely different jobs with different

goals and different missions. Not only are the two jobs different, but they also required different skills. There is inter-role conflict that exists within the teacher-coach model (Ryan & Sagar, 2006) which showed two specific strands of conflict, namely T.I.C. (teaching interfering with coaching) and C.I.T. (coaching interfering with teaching). Ryan and Sagar related that both of these strands led to lower overall job satisfaction. Ryan and Sagar (2006) found that as C.I.T. and T.I.C. increased, turnover intention also increased. Stryker and Stratham (1989) stated that multiple roles lead to increased stress and decreased job satisfaction. Ryan and Sagar(2006) also found that teachers who coached in college had both lower coaching job satisfaction and lower teaching job satisfaction.

A study by Freischlag (1988) showed a strong correlation between teaching physical education and college coaching. Freischlag noted results from 84 of 116 NCAA division I head basketball coaches that showed a majority of college men's basketball coaches had training in physical education and also possessed experience in coaching at the high school level. A strong connection was found between coaching and teaching in small colleges (Stier, 1982). A majority of the institutions surveyed had faculty or staff members that had jobs involving a combination of both teaching and coaching. In fact, only three percent of the full-time staff members had jobs that were strictly coaching (Stier, 1982). Stier also concluded that small college physical education teachers were typically highly educated and experienced.

Teaching and coaching can require distinctly different certification, training, and skill sets (Chelladuria & Kuga 1996). Biddle, Good, and Goodson (1997) reiterated the difficulty of having multiple job roles that often conflict. Chelladuria and Kuga (1996) also claimed that individuals often prefer focusing on coaching aspects at the risk of shortchanging the other role, which typically would involve the teaching aspect. Coakley's (1990) research found that

coaching usually took priority in terms of time and energy spent. Chu (1984) noted that people sometimes even become physical educators because of a desire they have to coach.

Edginton, Davis, and Hensley (1994) advocated that exercise science and physical education-type programs must be more ready to adapt to changing models that are happening in higher education. The teacher-coach model is seen as a viable cost option by integrating athletic programs and physical education programs or departments. Program reviews and other responsibilities may be relegated to a lower priority for faculty who also are responsible for coaching and management of an athletic program.

Frey's (2007) research showed the unusual and specific stress experiences that are common for college coaching. Frey used interviews to determine different experiences involving stress including things like responses to stress and managing stress. Frey also revealed five different dimensions including work conditions, sources of stress, responses and effects of stress, how stress is managed, and sources of job enjoyment. Frey noted that job satisfaction was lower when job demands outweighed coaching resources.

Chelladurai and Ogasawara (2003) noted that coaches of college sports face different pressures that continue to mount. Their findings also indicated that there is increased pressure on college coaches to keep their jobs. Buchanan (2006) found that stress is a huge part of the coaching life cycle and coaching turnover. Chelladurai (1999) also found an interesting challenge for coaches when comparing the coach and program to a president and business model.

Chelladurai (1999) pointed out the fact that coaches and programs often lack the continuity that a business or company has. The coach is the one and often only person in the program that is present the entire time and does not cycle through the program. Normally, all other personnel, with the exception of the head coach of the program, will cycle through the program, coming and going in the span of four or less years.

Thornton's (2007) research showed that coaches in some sports at the top level of college coaching are making much more than the average professor. Hayes (2004) pointed out that top college coaches in football like Nick Saban at Louisiana State University (3 million dollars per year) and Bob Stoops at the University of Oklahoma (2.2 million dollars per year) make far more than any faculty at any level. There are also many other coaches, at all levels, who are making a similar amount of money, or sometimes less than the professors at the school where they coach.

Cote et al., (1995) showed that there is a peripheral component of unstable factors that play into job satisfaction in college coaching. There are a plethora of undefined conditions with any job including program conditions, youth programs, and competition levels. These unstable factors may include tradition, Amateur Athletic Union programs, scholarship restrictions, entrance requirements, alumni support, recruiting restrictions, facility availability, budgeting restrictions, and staffing limitations that may all be seen as peripheral components and play a part in job satisfaction. Yalcin (2000) called for more scholarship on the teacher-coach role.

Keiffer (1998) asked for more research to help determine why there is a low percentage of doctorates teaching the required physical education and wellness courses? Knoppers also noted that half of all male coaches and 88% of all female coaches did not intend to coach until they reached the age of 65. Acosta and Carpenter (2002) pointed out that in the first three years of the twenty-first-century, more than 90% of all new college coaches hired were male.

Slovenski (2003) urged colleges to protect college coaches by allowing them to be a part of higher education and physical education. Slovenski mentioned that until 1970, the teacher-coach model allowed for coaches to be tenured. This model also allowed coaches to have a proper perspective towards athletics, winning, and an academic culture. This model allowed the coach not to have to focus solely on winning.

Slovenski (2003) also blamed the deterioration of the teacher-coach model on television revenue. Wolverton (2007) showed annual NCAA revenue to be \$558 million. Wolverton found that each NCAA member spends \$2.3 million dollars annually on their athletic teams. Wolverton (2007) reported the total annual revenue of all NAIA institutions is only \$4 million, roughly what two NCAA schools make in a year. Coaching pressure accompanies potential for revenue based on winning games (Wolverton, 2007). The NAIA schools often have less pressure to win because they have far less at stake financially (Wolverton, 2007).

Teacher-Coach Research Related to Personal and Job Characteristics

The second section of the review of literature focuses on personal characteristics that influence job satisfaction. There are several areas of research involving job satisfaction and personal characteristics that include highest degree earned, age, gender, pay, experience, and the season in which the person coached.

Highest Degree Earned

There is not a great deal of information about level of education and coaches' job satisfaction. However, as a means for looking at highest degree earned, Stier's (1983) research found that a significant number of physical education professors working in community colleges did not have doctorates. Stier revealed statistics that showed that master's degrees were held by only 53.6% of all community college physical education teachers, with department chairs holding master's degrees 74% of the time. Only four percent of department chairs had doctoral degrees at the community college level.

Akindutire (2003) found a higher degree earned also was related to having a higher and more positive level of job satisfaction for coaches. One significant study focused on coaches and their level of education. White (1992) found that only five percent of all surveyed college coaches in Eastern North Carolina had a doctorate although 60% had earned a master's degree.

White (1992) also showed that 31% had a bachelor's degree among those surveyed in 20 different sized college's coaches of different sports. Fifty-seven percent of those surveyed had a major of physical education. Forty-one percent of these coaches held a master's degree in physical education.

Kuchler (2001) showed that head coaches at Midwest NCAA division III schools usually had a BA or MA. Among 86 head coaches surveyed, 58.14% held a master's degree, while 30.23% held a bachelor's degree. Only 6.98% had a doctorate, while 4.65% had less than a bachelor's degree.

Quinn and Mandilovitch (1980) noted that coaches' job satisfaction had a positive relationship to level the of education. This revelation was challenged by Klein & Maher (1966). Klein and Maher conducted research that indicated a negative correlation between level of education and job satisfaction. There is a need for more research on this topic.

Age

Weaver's (1980) research found that college coaches' job satisfaction improved with age. Miller, Lutz, Shim, Fredenburg, and Miller (2005) explained that the best education for coaches involves practical experience. Miller et al. (2005) went on to explain that the best preparation for coaching involves hands on experience as a coach. Weaver claimed that winning is tied to strategizing and learning different successful techniques. As with many other occupations, learning techniques and strategies come from hands-on experience. Miller et al. (2005) reiterated the value of years of coaching wisdom. Miller also suggested a unique difficulty involved in the profession of coaching. Miller (2005) stated that there is a high turnover for the coaching profession when 50% of all coaches are guaranteed to lose on any and every given night at every contest.

Leblicq, Van Hoeckw, and De Koup (2002) also found years of experience, as well as age have a positive correlation to coaching job satisfaction. This study showed that 30-year-olds had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than the grouping in their younger twenties as well as a group in their later twenties. Leblicq et al. also found the 23-29 year old group had a higher level of job satisfaction than the youngest group of coaches. Leblicq's study showed that the more experienced coaches had higher job satisfaction. Furthur, Leblicq et al. (2003) found coaches who had more control of the decision making processes of their job were more satisfied in their jobs.

Gender

Sagas and Ashley (2001) found that females left coaching earlier than males. Button (2001) found discrimination against female coaches in areas such as job responsibilities, job promotions, job raises, and opportunities for job development. This trend, combined with the fact that a majority of female coaches did not intend to coach until they were of retirement age, was an indication that male coaching numbers at the college level were only going to keep increasing.

West, Green, Brackenridge, and Woodward (2001) explored the reasons for underrepresentation of female coaches at the collegiate level. Their study revealed that both men and women felt the underrepresentation was due to two different factors. First, the study concluded that females were less likely to have the ability to commit the time and job demands necessary to find success at the college level. Secondly, West et al. (2001) stated that women were also inhibited by the lack of role models because of the smaller percentages of females currently involved in coaching at the college level. Knoppers et al. (1991) also stated that other occupations have much greater chances for promotion. These coaches have reached the

pinnacle of their profession. They may not have seen the opportunity for financial increase or other opportunity for vertical mobility as a natural promotion from their current jobs.

Cunningham and Sagas (2003) found that both female and male coaches with similar work experience and similar work responsibilities viewed their career options differently. Females viewed their opportunity to advance their careers as being more limited than their male counterparts. Fox and Hesse-Biber (1984) claimed that males have a greater job satisfaction than females, based on greater social support. Kuchler (2006) showed that females who coach at the college level were only moderately satisfied in several areas.

Caccese and Mayerberg (1984) found that female college coaches had a lower overall job satisfaction than their male counterparts because the female burnout was significantly higher on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Sandell and Shapiro (1978) noted that women generally earned less than men spanning a broad range of professional job descriptions. Caccese and Mayerberg's (1984) research showed women had less years of experience than male college coaches. Caccese and Mayberber (1984) also showed a correlation between females' higher stress levels and female coaches having less experience. Mathes (1982) also contributed research showing that job satisfaction factors including pay and facility usage were important roles in females' decisions to leave college coaching jobs.

Experience

Steir (1982) found that over 70% of coaches had more than five years of teaching experience. Kuchler (2001) also showed similar data; their research found that the amount of experience in that particular head coaching position was 5.3 years. Kuchler (2001) found the average amount of college coaching experience in his survey was 9.2 years.

Steir's research (1982) found that only 15% of the physical education teachers surveyed reported they had jobs that involved teaching only. That leaves 85% of teacher-coaches that

has responsibilities above and beyond, or at least different than the tasks usually associated with higher education.

Income

Hambleton (1989) found that income was the only variable in their study that contributed significantly to job satisfaction. Kuchler (2006) pointed out that the biggest variable for females in terms of job satisfaction was the income level. Caccese and Mayberber (1984) also indicated in their study that female coaches were not rewarded as well as their male counterparts.

Other Job Satisfaction Characteristics

There are also other factors and characteristics related to college coaches' job satisfaction that have been researched. Different factors not included in the job characteristics and personal characteristics section that influenced job satisfaction are included in this final section of the literature review. They are divided into two sections. The first section reviews factors and characteristics that enhance job satisfaction. The second section reviews the factors and characteristics that reflect negatively on job satisfaction.

Hoppock (1935) used a simple definition of job satisfaction as being circumstances that cause people to truthfully state that they are satisfied with their job. Locke (1976) noted that job satisfaction can be described as a pleasurable component of a job or a positive emotional state that is a result of appraisal of a person's job.

Akindutire (2003) found that those who were married had a higher level of job satisfaction. Lebicq, Van Hoeckw, and De Koup (2002) found that the amount of commitment to coaching was tied to the level of job satisfaction. Their research showed coaches were more satisfied with their jobs when they practiced more hours. Lebicq et al. (2002) found that coaches that practiced 10 or more hours per week were significantly more satisfied with their job than

those coaches that practiced less than 10 hours per week. Singh & Surujlal (2006) provided evidence that showed that the characteristic that gave coaches the greatest amount of satisfaction came from the pride that comes from the actual coaching of the team. Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) also noted the greatest source of satisfaction for both male and female college coaches was working with athletes.

Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) showed that a positive relationship with the athletic director led to a higher job satisfaction for college coaches. Dixon & Sagas (2007) supported those results when they found a correlation between stronger organizational support and higher job satisfaction. Clopton, Ryan, and Sagas (2007) noted that when the athletic director had a high career satisfaction, coaches under that athletic director had a higher job satisfaction than coaches that worked for an athletic director with a lower career satisfaction.

Akindutire (2003) found higher job satisfaction to be linked in a positive way to positive relationships with colleagues. Cunningham and Sagas (2004) showed evidence that coaches with similar attitudes and values as their counterparts were more likely to stay at the school. Dissimilarities also caused greater turnover among coaches in the study. Cunningham and Sagas (2004) used "turnover intention" as a way to gauge likely intent to leave a school. Their study emphasized the importance of hiring coaches with values and attitudes that are like those that already reside in that department.

Dawis and Lofquist (1984) described the importance of work environment as it relates to job satisfaction. They revealed that job environment is a major contributing factor to making coaches feel satisfied with their jobs. Dawis and Lofquist (1984) identified a group of characteristics that helped to measure whether or not a work environment is capable of meeting a worker's needs. They showed why these will ultimately determine the amount of satisfaction people will feel from the tasks they are asked to perform. Kuchler (2001) revealed

the correspondence between job expectations and individual abilities. The higher the correlation, the more positive effect it will have on job tenure and expectation that a good fit for a job will lead to a longer tenure. High job satisfaction was related to athletic directors having higher leadership skills (Yosif, 1998).

Jordan, Malone, and Gillantine (2004) found that coaches had greater job satisfaction when their immediate supervisor was a male. Jordan, Malone, and Gillantine (2004) completed a survey of well over 200 college coaches from the division I and the division III levels. Their variables included gender of the coach, gender of the team and athletes, experience of the coach, education of the coach, level of the institution (either division I or division III), and gender of the supervisor. Jordan, Malone and Gillentine (2004) also found that males and higher division levels had greater job satisfaction than their counterparts. They may have been at the top of their profession, so they should get more pay, more perks, more work release time, more help, a bigger budget, and better athletes. Chelladurai and Ogasewara (2003) found that division I and division III coaches in the United States had higher job satisfaction than coaches in Japan. The coaches in colleges in the United States also had a higher commitment to the sport they coached than did their Japanese coaching counterparts (Chelladurai & Ogasewara, 2003). The Japanese coaches had a higher commitment to the organization or school that they worked for than the United States coaches did. One interesting characteristic of this study is that the division I and the division III individual variables are very similar when compared to the Japanese coaches (Chelladurai & Ogasewara, 2003).

Weiss and Friedrichs (1986) found that job satisfaction increases when there is a concerted effort to promote a positive atmosphere amongst the team. Kenow and Williams (1999) showed that job satisfaction was higher when coaches were able to work with athletes that they gauged to be self-motivated and highly confident. Davies (2003) found that the

environment was enhanced when athletes' intrinsic interests were nurtured-this had a positive impact on job satisfaction.

Coaches can have a direct influence on decision-making skills and moral values even when working with younger athletes (McCallister, Blinde, & Weiss, 2000). Miller (1996) showed coaches rated academic goals and personal goals higher than athletic goals when ranking program development. A study by Weinberg, Bolt, Knight, and Perritt (2001) showed that coaches get job satisfaction because of their love of the game and the enjoyment that comes from working with players.

Leblicq, Van Hoeckw, and De Koup (2002), using a survey tool designed by Ogasawaga and Chelladuria, found that coaches reported the least job satisfaction from extrinsic rewards. Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) found that a major source of dissatisfaction for both men and women that are head coaches is a lack of administrative support.

Hambleton (1989) studied the relationship between job satisfaction and many components, including age, income, tenure, and success. Hambleton noted (1989) that recruiting restrictions and rules, drug testing, and elevated academic standards have had an expectedly negative impact on job satisfaction for college coaches. Frey's (2007) research found that perceived demands on coaches had a negative effect on coaching performance. Coaches indicated they would have negative stress response symptoms when the perceived demands were too high (Frey, 2007).

Danylchuk (1992) reported that coaches who also taught showed a significantly higher level of emotional exhaustion than non-coaching teachers. Frey (2007) found that when demand outweighed teacher-coach perceived resources, negative stress response occurred. Stress can create a very difficult situation for a coach. Knoppers et al. (1991) showed the most significant source of dissatisfaction was a lack of support from administration.

Akindutire (2003) noted that professional pressures such as expectations to win, or living up to community or employers expectations, was a factor in decreased job satisfaction and a primary reason why people would turn away from a coaching career. Pryor and Daw (2006) referenced the high cost of searching for new coaches. Pryor also showed the value of program continuity. There is a relationship between program continuity and program success (Pryor & Daw, 2006). Pryor also showed that there is a relationship between coaches meeting program goals and coaching continuity. Research also demonstrated that coaches with more experience had higher job satisfaction (Pryor & Daw, 2006). This would be a very positive factor for reducing job turnover, and thus reducing the related expenses. Pryor and Daw (2006) showed that goal setting enhanced coaches' job satisfaction in their study which involved both NCAA and NAIA coaches.

Summary

There has been a lot of research related to job satisfaction and coaching. Research on job satisfaction has included college coaches age, gender, experience, and other characteristics. There are many factors involved in the level of job satisfaction. Chapter 2 reviewed the research of many of these different job and personal characteristics as the related to job satisfaction. Chapter 2 reviewed sources of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction with coaching.

There is also a lot of conflict that has resulted from teaching and coaching at the same time. There is a tendency for coaches to be teachers, and vice-versa. There is also a tendency for a teacher or coach to prioritize one responsibility over the other and to devote time and effort to being successful at one over the other. This chapter also reviewed prior research on this teacher-coach model.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Chapter 3 describes the methods and procedures that were used to guide this research study. Chapter 3 was comprised of the purpose, methodology, research questions, population, sample, instrumentation, data collection, and methods of analysis.

Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). This study also determined differences in coaches' level of job satisfaction based on their personal and specific job characteristics. Finally, this study identified which specific job responsibilities coaches perceive to enhance their level of job satisfaction and what coaches perceive as barriers to their higher level of job satisfaction.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study regarding the job satisfaction of small college athletic coaches:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction for Great Plains Athletic Conference college head coaches?
2. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following personal characteristics?
 - a. Highest degree earned
 - b. Age
 - c. Gender
 - d. Years of coaching experience
 - e. Semester coached

3. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following job characteristics?
 - a. Load credits for coaching
 - b. Load credit for teaching
 - c. Perceived level of success in coaching
 - d. Level of salary
 - e. Support of supervisor
4. What specific job responsibilities do college coaches perceive help to enhance their job satisfaction?
5. What barriers do college head coaches perceive to hinder their job satisfaction?

Review of Literature

The review of literature for this research survey included journals, articles, books, and dissertations from a wide variety of online resources, and the I.D. Weeks Library, USD, Vermillion. The research comes primarily from a host of search sources including Educational Resources Information Center, *Ebsco HOST*, *Sport Discus*, and other website search tools. Key terms for the research included job satisfaction, coaches, intercollegiate athletics, sports, job description, teaching, and higher education.

Population

The coaches surveyed in this study were from the Great Plains Athletic Conference which was formed in 2000. The GPAC is a conference made up of private faith-based Midwest NAIA schools in Nebraska, Iowa, and South Dakota. The conference started with 11 charter schools including Concordia, Dakota Wesleyan, Dana, Doane, Dordt, Hastings, Midland Lutheran, Mount Marty, Nebraska Wesleyan, Northwestern, and Sioux Falls. Briar Cliff joined the conference in 2002, and Morningside, another Sioux City, Iowa-based school, joined the

conference in 2003. This brought the GPAC membership to the 13 schools in 2010. The Great Plains Athletic Conference is referred to as America's small college super conference. The conference has produced 15 national champions in its short existence. The conference also focuses on academic achievement, producing over 400 NAIA national scholar athletes (GPAC, 2009).

Each of these schools is a member of the NAIA. The NAIA is the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. The NAIA has fewer members and the members have fewer rules and regulations than the NCAA. One conference school, Nebraska Wesleyan, also has dual membership with the NCAA. The conference is led by the college presidents, athletic directors, and Faculty Athletic Representatives. The articles of the constitution (GPAC, 2009) of the GPAC state that each member must be a four-year, faith-based, institution of higher learning. The conference constitution also requires the institution to offer at least five of the primary sports for both men and women. Those sports are cross country, basketball, baseball and softball, soccer or football, and volleyball or soccer (GPAC).

The head coaches from the following sports were the population for the study: football, volleyball, men's soccer, women's soccer, men's basketball, women's basketball, softball, baseball, men's track, and women's track. This represents 10 coaches from 13 different schools for a total population of 130. Each of these head coaches was surveyed.

Instrumentation

The researcher-developed survey (Appendix A) was designed to measure coaches' job satisfaction in different specific areas and measure overall job satisfaction. The questions in this survey were developed based on the literature review and the *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire*. There are 15 questions (survey items 1-15) to determine job satisfaction concerning specific items related to the job of coaching. The questionnaire used the Likert scale

to measure the amount of satisfaction on a five-point scale where “1” is *extremely dissatisfied* and “5” is *extremely satisfied*. The job satisfaction questions were developed based on specific items that relate to college head coaches. The *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire* was examined to help develop a framework for the survey, tailoring the survey to college coaching. There is an additional question regarding overall job satisfaction. The study also included several demographic questions concerning job experience, highest degree earned, age, and gender. There were also questions that allowed those taking the survey to identify specific items that enhance job satisfaction, as well as identifying specific items that are barriers to job satisfaction. A draft of the survey was critically reviewed by five professionals including two athletic directors, one retired athletic director, and two college faculty members. Based on results from these responses from those critiquing the survey, small changes were made to the final instrument.

Data Collection

The request to participate in the online survey, administered through the Survey Monkey® was mailed to all participants using their college email. A project explanation letter (Appendix B) was sent along with the survey. The email was sent to each of the head coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference in each of the 10 primary sports. Follow-up emails were sent seven and 15 days later. A final follow-up reminder was sent one month after the initial survey email.

After institutional board review approval was met, an electronic mailing soliciting participation in this study was sent to all coaches in the 13 schools involved in the survey. This initial contact described the study and includes a hyperlink to the survey. The electronic mail informed participants that their clicking on the hyperlink was their consent to participate in the study.

The researcher-designed survey was developed and managed electronically through Survey Monkey®, an online survey firm that specializes in survey development and analysis. Participant responses to the Survey Monkey® were monitored.

Data Analysis

The data were exported from the Survey Monkey® into an SPSS statistical software package for data analysis. The level of job satisfaction for Great Plains Athletic Conference college coaches (Research Question #1) was determined by calculating the means and standard deviations from survey items 1-15.

The differences in GPAC coaches' job satisfaction based on their personal characteristics were determined using inferential statistics (Research Question #2). Differences based on gender (survey item #33) were determined by a series of independent *t* tests. The independent variable was the gender (survey item #33), and the dependent variable response means for survey items #1-15 was the level of job satisfaction. Differences based on highest degree earned were determined using a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA). The independent variable was the highest degree earned (survey item #24) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the level of job satisfaction. Differences based on age were determined using one-way ANOVAs. The independent variable (survey items #28) was age and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the level of job satisfaction. Differences based on years of coaching experience were determined using one-way ANOVAs. The independent variable was years of coaching experience (survey item #29) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) the job satisfaction. Differences based on sport coached were determined using one-way ANOVAs. The independent variable was the sport coached (survey item #27) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the level of job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used for all inferential statistics.

The differences that exist in GPAC coaches' job satisfaction based on the following job characteristics (Research question #3) were determined using inferential statistics. Differences in load credits for coaching were determined using a series of one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the load credits for coaching (survey items #20) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on load credits for teaching were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the load credits for teaching (survey item #21) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction.

Differences based on perceived level of coaching success determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The responses to this item were dichotomized from a five point responses into "1" and "2" were recoded as "1" for successful and responses "4" and "5" were recoded to "2" for not successful. Responses of neither success nor not success were not used. The independent variable (survey items #16 and 17) was the perceived level of coaching success and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on support of supervisor were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the support of supervisor (survey item #6) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-5 and 7-15) was the job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used for all inferential statistics.

The specific job responsibilities that college coaches perceived to help or enhance their job satisfaction (Research Question 4) were determined by calculating the frequencies and percentages from survey item #18. The specific job responsibilities that college coaches perceived as barriers or challenges to keep them from having a higher job satisfaction (Research Question #5) was determined by calculating the frequencies and percentages from survey item #19.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

Chapter 4 provides the results of data analyses and findings of the study. The chapter contains sections on response rate and findings related to each research question and respondents' demographic data. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). This study also sought to determine if there were differences in coaches' level of job satisfaction based on their personal and specific job characteristics. Finally, the study identified what specific job responsibilities coaches perceived to enhance their level of job satisfaction and what coaches perceive are barriers to their higher level of job satisfaction.

Response Rate

The email addresses of the head coaches for all the sports were obtained from the commissioner of the Great Plains Athletic Conference. There were 109 emails sent out to coaches of 10 sports for the 13 members of GPAC institutions. Seventy-four coaches completed the survey, for a response rate of 67.9%. There were 76 coaches who responded to the survey, but only 74 completed the entire survey. Rate of respondents is listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Rate of Respondents

Percent	Frequency	Valid Percent
Returned completed surveys	74	67.9
Total emailed surveys	109	100.0

Demographic Data

Survey items 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 are questions which give descriptive information from the population surveyed. Almost three quarters of the coaches who completed the survey (73.0%, $n=54$) reported they had a master's degree, while 23% ($n=17$) had achieved a bachelor's degree, and only 4.1% ($n=3$) had a doctoral degree. There was an almost equal percentage of coaches who coached a multi-semester sport (40.5%, $n=30$) and coaches that coached a fall sport (41.9%, $n=30$). The smallest percentage of coaches (27.6%, $n=13$) coached a spring sport.

The age of the respondents was balanced. The most represented group was age 45 or older (35.6%, $n=26$), followed closely by the age 25-34 group (34.2%, $n=25$), and the 35-44 age group (28.8%, $n=21$). The smallest group representation came from the 18-24 year old coaches (1.4%, $n=1$). Almost half (47.9%, $n=28$) of the survey respondents had six to 15 years of experience coaching at all levels. An interesting characteristic of the head coaches completing the survey was that almost 60% (58.3%, $n=42$) had only zero to five years of experience at their current head coaching position.

Most of the coaches who completed the survey (89.2%, $n=66$) were full-time employees at the school where they coached. Also, roughly two thirds (66.2%, $n=49$) considered themselves as holding full-time staff positions while only 18.9% ($n=14$) were considered to be full-time faculty. A large majority (87.8%, $n=65$) of the respondents was male, while only 12.2% ($n=9$) were female head coaches. The gender that the respondents coached was fairly similar between those that coached males (45.1%, $n=32$) and those that coached females (40.8%, $n=29$). The gender of the respondents' immediate supervisor was predominantly male (98.6%, $n=73$), with only one respondent (1.4%, $n=1$) having a female as their immediate supervisor. These demographics are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Valid Percent
Gender	74	100.0
Male	65	87.8
Female	9	12.2
Age	73	98.7
18-24	1	1.4
25-34	25	34.2
35-44	21	28.8
45 or older	26	35.6
Highest degree earned	74	100.0
bachelor's degree	17	23.0
master's degree	54	73.0
doctoral degree	3	4.1

Findings

The subjects were asked to respond via a five point likert scale with "5" being *extremely satisfied*, and "1" being *extremely dissatisfied* with different aspects of job satisfaction. The means and standard deviation of survey items 1 to 15 were calculated to determine levels of job satisfaction for each survey question. The following scale was used to interpreting meaning: 1.00 through 1.50 represented being very dissatisfied, 1.51 through 2.50 represented being dissatisfied, 2.51 through 3.50 represent being neither satisfied or dissatisfied, 3.51 through 4.50 represented being satisfied, and 4.51 through 5.00 represented being extremely satisfied.

Job Satisfaction. Research question #1 asked Head Coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference about different aspects of job satisfaction. Respondents reported being extremely satisfied with the opportunity to work at something they enjoy ($M=4.67, SD=0.58$) and the chance to serve other people ($M=4.51, SD=0.70$). The amount of pay received ($M=2.94, SD=1.10$) was the only response area in which coaches reported below being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Respondents were also satisfied with eleven other areas which are summarized on Table 3.

Table 3

Coaches Perceptions of Job Satisfaction

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Coaching gives me an opportunity to do something I enjoy	74	4.66	0.70
The chance to serve other people	74	4.51	0.58
The opportunity to use my talents and gifts	74	4.38	0.71
The opportunity for variety in your day	74	4.32	0.64
The chance to make decisions	74	4.29	0.89
The feeling of accomplishment from your job	74	4.25	0.68
The flexibility the job offers	74	4.16	0.82
The opportunity to work at a faith based institution	74	4.09	0.82
Having control of practice planning and scheduling practice	74	4.07	0.87
The working environment	74	4.05	0.92
Having the support of my supervisor/ athletic director	74	4.05	0.91
The way my job provides for steady employment	74	3.85	0.80
The chance to be recognized by the college and community	74	3.57	0.75
The campus facilities	74	3.50	1.25
Salary	74	2.95	1.10

Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Personal Characteristics

Research question 2 examined the differences that exist in GPAC coaches' job satisfaction based on the personal characteristics of highest degree earned, age, gender, years of coaching experience, and which type of sport coached.

Age. One-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine if there were differences in coaches' job satisfaction based on their age. The age category options were: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, and 45+. There was only one participant in the 18-24 year old category so that respondent response was not used in this analysis. The independent variable was the age (survey question #28) and the dependent variable was the level of job satisfaction (survey questions #1-15). There were two significant differences in coaches' job satisfaction based on their age. Coaches who were 45 years of age or more ($M=4.73$, $SD=0.45$) were more satisfied with the chance to serve others than coaches who were 25-34 years of age ($M=4.28$, $SD=.67$), $F(2,69)=4.286$, $p=.018$. The other difference based on age was coaches between the ages of 35-44 who got more job satisfaction from being in control of planning practices and schedules ($M=4.38$, $SD=.74$) than coaches between the ages of 25-34 ($M= 3.76$, $SD= .83$), $F(2,69)=3.959$, $p=.024$. These significant findings are noted on Table 4.

Table 4

Significant Differences in Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Age

	M^1	M^2	M^3	$F(2, 69)$	p
Chance to Serve	4.28 ³	4.57	4.73 ¹	4.286	.018
Control of Planning	3.76 ²	4.38 ¹	4.19	3.959	.024

$M^1= 25-34$ years of age

$M^2= 35-44$ years of age

$M^3= 45$ years of age or older

Highest degree earned. One-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine if there were differences in coaches' job satisfaction based on the highest degree earned by the respondents. The independent variable was the highest degree earned and the dependent variables were the survey questions #1-15 on job satisfaction. Two significant differences were found. The first difference was the opportunity to do a job that best utilizes

their talents and gifts ($F=4.005, p=.023$), but the post-hoc test failed to find a difference. The other difference was working and coaching at faith-based institutions ($F=3.783, p=.028$), but again the post-hoc test failed to find a difference.

Gender. Independent t tests were used to determine if there was a significant difference in job satisfaction based on gender. The independent variables were gender and the dependent variable was the survey questions 1-15 on job satisfaction. There were three differences in coaches' perception of their job satisfaction based on their gender. Male coaches ($M=4.41, SD=.75$) were more satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact than female coaches ($M=3.62, SD=1.06$), $t(54)=-2.654, p=.010$. Male coaches were more satisfied ($t= -2.269, p=.026$) with support from their supervisor ($M=4.16, SD=.87$) than female coaches ($M=3.44, SD=1.01$). The third difference was male coaches ($M=3.02, SD=1.09$) were more satisfied ($t=2.733, p=.00$) with the amount of pay they receive for doing their job than female coaches ($M=2.00; SD=.50$). The gender differences are listed in Table 5.

Table 5

Differences in Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Gender

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Chance to make decisions that impact the team					
Male	29	4.41	.75		
				-2.654	.010
Female	27	3.96	.72		
Support of supervisor					
Male	29	3.89	.67		
				-2.269	.026
Female	27	3.30	.72		
Amount of pay					
Male	29	3.01	1.09		
				2.733	.006
Female	26	2.00	.50		

Years of coaching experience. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine if there were differences in coaches' job satisfaction and their years of coaching experience. The independent variable was the years of coaching experience and the dependent variables were the survey questions #1-15 on job satisfaction. There were no significant differences in coaches' perceptions of their job satisfaction based on number of total years they had in coaching. However, there were two differences in coaches' perceptions of job satisfaction based on the number of years of experience they had as head coach. There was differences in coaches' perceptions of job satisfaction and chances to be recognized by the

college and in the community ($F=3.604, p=.017$) based on the number of years as a head coach. Coaches with 16-25 years of head coaching were the most satisfied ($M=3.86, SD=.69$) with the chance to be recognized by the college and in the community in comparison to coaches with 6-15 years of experience ($M=3.60, SD=.68$), coaches with zero to five years of head coaching experience ($M=3.56, SD=.66$), and coaches with 26 plus years of experience of head coaching experience ($M=2.33, SD=1.54$).

There were differences in coaches perception of satisfaction with the chance to make decisions that impact the program ($F=5.568, p=.002$) based on the number of years they had been a head coach. Coaches with 16-25 years of experience ($M= 4.71, SD=.49$) were the most satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact the program compared to coaches with 6-15 years of experience ($M= 4.42,SD=.90$), coaches with zero to five years of head coaching experience ($M=4.33,SD=.69$), and coaches with 26 plus years of head coaching experience ($M=2.33, SD=1.54$). These differences are listed on Table 6.

Table 6

Significant Differences in Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Years of Coaching Experience

	M^1	M^2	M^3	M^4	$F(2,71)$	p
Chance to be recognized	4.28 ³	4.57	4.73 ¹	4.29	3.640	.017
Chance to impact program	4.33	4.42	4.71 ¹	2.23 ³	5.568	.024

M^1 = 0-5 years of experience
 M^3 =16-25 years of experience

M^2 = 6-15 years of experience
 M^4 = 26 years or more of experience

Sport coached by semester. An independent t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in job satisfaction based on the semester the sport was coached. The independent variable was sport coached and the dependent variable was the survey questions 1-15 on job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used. There was only one significant

difference in coaches' job satisfaction based on the semester they coached ($F=6.434, p=.003$). Coaches who coached in the spring were more satisfied with the opportunity for variety in their day to day work ($M=4.77, SD=.44$) than the coaches who coached in the fall semester ($M=4.07, SD=.69$). The differences are listed on Table 7.

Table 7

Significant Differences in Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Sport Coached by Semester

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F(2, 71)</i>	<i>p</i>
A Chance for Variety in day to day work				
Spring Sport	4.77	.44		
Fall Sport	4.07	.6	6.434	.003

GPAC Coaches' Job Satisfaction Based on Characteristics of their Job

Research question #3 evaluated what differences existed in coaches' job satisfaction based on the characteristics of their job. These characteristics included their load credit for coaching, their load credit for teaching, their level of success in coaching, their level of salary, and their support from a supervisor.

Load credit for coaching. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used to determine if there was significant differences in job satisfaction based on load credits for coaching. The independent variable was the load credits for coaching and the dependent variables were the survey questions #1-15 on job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used. There were no significant differences found.

Load credit for teaching. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVAs) were used to determine if there was significant differences in job satisfaction based on load credits for teaching. The

independent variable was the load credits for teaching and the dependent variables were the survey questions #1-15 on job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used. There were no significant differences found.

Coaches perceived level of success. An independent *t* test determined that there were many significant differences in coaches' job satisfaction based on whether they perceived they were successful or not. Survey item 3 asked coaches their perception of their success as a coach on a five point Likert scale. The responses to this item were dichotomized from a five-point responses into two responses and were recoded as "1" for successful and were recoded as "2" for not successful and responses that were neither success nor not success were not used. There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions regarding the flexibility that coaching offers and whether they perceived they were successful or not ($t=-2.026, p=.049$). Coaches who perceived they were successful were more satisfied with the flexibility of the job ($M= 3.89, SD=.67$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=3.30, SD=.72$). There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions regarding the chance to be recognized by the college and community and whether they perceived they were successful or not ($t=-3.215, p=.002$). Coaches who were more successful were more satisfied ($M=3.90, SD=.67$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=3.30, SD=.72$). There were significant differences in coaches perceptions regarding the chance to make decisions that impact the program and whether they perceived they were successful or not ($t=-2.836, p=.006$). Coaches who were successful were more satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact the program ($M= 4.58, SD=.57$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=4.00, SD=.94$). There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions regarding the amount of pay they received and whether they perceived they were successful or not. Coaches who perceived they were successful were more satisfied ($t=-2.376, p=.021$) with the amount of pay they received ($M=$

3.25, $SD=1.04$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=2.59$, $SD=1.00$). There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions regarding the feeling of accomplishment from the job and whether they perceived that they were successful or not ($t=-2.570$, $p=.006$). Coaches who perceived they were successful were more satisfied ($t=-2.570$, $p=.013$), with the feeling of accomplishment from their job ($M= 4.48$, $SD=.51$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=4.07$, $SD= .68$). There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions regarding the working environment and whether they perceived they were successful or not. Coaches who perceived they were successful were more satisfied ($t=-2.570$, $p=.011$), with the working environment ($M= 4.41$, $SD=.78$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=3.85$, $SD=.82$). There were significant differences ($t=-2.421$, $p=.019$) in coaches' perceptions regarding the opportunity to work and coach in a faith-based environment and whether they perceived they were successful or not as a coach. Coaches who perceived they were successful as a coach were more satisfied ($t=-.545$, $p=.019$) with the opportunity to work and coach in a faith-based environment ($M= 4.29$, $SD=.76$) than coaches who perceived they were not successful ($M=3.74$, $SD=.90$). These differences are noted in Table 8.

Table 8

Significant Differences in Coaches' Perception of Success Based on Job Characteristics

Coaches	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Flexibility Coaching offers					
Perceived as successful	29	4.41	.67		
				-2.065	.049
Perceived not successful	27	3.96	.72		
Chance to be recognized					
Perceived as successful	29	3.89	.67		
				-2.026	.002
Perceived not successful	27	3.30	.72		
The chance to make decisions that impact the team					
Perceived as successful	29	4.59	.57		
				-2.836	.006
Perceived not successful	26	4.00	.94		
The amount of pay I receive					
Perceived as successful	28	3.25	1.04		
				-2.376	.021
Perceived not successful	27	2.59	1.00		
The feeling of accomplishment from the job					
Perceived as successful	29	4.48	.50		
				-2.570	.013
Perceived not successful	27	4.07	.67		

Table 8- Continued

Significant Differences in Coaches' Perception of Success Based on Job Characteristics

Coaches	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
The working environment					
Perceived as successful	29	4.41	.78		
				-2.631	.011
Perceived not successful	27	3.85	.82		
The opportunity to work at a faith based institution					
Perceived as successful	29	4.29	.76		
				-2.421	.01
Perceived not successful	27	3.74	.90		

Coaches' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction Based on Level of Pay

Coaches perceived level of satisfaction with Pay. An independent *t* test was used to determine any significant difference in coaches' perception of job satisfaction based on satisfaction with their level of salary. The independent variable was the coaches' level of satisfaction with salary and the dependent variables were the survey questions #1-15 on job satisfaction. Coaches' satisfaction with their level of pay was Likert scale the five point responses survey item number 7. The responses were dichotomized into two responses and recoded as "1" for successful and "2" for not successful, and responses that were neither success nor not success were not used. Responses "1" and "2" were recoded as dissatisfied with their level of pay and "4" and "5" as satisfied with their level of pay. Responses "3" which neither agree nor disagree were not used in creating the dichotomous variable. A .05 level of significance was used. There were significant differences ($t=-.397, p=.035$) in coaches' perceptions regarding the

chance to be recognized by the college and community and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with the chance to be recognized by the college and community ($M=3.75$, $SD=.762$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.35$, $SD=.734$). There were significant differences ($t=-2.24$, $p=.000$) in coaches' perceptions regarding the support of their supervisor or athletic director and whether coaches were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with the support of their supervisor ($M=4.09$, $SD=.296$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=1.85$, $SD=.36$).

There were significant differences ($t=-2.24$, $p=.000$) in coaches' perceptions of the way their job provides for steady employment and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with the way their job provides for steady employment ($M=4.09$, $SD=.89$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.59$, $SD=.70$). There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions of their working environment ($t=-3.632$, $p=.021$) and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with their working environment ($M=3.25$, $SD=1.04$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=2.59$, $SD=1.00$). There were significant differences ($t=-.763$, $p=.000$) in coaches' satisfaction with the opportunity to work in a faith-based institution and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with an opportunity to work in a faith-based institution ($M=4.47$, $SD=.67$) than coaches that were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.71$, $SD=.800$). The findings of this study are listed in table 9.

Table 9

Comparison of Coaches' Job Satisfaction by Satisfaction with Pay

Coaches	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Chance to be recognized					
Satisfied with pay	34	3.75	.76		
				-2.157	.035
Dissatisfied with pay	32	3.35	.73		
Satisfaction with Pay					
Satisfied with pay	34	4.09	.29		
				-27.542	.000
Dissatisfied with pay	32	1.85	.35		
The way my job provides for steady employment					
Satisfied with pay	34	4.59	.57		
				-2.566	.006
Dissatisfied with pay	32	4.00	.94		
The working environment					
Satisfied with pay	34	3.25	1.04		
				-3.632	.021
Dissatisfied with pay	32	2.59	1.00		
The opportunity to work at a faith-based institution					
Satisfied with pay	34	4.47	.67		
				-4.187	.000
Dissatisfied with pay	32	3.71	.80		

Support of supervisor. An independent *t* test was used to determine any significant differences in job satisfaction based on support of supervisors. The independent variable was the coaches' satisfaction with support of supervisor and the dependent variables were the perceived level of job satisfaction survey questions #1-15. A .05 level of significance was used. There were significant differences ($t=-.764$, $p=.029$) in coaches' satisfaction with the chance to make decisions that impact the program and whether they were satisfied with the support of athletic director or supervisor or not. Coaches that were more satisfied with support from their supervisor were more satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact the program ($M=4.43$, $SD=.671$) than coaches that were dissatisfied with the support of athletic director or supervisor ($M=3.66$, $SD=1.033$). The results can be found on Table 10.

Table 10

Significant Difference in Coaches' Job Satisfaction by Their Perceived Support of Supervisor

Coaches	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Chance to make decisions that impact the program					
Satisfied with support of supervisor	59	4.43	.77		
Dissatisfied with support of supervisor	6	3.66	1.03	-2.065	.049

Job Responsibilities of Coaches and Level of Job Satisfaction

Coaches indicated on research question #4 which specific job responsibilities enhance their job satisfaction. Coaches were asked to choose only one from a list of items. The "enjoyment that comes from coaching a team" was chosen by more than half (58.1%, $n=43$) of the respondents. Over a quarter (27%, $n=20$) of the respondents chose "the ability to work with youth." The frequencies and percentages are presented on Table 11.

Table 11

Job Responsibility That Causes You to Have a High Level of Job Satisfaction

Characteristics	Frequency	Valid Percent
The enjoyment of coaching a team	43	58.1
Ability to work with youth	20	27.0
Job flexibility	5	6.8
Ability to make decisions	3	4.1
Support from my supervisor	2	2.7
Salary	1	1.4
Notoriety and recognition	0	0.0

Job Responsibilities of Coaches and Barriers to Satisfaction

Research question #5 focused on responsibilities creating barriers to having high levels of job satisfaction. Coaches were asked to choose only one from a list of items. Non-coaching job responsibilities was chosen by over 40% (40.8%, $n=29$) of the respondents. Salary (16.9%, $n=12$) and recruiting (15.5%, $n= 11$) also received a significant share of responses. The frequencies and percentages are presented on Table 12.

Table 12

Job Responsibility that Coaches Perceive as Barriers to a High Level of Job Satisfaction

Characteristics	Frequency	Valid Percent
Non-coaching job responsibilities	29	40.8
Salary	12	16.9
Recruiting	11	15.5
Job Stress	8	11.3
Working environment	5	7.0
Job responsibilities	4	5.6
Lack of support from supervisor	2	2.8

Summary

This chapter has presented the data analyses and findings of this study. A summary of this study is presented in Chapter 5 along with findings, conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for practice and further study.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The final chapter of this study presents a summary of the study, its findings, and conclusions drawn from the findings. This chapter also includes recommendations for practice and future research.

Summary

This study examined job satisfaction of college coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference. The coaches in the survey coached baseball, basketball, football, soccer, track, and volleyball. College coaches have a history of being satisfied with some aspects of their job, while being dissatisfied with others. The research questions used to guide the study are listed below.

Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the level of job satisfaction of coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). This study also sought to determine the differences in coaches' level of job satisfaction based on their personal and their specific job characteristics. Finally, the study identified the specific job responsibilities coaches perceived enhance their level of job satisfaction and the job responsibilities coaches perceived were barriers to their higher level of job satisfaction.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of job satisfaction for Great Plains Athletic conference college head coaches?
2. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following personal characteristics?
 - a. Highest degree earned
 - b. Age

- c. Gender
 - d. Years of coaching experience
 - e. Semester of sport coached (fall, multi-semester, spring)
3. What differences exist in GPAC head coaches' job satisfaction based on the following job characteristics?
- a. Load credits for coaching
 - b. Load credit for teaching
 - c. Perceived level of success in coaching
 - d. Level of salary
 - e. Support of supervisor
4. What specific job responsibilities do college coaches perceive will help enhance their job satisfaction?
5. What barriers do college head coaches perceive to hinder job satisfaction?

Literature Review

There are several factors associated with job satisfaction including salary, years of experience, and non-coaching responsibilities that have been researched in the past. The research also explores the teacher-coach model. Darst & Pangrazi (1996) raised concerns about doing two different jobs well. Their concerns included raising questions about the different skills required to do both teaching and coaching well. Ryan & Sagar (2006) reiterated the fact that the goals and job expectations for coaches and for teachers are often quite different. Rosser and Townsend (2006) noted that skill sets for teachers and coaches are often very different. Rosser and Townsend also found that faculty turnover is expensive to colleges and universities. Terpstra and Honoree (2006) found that greater job satisfaction in higher education is a key to

less employee turnover, less absenteeism, and higher job motivation. Ryan & Sagar (2006) noted common conflict that occurs when a coach is also a teacher.

Ryan & Sagar pointed out that when teaching interfered with coaching or coaching interfered with teaching, both resulted in a lower job satisfaction. Coakley (1990) provided research that showed coaching took priority over teaching in terms of time and energy spent. Frey (2007) noted different specific stress that was commonplace for college coaches. Buchanon found stress was a huge part of coaching turnover. Chelladurai & Ogasawara (2003) noted that indicated the pressure on college coaches continues to increase. Yalcin (2000) called for more research on the teacher-coach model.

Akindutire (2003) noted that a higher level of job satisfaction was related to a higher degree earned. Quinn and Mandilovitch (1980) also found a relationship between a higher level of education and a higher job satisfaction. These studies contrast an earlier study by Klein & Maher (1966) that showed a negative correlation between job satisfaction and level of education.

White (1992) found that only five percent of the college coaches surveyed had a doctorate, whereas 60% had earned a master's degree. Kuchler (2001) presented research that produced results very similar to that of White. Kuchler found that 58% of the respondents in his study had a master's degree, 30% held a bachelor's degree, and just under seven percent had a doctoral degree.

Weaver's (1980) found that college coaches' job satisfaction improved with age. Hambleton (1989) found that income was the only variable in his study that contributed significantly to job satisfaction. Miller, Lutz, Shim, Fredenburg, and Miller (2005) noted that the best education for coaches involves practical experience. Pryor and Daw (2006) noted that coaches with more experience had a higher level of job satisfaction. Doherty and Danylchuk also

found that greater job satisfaction for coaches was related to a positive relationship with the athletic director. Program success and program continuity (Pryor & Daw , 2006) were also linked. Leblcq, Van Hoeckw, and De Koup (2002) also found that age and experience both were factors in higher job satisfaction for coaches. Leblcq's study showed that coaches who had more control of their decision-making processes had higher job satisfaction. Fox and Hesse-Biber (1984) found that males had greater job satisfaction than females because of greater social support while Kuchler (2006) found that income was the biggest factor for female coaches' job satisfaction. Sagas and Ashley (2001) found that males stayed in coaching for a longer period of time than females.

The pride that comes from coaching a team gave coaches the greatest source of job satisfaction according to a study (2006) by Singh and Surijjal. Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) noted that working with athletes gave college coaches the greatest source of job satisfaction. Weinberg, Bolt, Knight, and Perritt (2001) found that coaches got a high level of job satisfaction from their love of the game and their enjoyment that comes from working with players. Dawis and Lofquist (1984) found that work environment was an important characteristic for higher job satisfaction. Jordan, Malone and Gillantine (2004) found that higher division level coaches had greater job satisfaction than their counterparts. Chelladurai and Ogasewara (2003) found that division I and division III coaches had higher job satisfaction than coaches in Japan.

Akindutire (2003) noted that professional pressures such as expectations to win, or living up to community or employers expectations, were factors in decreased job satisfaction and a primary reason why people would turn away from a coaching career. Research by Frey (2007) showed that increased perceived demands on coaches had a negative effect on coaching performance. Danylchuk (1992) reported that coaches who also taught had a significantly higher

level of emotional exhaustion than non-coaching teachers. Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) noted that a major source of dissatisfaction for college head coaches was a lack of administrative support.

Methodology

One hundred thirty coaches from the Great Plains Athletic Conference, which was formed in 2000, were invited to participate in this study. The GPAC is an organization made up of private faith-based Midwest NAIA schools in Nebraska, Iowa, and South Dakota.

The researcher-developed survey (Appendix A) was designed to measure coaches' job satisfaction in specific areas and measure overall job satisfaction. The questions in this survey were developed based on the literature review and adapted from the *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire*. There were 15 questions (survey items #1-15) to determine job satisfaction concerning specific items related to the job of coaching. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale to measure job satisfaction. The *Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire* was reviewed to develop a framework for the survey and then tailored to college coaching. There was an additional question regarding overall job satisfaction. The survey also included several demographic questions concerning job experience, highest degree earned, age, and gender. There were also questions that allowed those taking the survey to identify specific items that enhanced job satisfaction, as well as identifying specific items that were barriers to job satisfaction. After institutional board review approval, an electronic mailing soliciting participation was administered through Survey Monkey®. All coaches in the 13 schools were participants in the survey. This initial contact described the study and included a hyperlink to the survey. The electronic mail informed participants that their clicking of the hyperlink was their consent to participate in the study.

The survey was administered through the Survey Monkey®. The request to participate in this online survey was emailed to all participants using their college emails. A project explanation letter (Appendix B) was sent along with the survey. After institutional board review approval was met, the email was sent to each of the head coaches in the Great Plains Athletic Conference in each of 10 primary sports. A follow-up email was sent seven and 15 days later. A final follow-up reminder was sent one month after the initial survey email. This initial contact described the study and included a hyperlink to the survey. The electronic mail informed participants that their clicking of the hyperlink was their consent to participate in the study.

The researcher-designed survey was developed and managed electronically through Survey Monkey®, an online survey firm that specializes in survey development and analysis. Participant responses to the survey monkey were monitored. Coaches who did not respond to the initial survey received an email reminder seven and 15 days after the initial email.

The data were exported from the Survey Monkey® into an SPSS statistical software package for data analysis. The level of job satisfaction for Great Plains Athletic Conference college coaches (Research Question 1) was determined by calculating the means and standard deviations from survey items 1-15.

The differences in GPAC coaches' job satisfaction based on their personal characteristics was determined using inferential statistics (Research Question #2). Differences based on gender (survey item #33), was determined by independent *t* tests. The independent variable was the gender (survey item #33), and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on highest degree earned were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the highest degree earned (survey item #24) and the dependent variable (survey items # 1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on age were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable (survey items #28) was the

age and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on years of coaching experience were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the years of coaching experience (survey item #29) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on sport coached were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the sport coached (survey item #27) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used for all inferential statistics.

The differences that exist in GPAC coaches' job satisfaction based on the following job characteristics (Research question 3) was determine using inferential statistics. Differences in load credits for coaching were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the load credits for coaching (survey items #20) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on load credits for teaching was determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the load credits for teaching (survey item #21) and the dependant variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction.

Differences based on perceived level of coaching success were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable (survey items #16 and 17) was the perceived level of coaching success and the dependent variable (survey items #1-15) was the job satisfaction. Differences based on support of supervisor were determined using one-way *ANOVAs*. The independent variable was the support of supervisor (survey item #6) and the dependent variable (survey items #1-5 and 7-15) was the job satisfaction. A .05 level of significance was used for all inferential statistics.

The specific job responsibilities that college coaches perceived to help or enhance their job satisfaction (Research Question #4) were determined by calculating the frequencies and percentages from survey item #18. The specific job responsibilities that college coaches perceive

as barriers or challenges to keep them from having a higher job satisfaction (Research Question #5) were determined by calculating the frequencies and percentages from survey item #19.

Findings

The following findings emerged from the results of the survey:

1. Coaches ranked a high level of job satisfaction for eleven of the fifteen areas in the job satisfaction survey indicating an overall high job satisfaction. Coaches perceive their greatest job satisfaction from the opportunity to do something they enjoy ($M= 4.66, SD = .70$) as well as the chance to serve other people ($M=4.51, SD=.58$).

2. Coaches were very satisfied by the opportunity to work at a faith-based institution ($M=4.09, SD=.82$).

3. Coaches derived a high level of job satisfaction ($M=4.05, SD=.91$) from having the support of their supervisor.

4. Coaches were very satisfied with their job autonomy traits. These traits included the chance to make decisions ($M=4.29, SD=.89$), the flexibility provided by the job ($M=4.16, SD=.82$), and having control of practice planning and practice scheduling ($M=4.07, SD=.87$).

5. Coaches noted the least job satisfaction from their campus facilities ($M=3.50, SD=1.25$) and their salary ($M=2.95, SD=1.10$).

6. Coaches age 35-44 had a significantly higher job satisfaction ($M= 4.77, SD=.44$) than coaches age 18-24($M=4.07, SD=.69$).

7. Coaches who were 45 years or more in age ($M=4.73, SD=.45$) were significantly more satisfied ($F=4.286, p=.018$) with the chance to serve others than coaches who were 25-34 years of age ($M=4.28, SD=.67$).

8. Coaches ages 35-44 enjoyed being in control of planning practices and schedules ($M=4.38, SD=.74$) more than coaches between the ages of 25-34 ($M=3.76, SD=.83$).

9. There were three differences in coaches' perception of their job satisfaction based on gender. Male coaches ($M=4.41$, $SD=.75$) were more satisfied ($t=-2.654$, $p=.010$) with the chance to make decisions that impact than female coaches ($M=3.62$, $SD=1.06$). Male coaches were more satisfied ($t=-2.269$, $p=.026$) with support of from their supervisor ($M=4.16$, $SD=.87$) than female coaches ($M=3.44$, $SD=1.01$). The third difference were male coaches ($M=3.02$, $SD=1.09$) were more satisfied ($t=2.733$, $p=.00$) with the amount of pay they received for doing their job than female coaches ($M= 2.00$; $SD=.50$).

10. There were differences in coaches' job satisfaction and the chance to be recognized by the community based on years of experience as a head coach. There were differences in coaches' perceptions of job satisfaction and chance to be recognized by the college and in the community ($F=3.604$, $p=.017$). Coaches with 16-25 years of head coaching were the most satisfied ($M=3.86$, $SD=.69$) with being recognized by the college and in the community in comparison to coaches with 6-15 years of experience ($M=3.60$, $SD=.68$), coaches with zero to five years of head coaching experience ($M=3.56$, $SD=.66$), and coaches with 26 plus years of experience of head coaching experience ($M=2.33$, $SD=1.54$).

11. There were differences in coaches' perceptions of satisfaction with the chance to make decisions that impact the program ($F=5.568$, $p=.002$) based on the number of years they had been a head coach. Coaches with 16-25 years of experience ($M=4.71$, $SD=.49$) were the most satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact the program compared to coaches who has 6-15 years of experience ($M=4.42$, $SD=.90$), coaches with zero to five years of head coaching experience ($M=4.33$, $SD=.69$), and coaches with 26 or more years of head coaching experience ($M=2.33$, $SD=1.54$).

12. There were significant differences in coaches' perception of job satisfaction based on the semester in which they coached ($F=6.434$, $p=.003$). Coaches who coached in the spring were

more satisfied with the opportunity for variety in their day to day work ($M=4.77$, $SD=.44$) than the coaches who coached in the fall semester ($M=4.07$, $SD=.69$).

13. Coaches who perceived themselves as being successful had a significantly higher level of job satisfaction in several different areas as noted in Chapter 4, Table 8.

14. There were significant differences ($t=-.397$, $p=.035$) in coaches' perceptions regarding the chance to be recognized by the college and community and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with the chance to be recognized by the college and community ($M= 3.75$, $SD=.762$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.35$, $SD=.734$).

15. There were significant differences ($t=-2.24$, $p=.000$) in coaches' perceptions regarding the support of their supervisor or athletic director and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with the support of their supervisor ($M=4.09$, $SD=.296$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=1.85$, $SD=.355$).

16. There were significant differences ($t=-2.24$, $p=.000$) in coaches' perceptions of the way their job provides for steady employment and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied, with the way their job provides for steady employment ($M= 4.09$, $SD=.89$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.59$, $SD=.701$).

17. There were significant differences in coaches' perceptions of their working environment ($t=-3.632$, $p=.021$) and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with their working environment ($M= 3.25$, $SD=1.04$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=2.59$, $SD=1.00$).

18. There were significant differences ($t=-.763, p=.000$) in coaches' satisfaction with the opportunity to work in a faith-based institution and whether they were satisfied with their level of pay or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with their level of pay were more satisfied with an opportunity to work in a faith-based institution ($M= 4.47, SD=.67$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with their level of pay ($M=3.71, SD=.800$).

19. There were significant differences ($t=-.764, p=.029$) in coaches' satisfaction with the chance to make decisions that impact the program and whether they were satisfied with the support of athletic director or supervisor or not. Coaches who were more satisfied with support from their supervisor were more satisfied with the chance to make decisions that impact the program ($M=4.43, SD=.671$) than coaches who were dissatisfied with the support of athletic director or supervisor ($M=3.66, SD=1.033$).

20. Coaches perceived non-coaching job responsibilities ($n=29, 40.8\%$) as the one barrier which inhibited them from having a high level of job satisfaction more than double any other response. More than 15% of coaches picked salary or recruiting as barriers which inhibited them from having a high job satisfaction.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of this study. For each of these conclusions, coaches refers to college head coaches.

1. Coaches derive their job satisfaction from coaching their team and working with young people.
2. Coaches are very satisfied with their jobs overall and also have a high level of satisfaction from working in a faith-based institution.

3. Coaches are very satisfied with traits of their job that gave them autonomy. The flexibility of their job, the chance to plan practices, and the chance to make practice schedules and decisions are areas where coaches are very satisfied.

4. Coaches are the least satisfied with their level of pay and their campus facilities compared to all other areas of job satisfaction.

5. Non-coaching job responsibilities are the greatest barrier to high levels of job satisfaction for coaches.

6. Coaches who perceived themselves as successful are also more satisfied with the level of support of their supervisor.

Discussion

College head coaches derive their job satisfaction from coaching their teams and working with young people. Research by Singh and Surijlal (2006) found the pride that comes from coaching a team was the greatest source of satisfaction for coaches. The GPAC coaches also found satisfaction from coaching a team and working with young people. These findings concur with the research by Singh and Surijlal. The other item that rated highly in terms of job satisfaction for the GPAC coaches was working with young people. Similar results related from Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) noted that working with athletes gave college coaches their greatest source of satisfaction. Weinberg, Butt, Knight, and Perritt (2001) also found the highest job satisfaction for coaches came from their love of the game and from the enjoyment that comes with working with student athletes. This study found similar results that correlate to those earlier findings. Coaches were very satisfied with their jobs overall and also had a high level of satisfaction from working in a faith-based institution. Frey (2007) noted the continuing challenges and stresses that go along with coaching. The research from the GPAC

coaches indicates that despite the mounting stress found by Fry, the college coaches surveyed here still had an overall high level of job satisfaction.

Coaches were very satisfied with traits of their job that gave them autonomy. The flexibility of their job, the chance to plan practices, and the chance to make practice schedules and decisions all were areas in which coaches were very satisfied. This research contradicts Hambleton (1989), and Kuchler (2006) who found salary to be a primary variable for job satisfaction. Flexibility in a job allows coaches to plan and schedule according to personal characteristics that allow them freedom to take care of responsibilities as they see fit. This also allows coaches to prioritize work.

Coaches found the least job satisfaction in this research from their level of pay and their campus facilities. Previous research does not relate to this study. Salary was the only significant factor in job satisfaction according to Hambleton (1989) and the biggest variable for female coaches according to Kuchler (2006). Pay may be diminishing in terms of its importance in job satisfaction. A replication of this study at a different level (perhaps division III) or a different area, or in five to 10 years would be very interesting.

Non-coaching job responsibilities are the greatest barrier to high job satisfaction for coaches. These findings related to Coakley (1990) whose research showed that coaching was prioritized higher than teaching in terms of time and energy spent. Darst and Pangrazi (1996) raised concerns about doing two different jobs as well. The findings from this study do reinforce research from Coakley as well as Darst and Pangrazi. Because coaches in this research found their greatest barrier to high job satisfaction to be non-coaching responsibility, it is reasonable to expect, as noted by Coakley, that these coaches also would prioritize teaching over coaching. The concerns raised by Darst and Pangrazi are also validated by this study. Because non-coaching responsibilities were the greatest barrier to job satisfaction, it is reasonable to

conclude that the job coaches prioritize to do well was coaching ahead of teaching. The economy of the era will determine the necessity and value of the teacher-coach model. Small colleges will likely continue to use the teacher-coach model out of financial necessity.

Previous research by Rosser and Townsend (2006) noted the high cost of job turnover for college coaches. There is a lot of time spent in the hiring process. Screening applicants, reviewing and reading resumes, interviewing candidates, and meeting to discuss hiring decisions are time-consuming ventures. This often becomes an expensive process. Research indicated perceived coaching success leads to a higher job satisfaction. Higher job satisfaction also was linked to less job turnover and more job continuity. The job continuity is a cost benefit. College presidents and athletic directors can have a positive impact on their school and athletic department by helping the coaches to be successful and feel successful.

Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) noted that a major source of dissatisfaction for college head coaches was a lack of administrative support. This research was supported by our research findings. Coaches who perceived themselves as successful also were more satisfied with the level of support of their supervisor. Support of supervisor is an important element for coaches in coping with the job stress of winning, recruiting, and non-coaching responsibilities.

The passion to coach and the demands to coach mean that the result for the non-coaching job responsibilities, which includes teaching, are often not going to be a priority. These may become items to check off the list. The typical passion to teach is often replaced by the passion to coach. This research also noted the pressure to be successful also demands that college coaches prioritize coaching and recruiting over other duties. This comes through clearly in the GPAC coaches listing the non-coaching responsibilities as the item that is the biggest barrier to job satisfaction.

The GPAC conference has some sports in which the teacher-coach model may work. There are other sports in which the time commitment involved for recruiting, tape scouting, practice preparation, work with admissions, travel, organization, camps, off season programs, and program promotion does not make it possible to teach. Some schools are aware of the fact that sports such as track, basketball and football require full-time personnel to do the best coaching.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Practice

1. College coaches draw a great satisfaction from working with a team and coaching young people. The one recommendation for college coaching is to remind them that they work at something they most often enjoy, and it is a blessing to be able to enjoy one's occupation.
2. The previous research noted the high cost of job turnover for college coaches. There is a lot of time spent in the hiring process. College presidents and athletic directors can have a positive impact on their school and athletic department by helping the coaches to be successful and feel successful. A secondary recommendation for athletic directors is to search hard to find college coaches who were successful.
3. Since college coaches will prioritize coaching over teaching, athletic directors may benefit from explaining the importance of the teacher-coach model to prospective coaches in the hiring process.
4. Health, exercise science, human performance, and wellness department chairs and supervisors would benefit their department by being aware of the coaches' priorities and by being supportive of college coaches other responsibilities. For the department chair, the "other" responsibilities would be coaching.

5. College coaches had a high job satisfaction from working in a faith-based institution. College athletic directors and presidents that work for faith-based institutions can also know they should use this to promote their college to prospective coaches.

6. Athletic director, provosts, presidents, and others involved in the hiring of college coaches should be aware that salary is not as important to college coaches as are other factors. This survey sheds light on the insignificance of salary. Although salary had the lowest mean number (out of 15 job satisfaction items) in terms of job satisfaction, college coaches still had an overall very high job satisfaction. Being able to work with young people, doing a job they enjoy in a good environment will probably mean more to a prospective coach than the level of pay they receive.

7. Support of supervisor was noted as a factor for higher job satisfaction in previous research, and that support enhances job satisfaction for coaches. The recommendation is for athletic directors to be supportive of their coaches. Coaches that perceived themselves as successful noted a significantly higher job satisfaction from the support they got from their supervisor. The two go hand in hand. Support equals success and success equals support.

8. Future college coaches also should be taught to understand the prevalence and value of the teacher-coach model. Based on the economic climate, future coaches should also have an understanding of the likelihood of the teacher-coach model's existence in their futures. These future college coaches should also understand the value of versatility in the job market.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. Research should be conducted replicating this study with a larger group of similar Colleges like the Coalition for Christian Colleges group.

2. Research should be conducted using a larger group using specific sports instead of fall, spring, and multi-semester sports to find out if differences exist between one sport and another.

3. Research should be conducted at the NCAA division III level to see if there are significant differences in their job satisfaction when compared to the NAIA schools in this survey.

4. Research should also be conducted at non-faith based colleges to see if there are similarities and/or significant differences found when compared with the results from this survey.

5. Research should be conducted using different job characteristics such as number of assistant coaches and amount of recruiting dollars budgeted.

6. Research should be conducted using salary amounts as a job characteristic instead of using level of satisfaction with pay. The actual pay could then be used to examine job satisfaction.

7. Research should be conducted to see if there is a relationship between job satisfaction and the amount of load credits given for coaching.

8. Research should be conducted to determine if there are differences in job satisfaction between sports coached, specifically looking for differences between higher profile sports such as football and basketball and lower profile sports.

The functional role of teacher-coach model has a long history. College coaches who work at small colleges and universities will be required to perform other tasks and have other responsibilities. The economy and college financing will determine if the teacher-coach model is necessary at different institutions. Coaches enjoy working at colleges and have a high level of job satisfaction despite having to teach and be responsible for other tasks. History indicates that

smaller colleges cannot afford to hire and pay full-time coaches for many sports at many different institutions. College presidents, athletic directors, and coaches need to understand the aforementioned circumstances. Those involved in the hiring of college coaches, directing of college athletics, and the college coaches themselves may benefit from knowing what characteristics lead to high job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2002). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study- twenty-five year update- 1977-2002*. Unpublished manuscript, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY.
- Aldridge, J. S. (1975). Certification of high school coaches as viewed by state directors of athletics, physical educators, and coaches. Ann Arbor: University microfilms.
- Akindutire, I. O. (2003). Determinants of satisfaction in career: Expectations of Nigerian coaches. *International Journal of Sports Psychology, 24*, 18-26.
- Biddle, J. B., Good, T. L., & Goodson, I. F. (1997). *International handbook of teachers and teaching*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Buchanan, B. (2006). Coaching for Life. *American School Board Journal, 20-23*.
- Burns, R., (2009). No job for old men. *Soccer Journal, 54(1)*, 14-17.
- Button S. B., (2001) Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 17-28.
- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerber, C. K., (1984) Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 6*, 279-288.
- Chelladurai, P. Kuga, D.J. & O'Bryant C. (1999) Individual differences, perceived task characteristics, and preferences for teaching and coaching. *Research Quarterly for exercise and sport, 9 1*.
- Chelladurai, P. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese Collegiate Coaches. *Journal of sport management, 17,(1)*, 62-74.
- Chelladurai, P., & Kuga, D. J. (1996). Teaching & coaching: Group and task differences. *Quest, 48*, 470-485.

- Chelladuria, P., & Ogasewara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management, 17*(1), 62-73.
- Chu, D. (1984). Teacher-coach orientation and role socialization: A description and explanation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 3*, 3-8.,
- Clopton, A. W., Ryan, T. D., & Sagus, M. (2007). Examining the role of job satisfaction as a mediator on selected work outcomes of college coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 78*, (1), 108-109.
- Coakley, J. J. (1990). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies* (4th edition). St Louis: Mosby Publishing.
- Cote', J., Salmela, J. H., Trudel, P., Baria, A., & Russell, S. J. (1995). The Coaching Model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 17*, 1-17.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M., (2003). Treatment discrimination among assistant coaches of women's teams. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 74*(4), 455-466.
- Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M., (2004). Examining the main and interactive effects of deep and surface level diversity on job satisfaction and organizational turnover intentions. *Organizational Analysis, 12*(3), 319-332.
- Daly ,C. J., & Dee, J. R., (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(5), 776-803.
- Danylchuk K. E., (1992). *Occupational Burnout in Physical Education Faculties: A Study of contributing Factors*. Dissertation. University of Toronto.
- Darst P. W., & Pangrazi R. P. (1996). The teaching/coaching challenge. *Teaching Elementary Physical Education, 2*(6), 4-5.

- Davies, M. J. (2003). Factors affecting the job satisfaction of Canadian male university basketball coaches.
- Dawis R. V., & Lofquist L. H. (1984). A psychological theory of work adjustment. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.
- Dixon, M. A., & Sagas, M. (2007).The relationship between organizational support, work-family conflict, and the job-life satisfaction of university coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 78(3), 236-247.
- Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletics management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 292-309.
- Edginton, C. R., Davis, T. M., & Hensley, L. D.(1994) Trends in higher education: Implications for health, physical education, and leisure studies. *The Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance*, 65 (7), 51-57.
- Fox, M., & Hesse-Biber, S. (1984). *Women at work*. Boston: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Freischlag, J. J., (1988) Developmental factors among college men basketball coaches. *Journal of Applied Research in Coaching & Athletics*, 3 Issue 2, p. 91-92.
- Frey, M. (2007). College coaches' experiences with stress: Problem solvers have problems too. *The Sports Psychologist*, 21, 38-57.
- Frost, R. B. (1970). *Psychological concepts applied to physical education and coaching*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley, 10, 211-232.
- GPAC (2009) www.gpacsports.com/members/by-laws.php.
- Hambleton, S. L., (1989) *Job satisfaction among female intercollegiate athletic coaches*.
Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Hayes, M. (2004). Check imbalances. *Sporting News*, 228, (46).

- Hoppock, R., (1935) *Job satisfaction*. New York: National Occupational Conference, Harper.
<http://www.psych.umn.edu/psylabs/vpr/msqinf.htm>
- Jacobson, J. (2002). Dashing from Classroom to Locker Room. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48,(34), 39-40.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J., (2002) Faculty members' morale and their intentions to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71,(1), 34-59.
- Jordan, J. S., Mullane, S., & Gillentine, A. (2004) Job satisfaction in sports organization: An examination of NCAA division I and III basketball coaches. *Research Quarterly for Sport and Exercise*, 75,(1).
- Kenow, L. J., & Williams, J. M. (1999). Coach-athlete compatibility and athlete's perception of coaching behaviors. *Journal of Sports Behavior*, 22.
- Kieffer, H.S. (1998) *Trends in the general education requirement of physical education/ wellness at Christian colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, Vermillion.
- Kingston-Mann, E. & Sieber, T. (Eds). (2001). *Achieving against the odds: How academics become teachers of diverse students*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Klein, S. M. & Maher, J. R. (1966). Education level and satisfaction with pay. *Personnel Psychology*, 7, 195-208.
- Knoppers, A., Meyer, B. B., Ewing M., & Forrest L. (1991). Opportunity and work behavior in college coaching. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*. 15; 1
- Kuchler, W. K. (2006). The Association of perceived leadership behaviors with subordinate job satisfaction at selected NCAA Division III Midwest college athletic departments.
Dissertation for Doctor of Education from the United States Sports Academy.

- Leblicq, S., Van Hoecke, J., De Knop, P. (2002). Coach satisfaction in the traditional sport system. *International Journal of Sport Management*, (3) 3, 229-246.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction . In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* . Chicago Rand McNally.
- Mathes, S. A. (1982). *Women coaches: Endangered species?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Alliance for health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance National Convention, Houston, Texas.
- McCallister, S. G. , Blinde, E. M. & Weiss, W. M. (2000). Teaching values and implementing philosophies: Dilemmas of the youth sport coach. *Physical Educator*, 57, 35-45.
- Miller, G., Lutz, R., Shim, J., Fredenburg, K., & Miller, J. (2005). Dismissals and perceptions of pressure in coaching in Texas high schools. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76, (1), 32-33.
- Miller, P. S. (1996). Varsity team sport coaches' perceptions of their roles and responsibilities. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Pryor, J., & Daw, J. (2006). Goal orientation and job satisfaction of college Coaches: *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 77, (1), 106.
- Quinn, R. P., & Mandilovitch, M.S.B.D. (1980). Education and job satisfaction, 1962-1967. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, 29.
- Richardson, H.D. (1981). Academic preparation of athletic coaches in higher education. *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation*, 52, (3).
- Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, (1).
- Ryan, T. D., & Sagas, M. (2006). Facets of role conflict in interscholastic coaching: The effect on turnover. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 77, (1).

- Sagas, M., & Ashley, F.A. (2001) Gender differences in the intent to leave coaching: The role of personal, external, and work- related variables. *International Journal of Sport Management, 2*.
- Sandell, S. H., & Shapiro, D. (1978). The theory of human capital and the earnings of women: A reexamination of the evidence. *Journal of Human Resources, 13*, 103-114.
- Singh, P. C. , & Surijlal, J. (2006). Factors affecting the job satisfaction of South African sport coaches. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 28*, (1), 127-136.
- Slovenski, P. Let's bring back the teacher-coach. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*,(8).
- Steir W. F. Jr. (1986) Junior and community faculty and programs. *Physical Educator, 57*,(6).
- Steir W. F. Jr. (1982) Physical education faculty and programs in small colleges and universities. *Physical Educator, 39*,(4), 195-198.
- Stryker, S. & Statom, A. (1989). Symbolic interaction and role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology*. New York: Random House.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Honoree, A.L., (2003). Job satisfaction and pay satisfaction levels of university faculty by discipline type and by geographic region. *Education, 124* (3)
- Thomas, G., & Asunka, K. (1995). Employment and quality of life of minority and women faculty in a predominantly White institution. In G. E. Thomas (Eds.), *Race and ethnicity in America: Meeting the challenge in the 21st century*. Philadelphia PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Thornton, S. (2007). Financial inequality in higher education. *Academe, 93*,(2).
- Turner, C. S. V. (2000). New faces, new knowledge. *Academe, 86*.
- Vanderzwaag, H. J. (1969). Historical relationships between the concepts of sport and physical education. *Proceedings of the National College Physical Education association for Men Conference*.

- Weaver, C. N. (1980). Job satisfaction in the United States in the 1970's. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 65*.
- West, A., Green, I., Brackenridge, C.H., Woodward, D., (2001). Leading the way: women's experiences as sports coaches. *Women in Management Review, 16*(2), 5.
- Weinberg, R., Butt, J., Knight, B., & Perritt, N. (2001). Collegiate coaches' perceptions of their goal setting practices: A qualitative investigation. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13*.
- Weiss, M. R., & Friedrichs, W. D. (1986). The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes, and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 8*.
- White, H. E. (1992). *Professional preparation and responsibilities of college coaches at 20 selected NCAA and NAIA colleges and universities in eastern North Carolina*. Dissertation for the degree Doctor of Arts in the Department of Physical Education. Middle Tennessee State University.
- Wolverton, B. (2007). A small athletic association tries to revamp its Image. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53* , (29).
- Yalcin, H. B. (2000). *Congruence of preferred and enacted roles of teacher-coaches and their satisfaction: The effects of task and individual difference factors*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 2000.
- Yosif, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviours of athletic directors and coaches' job satisfaction. *The Physical Educator, 55*.

Appendix A
Survey Instrument

GPAC Coaches Job Satisfaction Survey

The following are a group of questions pertaining to job satisfaction

How satisfied am I with this specific aspect of my job?

5 = Extremely Satisfied

4 = Satisfied

3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied

1 = Very Dissatisfied

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Coaching is being able to work at something I enjoy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | The flexibility that coaching offers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | The opportunity for variety in your day to day work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | The chance to be recognized by the college and in the community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | The chance to make decisions that impact the program. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | The support of my supervisor/ athletic director | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | The amount of pay I receive for doing my job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | The way my job provides for steady employment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | The chance to serve other people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. The feeling of accomplishment from the job
- 1 2 3 4 5
11. The opportunity to do a job that best utilizes my talents and gifts
- 1 2 3 4 5
12. The enjoyment I get from be in control of planning (scheduling and practices)
- 1 2 3 4 5
13. The working environment
- 1 2 3 4 5
14. The campus facilities.
- 1 2 3 4 5
- 15 Working and coaching at a faith-based institution.
- 1 2 3 4 5
16. How would you characterize your on the court/field success in terms of winning percentage
- 1 2 3 4 5
17. How would you characterize the overall success of the program (off the court, off the field, non-wins and losses) during the time that you have been the head coach?
- 1 2 3 4 5
18. Please check one job responsibility that causes you to have a high level of job satisfaction.
- _____ Job flexibility _____ Notoriety and recognition that come with job
- _____ Ability to make decisions _____ Support I receive from my supervisor
- _____ Ability to work with youth _____ The enjoyment of coaching a team
- _____ Salary _____ Other- please list:

19. Please check one primary barrier or job challenge which inhibit you from having a high job satisfaction

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Working environment | <input type="checkbox"/> Job stress |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of support from supervisor | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-coaching job responsibilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salary | <input type="checkbox"/> Recruiting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Job responsibilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Other- please list |

Demographics

20. What percentage of your job is appropriated to coaching responsibilities?

- 0-25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%

21. What percentage of your job involves teaching courses or activities?

- 0-25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%

22. In your estimation, what percentage of your health, wellness, exercise science and physical education faculty have head coaching responsibilities at your college or university?

- 0-25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%

23. What percentage of your job involves other responsibilities at your school?

- 0-25% 26-50% 51-75% 76-100%

24. What is your highest degree received?

- Bachelor's degree Master's degree Doctorate degree

25. The highest degree that your college requires all teachers that are head coaches to have is a

- MA BA

26. Does your college encourage all coaches that also teach to pursue a Doctorate?

- Yes No

27. What sport do you coach?

_____ a Fall sport

_____ a Multi- semester sport

_____ a Spring sport

28. What is your Age?

_____ 18-24

_____ 25-34

_____ 35-44

_____ 45 or older

29. What is the amount of experience coaching your current sport at all levels?

_____ 0-5 years

_____ 6-15 years

_____ 16-25 years

_____ 26 or more years

30. What is the amount of experience in years at the current head coaching position?

_____ 0-5 years

_____ 6-15 years

_____ 16-25 years

_____ 26 or more years

31. Are you a full time employee of the school? _____ Yes _____ No

32. Are you considered full time faculty or full time staff?

_____ Faculty _____ Staff

33. My gender is _____ Male _____ Female

34. The gender I coach is? _____ Male _____ Female
35. The gender of my immediate supervisor is
_____ Male _____ Female
36. How many hours per week during the season on coaching related tasks?
_____ 0-10 _____ 10-25 _____ 25-40 _____ 40+

Appendix B

Survey Letter

Dear Coach,

As a doctoral student at the University of South Dakota, I am conducting a survey of job satisfaction among college head coaches in the NAIA. You are cordially invited to participate in a study of small college coaches entitled: Job Satisfaction of NAIA Head Coaches at Small Faith-based Colleges. This study will access information about ten different head coaches at your college or university. The study will seek information on your years of experience, job satisfaction, coaching load credits, and the level of education of Great Plains Athletic Conference Head coaches in five female sports and five male sports.

The research involves a survey of coaches who are members of the Great Plains Athletic Conference. The survey was given to each head coach and should take around 5 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this study will help aid in the understanding of current head coach's job satisfaction, level of education, years of coaching experience, level of pay, and coaching credit load. Individuals will in no way be identified on an individual basis. Your school will in no way be identified on an individual basis. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. There is no risk to you for completing this survey. Returning the completed survey to me will be an indication of your consent to participate in the survey. Results will be emailed to you if you email me after completion of the survey. Please return the completed form by October 15, 2009.

Thank you for considering participation in this survey. Your help is valued and very much appreciated. If you have any questions, you may contact me at craigs@dordt.edu or 712-722-6309 or 712-441-3514. Questions may also be addressed to Dr. Karen Card, my advisor, at 605-677-5815. If you have any questions about human subjects, you may contact the human subject Coordinator at the University of South Dakota at 605-677-5656.

Sincerely,

Craig Stiemsma
Doctoral candidate
Adult/ Higher Education

Dr. Karen Card
Advisor
Adult/ Higher Education

This study is being conducted under the direction and with the approval of the student's Doctoral Committee at the University of South Dakota.

Appendix C
Content Validity Matrix

Appendix C

Content Validity Matrix

#	Research Question	Survey Question	References
1 1b	What is the level of job satisfaction? What percent of the coaches surveyed fit the teacher-coach model?	Q 1-15 Q 18, Q 19	Ryan & Sagar (2006) Chelladuria & Kuga (1996) Frey (2007) Buchanon (2006) Cote,Salmela, Trudel (1995) Jordan & Malone (2004)
2	What job satisfaction differences exist based on the following <u>personal</u> characteristics?	Q 24, Q 27-30, Q 33	Thomas & Asunka (1995) Akindutire (2003) Stier (1982), (1983) White (1992) Kuchler (2001) Quinn & Mandilovitch (1980) Weaver (1980) Miller, Lutz, Shim, Fredenburg & Miller (2005) Leblicq, Van Hoeckw & De Koup (2002) Sagas & Ashley (2001) Button (2001) Fox & Hesse-Biber (1984) Caccese & Mayberber (1984) Cunningham & Sagas(2004)
3	What job satisfaction difference exists based on the following <u>job</u> characteristics?	Q6, Q7, Q 16-17, Q 20-21	Rosser & Townsend (2006) Hambleton (1989) Cassese & Mayberber (1984) Kuchler (2006)
4	Which characteristics of college coaches enhance job satisfaction?	Q 18	Akindutire (2003) Leblicq, Van Hoeckw, & De Koup (2002) Cunningham & Sagas(2004) Dawis & Lofquist (1984) Kuchler (2006) Yosif (1998) Jordan & Malone (2004) Doherty & Danylchuk (1996) Dixon & Sagas (2007) Clopton, Ryan, & Sagas (2007) Weiss & Friedrichs (1986) Davies (2003) Bolt, Knight, & Perritt (2001)
5	Which characteristics of college coaches hurt job satisfaction?	Q 19	Cunningham & Sagas(2004) Leblicq, Van Hoeckw, & De Koup (2002)

			Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, & Forrest (1991) Hambleton (1989) Frey (2007) Danylchuk (1992) Akindutire (1993)
--	--	--	--

Appendix D
Human Subjects Approval